TUTOR-TUTEE ONLINE LEARNING OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE: A CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

Janice C. Bone

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

The significance of talk-in interaction as the basis of language learning cannot be fabricated. In learning and teaching discourse, there is a need to establish structures to guide the learners and teachers in discovering the talk-in interaction. Among the approaches to discourse analysis in speaking is CA an effective tool used to deeply understand the communication occurred in learning English in an online classroom setting.

The virtual ESL classroom is another distinctive communicative context in acquiring the second language. However in the study conducted by Noor, Aman, Mustaffa and Seong (2010), they found that the consequence of prolonging the patterns of teacher initiation makes communication ineffective. Yu (2009) also added that teacher initiated exchanges dominate more of the discourse in the English classrooms. Moreover, Thornbury (1996) corroborated the findings that the reason behind the occurrence was that the teacher focused on grammatical competence. Thus teachers become the center in the learning process and students have fewer opportunities to practice the language during classroom discourse.

Furthermore, the dynamics of classroom communication influences students' beliefs and help them to become more active in participating classroom activities. This interaction gives students' opportunities to be more engaging in the communication process using English language. However in virtual classroom discourse, teacher focuses more on the content of the lesson, though his role will become one of a learning catalyst and knowledge navigator (Volery & Lord, 2000).

Likewise, virtual form of instruction is shifting again the focus, pace, and form of interactions in language instruction. This time, however, the shift is qualitative in nature (Thorne & Black, 2007). In this instructional setting, the focus is not exclusively on acquiring linguistic forms, but on community building through social interaction and collaboration (Thorne & Payne, 2005).

In the above context that the researcher has conducted a study in on-line classroom discourse to satiate the gap in related literature particularly in the local setting, by providing a fine-grained analysis of the discourse produced by Japanese L2 learners of English through online conferencing. Additionally, through conversation analysis, information or knowledge is given that can be used to have a deeper understanding of interactional competence into more specific and systematic outcomes. It is because CA is powerful weapon in discovering the different interactional practices that constitute interactional competence.

Moreover the result of this study can help other L2 learners adapt the use of technology in foreign language instruction and justify the need to prepare them for the realities of this new virtual society. The integration of technology in the language-learning environment, using the new generation of computer-based tools helps the students accomplish communicative goals in their second language skills.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study employing Conversation Analysis (CA) is to know the turn-taking patterns that arise between tutor and tutee in online English learning.

Furthermore, the essential of conversation as the basis of all learning cannot be overstated. Clearly, a knowledge on how to teach conversation is of critical importance among language teachers. This knowledge begins with a firm understanding of what constitutes talk-in interaction.

Therefore, through CA, a holistic portrayal of verbal interaction revealing interrelation between the participants is provided. Thus a comprehensive discussion of the sequential organization of interaction, linguistic resources employed by the participants, and challenges of the technology to promote language learning in online classroom setting is achieved.

Research Questions

1. What are the turn-taking patterns in online classroom discussion?
2. What is the overall structural organization of the interaction?

Theoretical Lens

To explain this study into a simple context in terms of linguistic discipline, I include theories that on importance of analyzing the talk-in-interaction between the tutor and the tutee in an online English language learning.

This study is anchored on Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's (1974) Conversation Analysis (CA), who corroborated that a suitable object of the study

of language use is to identify how the actual participants use the techniques during conversation and how they construct and interpret the actual talk. Initially focusing on studying the smallest units of conversation.

Conversational Analysis is the basis for discourse analysis in general. Significantly, it is considered that the method of analysis to understand deeply the structures and process of conversation (Riggenbach, 2001). Likewise, the focus of this analysis is the structure of talk-in interaction which includes turn-taking, topic exchange and conversational structure. Also, the rules that govern the opening and closing of conversation rules are examined and studied comprehensively (Johnson &Tayler, 1998).

Qi and Tian, (2011) suggested a framework of conversationalists' behavior exhibited under the heading of a basic and systematic way to organize the turn-taking patterns in conversation. In contrast, in the model created by (Sacks et al, 1974) consists of two main features such as; turn construction unit and turn allocation unit are seen. These units are defined as grammatical entities, like a complete clause or utterance; however units of spoken discourse which are delineated basically by prosody (intonation, stress, pausing) rather than grammar are also involved. The second element of the simplest systematics model is a mechanism for allocating turns to particular participants in a conversation (Seedhouse, 2004). This means that a change of speaker should occur at a transitional relevance place (TRP) and one must practice for allocating the next turn; i.e, "current speaker selects next"; the other is "self-select" (Sacks et al, 1974).

Correspondingly, there are two related utterances by different speakers that are also considered part of turn-taking process. This governs the rules of adjacency pairs in which the second utterance is always a response to the first utterance (Richards, Plat & Plat, 1992). Adjacency pairs are the sequences which happen in talk-in interaction when the speaker utters and this must be followed a particular response that can be either a preferred or a dispreferred one (Burns,1998).

In like manner, repair organization is another turn taking pattern in conversation. Richards et al. (1992) defined repairs as the different errors of utterances, unintended forms, or misunderstandings corrected by speakers or others during conversation. This means that repair is an attribute of spoken discourse in which a speaker retrospectively changes some preceding item (Johnson & Tyler, 1998).

In online learning, Spitzberg (2006) stipulated that learners are motivated to learn English through online because they showed active participation. This implies that learners are more engaging and confident to learn the language online. However, it is clearly stated in this proposition that even in the best conditions some learners lack the participation in virtual discourse learning for their own reasons which is associated with the use of technology, the general tenor of the discussion but the perceived usefulness of the conversation, the range of interaction occurred, or the ongoing effectiveness of the conversation.

Significance of the Study

This qualitative study shall contribute knowledge and awareness to the following recipients involved in the tutor-tutee English language learning in a virtual classroom setting. This study will also investigate the interaction that happen in such learning and develop areas such as tutors training, testing and materials design. Through Conversational Analysis (CA) is a deep understanding on how to construct learning and competence realized in talk-in interaction will be developed. Perhaps its main contributions will be to provide a realistic idea of what actually happens in language learning talk and to enable a process account of language learning through interaction.

Furthermore, this study will offer valuable information to language teachers to develop a wider range of languages being learnt and taught, using a wider range of teaching practices and activities in a wider range of contexts. The use of technology-based forms of communication, e.g. Wechat, Skype and QQ must be analyzed to know its implications in terms of language learning. It is not yet clear, however, how many of the basic principles of CA can be applied to an online medium.

Similarly, conversation analysis is a powerful tool for revealing the various interactional practices that constitute interactional competence. The findings of this study will provide significant information to extend comprehensive understanding of classroom participation by describing different modes of tutee's participation. It is unlike most of the studies in this specific field since it is conducted in the EFL context, potentially facilitating a deeper understanding of conducting English

lessons where English is not the medium of communication in the learners' daily life.

Second, to the different online industries in Davao region this study's findings could give them a guiding path in searching for effective techniques of preparing L2 tutors, evaluating teaching styles, studying the relationship between teaching and learning, and promoting tutors' awareness of their teaching and consequently improving it. For these reasons, there are many approaches using CA utilized in order to measure, analyze and describe the behavior of participants in virtual classrooms.

In like manner, this study is also significant to future researchers for them to conduct similar studies in a wider scope like exploring other cultures who are engaged in this kind of language learning. Likewise, future researchers may find this study as a basis to include other variables in studying the talk-in-interaction in an online classroom discourse.

Definition of Terms

In order to avoid any ambiguity or misunderstanding, the important terms in this study are defined:

Online tutor. This refers to a person who conducts an English lesson in an online or virtual classroom setting. She/he is one who is responsible for assessing the areas where a tutee may need additional assistance and takes the time to share tips and strategies that work in enhancing their English skills.

Online Tutee. This refers to the Japanese learners who are being tutored English through online lessons.

English language. In this study, this is an international language, the lingua franca of the modern society. It is used as a medium of instructions as a second language around the world.

Conversation Analysis. This is a method for investigating the structure and process of online interaction between the tutor and the tutee. This uses audio recordings made from naturally occurring interaction.

Delimitations and Limitations

This qualitative study focused on the Conversation Analysis present in a tutor and tutee's virtual classroom interaction. This analysis is concerned with the different turn-taking patterns that occurred.

This research was delimited to 15 archival retrieved recorded audio lessons from July to August, 2016. I included the 25-minute lessons because this is the standard time of a complete session. Moreover, the retrieved lessons were taken from a category of Beginner English lessons.

Data analysis was delimited only to the qualitative type. It only examined the talk-in interaction between tutor and tutee in online classroom setting, using the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA) and examining the components of the different turn taking patterns include; turn construction unit, turn allocation unit, turn taking sequence and repair organization are the basis in analyzing the data.

However, this study does not include the non-verbal cues between the participants. It is only focused on the verbal type of interaction. In the analysis of data, there is a difficulty in analyzing the large body of the data and in Conversation Analysis (CA) there is a possibility of interpretation which is out of context.

The findings of qualitative approaches to corpus analysis cannot be extended to a wide range of population compared to quantitative study (Creswell, 1998). This is because the purpose of the findings of the study are not tested in order to determine whether they are statistically significant or due to chance.

Organization of the Study

This qualitative research using conversation analysis is classified into three chapters. Presented in Chapter 1 is the rationale of the study, purpose of the study, research questions, theoretical lens, significance of the study, definition of terms, delimitations and limitations, and organization of the study.

Presented in Chapter 2 are the opinions, principles, arguments and ideas of renowned researchers from various disciplines. The articles and narratives from previous researchers are considered as benchmark data in the formulation of the research questions and frame the theory which the current study is anchored on.

Explained in Chapter 3 are the importance of research design, role of the researcher, research participants, data collection, and data analysis, discussion of the study's trustworthiness and ethical consideration.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study obtained from the different data sources.

Chapter 5 consists of the discussions of the result of my study which are supported by related literature and studies. It further shows the implications of my study in the field of educational practices, my recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks which depict the experiences and realizations I had in my study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

To establish the viability and reliability of my analysis about talk-in-interaction occurring between tutor and tutee in an online classroom, I start my literature presentations by presenting the pieces of work from several scholars with their different opinions, contradictory findings or evidence, and the different explanations given for their conclusions and differences. My analysis of the factors found in the literary readings have helped me much to understand the facets of the discussion of what is insufficient about Conversation Analysis (CA) as a technique in analyzing the actual talk-in interaction.

English Online Tutoring

The Cambridge Dictionary of American English (2005) provides a definition which stated that the term tutoring refers to one on one or a small group of people who need special help. This definition provides essential elements to construct a concept of tutoring such as such as teaching and working to a certain special help required by the student or a group of students.

In the contrary, Medina (2009) stated that there some factors to consider such as orientation and human relationship to enrich this concept. He added that tutoring provides guidance service among learners which is done by specially trained teachers. Thus the significance of tutoring as a part of educational process strengthens human relationship and serves as a bridge between personalities in a spontaneous and educational environment.

Mechén (1999) elaborated that tutoring does not focus on the teaching process; instead, it is more concerned with the teaching learning process. This implies that tutoring is a complicated task in which the learners should know to discover the reality and culture. Therefore, the process itself bridges the gap between teacher and student in which not only students learn but teachers as well, or vice versa.

On the other hand, in today's society, using multimedia, Wi-Fi or Wireless Fidelity in learning is spreading. In fact, wireless technologies such as laptop computers, palmtop computers and mobile phones are considered as revolutionizing education. It is a form of transformation where the modern classroom setting can be conducted into anytime and anywhere education. In terms of learning English language, the utilization of Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) is also recognized with the integration of multimedia (Pusack & Otto, 1990). Thus the use of technology in language learning is getting comprehensive by the widespread adoption of the internet that renders inter-cultural boundaries wide open for social, cultural, economic and academic exchange.

Correspondingly, teachers are exploring how they can be utilized as a teaching and learning tool (Downes, 2005). However, in online classroom setting, there is a vast difference in form and function from informal exchanging of ideas and other institutional varieties of communication which happen in different platforms such a court rooms, hospitals, train stations, airports, etc.

Nevertheless, it is an important basis that conversation that may happen in different settings has distinct characteristics that language researchers must consider.

By the same token, video chat and videoconferencing applications, such as GoToMeeting, QQ, Skype and Google Hangout, make online classes and online tutoring more convenient and feasible to access (Shelly, Cashman, Gunter, & Gunter, 2007). These help the tutor motivate face-to-face- environment with the tutee and provide opportunities for the tutor and the tutee to exchange information while maintaining continuous contact. The continuous contact helps simulate a face-to-face environment through distance learning locally, nationally, or internationally. Moreover, the benefit of virtual classroom creates a bridge or instructional communication and new opportunities to strengthen national and international partnership. This program can be used in the traditional classroom, online classes, hybrid classes, and various experiential learning activities (Given, 2008).

English Language Learning

English is widely used in different countries as a second language. It is considered as a world language in today's society. Though English is not an official language in some countries, it is used as medium of instructions in the educational arena. Cruz and Thornton (2013) clearly defined that English language learning is when an individual whose native language is not English but he is studying in a country where English is the language most often spoken. Students under these conditions are required to speak English both inside and outside the classroom

since English is the language of the majority. Nowadays languages are important part of the real world where people communicate with one another in all academic and professional fields.

Nonetheless, speaking English is a complex learned skill according to Lundquist (2008) for second learners. In speaking the mother tongue, all of this control is automatic where learners do not think about it. This means that it is not enough to simply put new vocabulary words or grammar drills into the mind. Retraining the mind is used to recognize new sounds as well as new movements of the tongue, mouth and breathing. Second learners must follow these processes to speak fluent English, all retraining the memory. Hearing and the nerves in the mouth must be done simultaneously.

In learning English, teachers always encourage the students to speak in the classroom, and their participation is often evaluated according to the amount and quality of their talk, even though opportunities are not always available for everyone to participate orally (Cazden & Beck, 2003). Also, teachers often encourage their students to talk, and feel that they have had a successful lesson when participation merely involves any student speaking.

Some studies have indicated that student talk can be considered as a crucial factor in most language teaching methods even though they vary from one approach to another. Celce-Murcia (2001) stipulated that the contribution of communicative approach of language teaching has been regarded as essential for classroom participation. By describing an 'interactive' approach to pedagogy, Brown (2001) suggested that teachers have some degree of control over student

talk and they have to provide students with opportunities to talk and try the language out. Although it is clear that student talk is usually encouraged in most language teaching approaches. Even when opportunities for talk in the classroom are not available to some degree, there is little discussion of different types of student participation that should be considered.

As indicated above, although learners may be willing to participate during the discussion, opportunities to engage in oral discussion are not adequately available to all students due to issues related to the classroom context, including teachers' control over student talk in teacher fronted activities (Nunan, 2006). Due to this and from the present author's experience as a teacher, it is often the case that when students are prompted to speak, answer questions or give comments on their responses, they speak altogether and give answers as a group. Achieving participation in classroom relies not only on the ability to participate orally.

One aspect of this study is its attention to the role that human action plays in achieving classroom participation, and its focus on how the entire classroom can be involved in a discussion at the same time (Warayet, 2011). This study also includes an analysis of student-student talk (desk-talk) that occurs beyond the teacher and students' explicit talk, which is also exploited by EFL learners as a way to participate in classroom discussion.

In the field of second language acquisition, synchronous audio and video tools have been reported to improve second language fluency, accuracy, as well as complexity (Develotte, Guidchon & Vincent, 2010). Language teaching practices using desktop, video conferencing develop a taxonomy of skills that

online language teachers ought to possess in order to successfully teach language learners (Shelly, White, Baumann & Murphy, 2006).

Conversation Analysis

Conversation has become the major interest among linguistic researchers, because of its natural features. This is also considered as a speech activity in which all members of the community participate all the time (Riggenbach, 2001). As a matter of fact, conversational analysis is used as an approach in general discourse to deal with the linguistic analysis of conversation, associated with ethnomethodology (Johnson & Tayler, 1998). Richards and Schmidt (2013) agreed that CA is the analysis of natural conversation to determine the linguistic attributes of conversation and how it is used in ordinary life. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) added that CA is the organized analysis of the study of talk human interaction which is occurred in daily situations of life.

Likewise CA is also a method of examining the structure and process of human social interaction. It solely focuses on verbal factors but also includes nonverbal factors of interaction in its research design. Therefore CA studies utilize video or audio recordings of interactions that occur naturally. The main concern of CA is the way how people perform the turn taking patterns in conversation, the usual practices when they participate in conversation. This shows the uniqueness of analyzing language and human social interaction (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977). Therefore, the perspective of conversation analysis is the product of much joint effort.

In this regards, the expression of conversation analysis can be used both in a wide and in a more restrictive sense (Ten, 2001). In a restrictive sense, this includes any study of people talking together, oral communication, or language use, whereas in the restrictive sense, it refers to one particular tradition of analytic work. Likewise, CA analyzes the actual instances of talk, ranging from casual conversation between friends, acquaintances, co-workers or strangers to talk in more formal setting such as classrooms, doctor-patient consultations, courtroom proceedings, radio talk programs, interview, and so on. The latter falls within the domain of institutional talk (Heritage, 2005).

In the same manner, CA is a means of scrutinizing the talk which famously emphasized in talk-in social interaction. In the context of studies of Computer Supported Collaborative Work (CSCW), CA is utilized to examine the participants collaborate in synchronous communication like teleconferencing (Rubhleder & Jordan, 2001). Moreover, Ten (2001) suggested that in online discourse CA is very helpful in examining the structures and turn taking sequence in comprehensive way.

In conversation analysis, the main concern is the sequences and turn taking patterns of the conversation by the participants. The turns created by the participants orient in order to tacit knowledge about how turns occur. In his lectures, Sacks (1992) revealed three basic procedures usually happen in conversation. First, that one person talks at a time; second, that conversational turns should do the overlapping; and third, that people take turns at producing turns.

Learning to engage in conversation is one of the most difficult task for second language learners. As Hatch (1978) suggested, one learns how to do conversation, and out of conversation syntactic structures develop. In other words, conversation is the medium through which we do language learning. Clearly, then, knowing how to teach conversation is of critical importance for language teachers; knowledge begins with a solid understanding of what constitutes conversation. This means that in CA investigates rules and practices from an interactional perspective and studies them by examining recording of real-life interactions.

Furthermore opening and closing are also important part of the talk-in interaction. It plays a big role in determining how the conversation will be started and finished, and how the conversation will be going on. Another reason why it is very important is that each culture in this world uses that method of conversation to sign the relation between one another. The way to open and close a conversation is also different depending on where the conversation takes place. Paltridge and Burton (2000) claimed that "openings and closings in conversations are often carried out in typical ways." They are also context and speech-event specific. For example, how we open a conversation at the bus stop is very different from how we do it on the telephone.

In the same manner, openings and closings often make use of pairs of utterances (adjacency pairs), such as: 'Hi', 'How are you' and 'Bye', 'See you later', which are often not meant to be taken literally. Closings are often followed by pre-closings, such as: 'Okay', 'Good', statements such as 'Well, it's been nice talking to you' or 'Anyway, I've got to go now', and an accompanying fall in intonation.

These kinds of routine expressions in conversation, differ from culture to culture, just because someone is able to open and close a conversation in their first language does not mean that they will necessarily know how to do this in a second language and culture (Schegloff, 1993).

To fully understand the principles of Conversation Analysis (CA), (Sacks 1992, cited in Seedhouse, 2004) states that the main interest of CA is to uncover the organization of talk-in-interaction in its own right as machinery that makes it possible for people who are involved in the interactions to achieve this organization and order.

Conversational analysis is concerned with the structure of conversations, dealing with such matters as turn-taking, topic change and conversational structure—rules governing the opening and closing of conversations (Johnson, 1995). Through Conversation Analysis (CA), it is also believed that an understanding of the structures and processes of conversation is essential to an understanding of language (Riggenbach, 2001).

Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) added that CA aims to discover how participants understand and respond to one another, taking turns at talk and how, as a result, sequence of actions are generated. Therefore, the mechanism of this system is that the turns are distributed in systematic ways among participants. Conversation analysis is directed towards the examination of talk as a constitutive site of culture the interest is in the mechanisms of talk in social interaction (Sacks et al, 1974). They enumerated some components of conversation interaction; turn construction unit, turn allocation unit turn taking sequence and repair organization.

Turn –taking system

To look at the shape of the turn-taking sequence device and how it affects the distribution of turns for the activities, turn-taking is investigated (Sacks et al, 1974). This examines when and how participants take turns during the interaction. Overlaps in conversation is a statement of disagreement, urgency, and annoyance, or a high degree of competition for a turn. Though there is a little competition turn marks interactions which are more cooperatively negotiated. Moreover, pauses between turns possibly indicate that a speaker is looking for the right response or is signaling that an unexpected response is likely.

Furthermore, the mechanism of this system is that the turns are distributed in systematic ways among participants (Schegloff, 1993). The basic rules of turn allocations are: turn-taking occurs, one speaker tends to talk at a time, and turns are taken with minimum gap and overlap. This is to say, that there some instances that the next turn doesn't transpire immediately. For example, participants may produce extensive stretches of overlapping talk or sometimes they may laugh together. However, these are exceptions and in most cases turn-taking is managed remarkably orderly with a minimum silence between turns and with little overlapping speech.

Turn taking models are composed of two types; first, a turn-construction and a turn-distribution component. Turns are constructed out of units which involves linguistics features such as sentences, clauses, single words and phrases. These grammatical units are building blocks which are created from one or multiple units.

Each TCU is a coherent utterance in context and it is recognizable as possibly complete (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Each TCU's completion establishes a transition relevance place (TRP) where a change of speakership becomes relevant. To manage the transition of speakership, the recipient of a current turn has to assess what to produce as her response in the course of the current turn.

In like manner, TCU is also a key feature in that TCU does not just mark its completion but is also projected by the current speaker in advance so that it will be noticeable by the next speaker. The speaker achieves this through various practices (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990).

Turn-taking and classroom interaction

It seems to be very difficult to identify exactly what classroom interaction is, due to the various forms it might take. A review of the literature reveals many different definitions of classroom interaction. Johnson (1995) described classroom interaction as explicit behavior and language learning in the classroom which determines the students' learning opportunities and use of the target language. Likewise classroom interaction can also be described as the process in which students are exposed to the target language and therefore how different language samples become available for students to use in the classroom in an interactive way.

Therefore, classroom interaction can be categorized in different ways depending on how interaction is examined (Mackey & Philp, 1998). For example, responding to questions can be contrasted with acting out a dialogue; and choral repetition with eliciting. All examples of classroom interaction may affect language

learning and therefore need to be researched on. Although there is no general agreement upon a particular definition of classroom interaction, because it is a variety, it is clear that classroom interaction generally refers to any interaction which takes place between the teacher and students and amongst students themselves.

The organization of turn-taking in classroom interaction is very important in understanding student participation. It is relevant, therefore, to show how turn-taking has been dealt with in different studies. Sacks et al (1974) described the basic organization of turn-taking among speakers. They noted that in the overwhelming majority of cases one party speaks at a time and the transition between participants is performed with only brief pauses or overlaps. The linguistic component describes turn-constructional units (TCUs) ranging from a single word to a full sentence. However, the social components describe how transition between speakers is organized. Lerner (2003) illustrated that either the current speaker selects the next-speaker or the next speaker self-selects. The rules that combine these two components are also related to the organization of turn-taking within conversation (Sacks et al., 1974).

Meanwhile, Seedhouse (2004), showed that turn-taking is organized differently depending on the pedagogical activities, such as "form and-accuracy, meaning-and-fluency, tasks and procedural contexts. This means that turn-taking in the classroom is associated with the pedagogical aims, and when they change turn-taking changes accordingly. Therefore, since turn-taking depends on the teacher's pedagogical aim, the student's participation in classroom interaction may

be restricted to providing short answers during form-and-accuracy contexts, or turn-taking may be organized on a moment-to-moment basis during meaning-and-fluency contexts.

Sequence Organization.

Adjacency pair (AP) refers to a sequence of two-turn produced by a different speakers ordered as First Part Pair or FPP and Second Part Pair or SPP where a particular type of FPP requires a particular type of SPP (Shegloff,1993). This means that upon a production of a FPP, an SPP is made conditionally relevant. For instance, a question makes an answer conditionally relevant, a greeting makes a return greeting condition relevant, and an offer make an acceptance or refusal conditionally relevant.

Likewise, adjacency pair is sequence of two turns which is produced adjacently and it is related to each other. Different speakers are involved in each turn and the turn are arranged as the first part pair (FPP) and the second pair part (SPP). The turn can be specified as pair typed as a requirement so that the FPP of a particular type that SPP requires has the same type (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, Sacks, 1992). Therefore, adjacency pairs are patterns of two related spoken utterance which are produced by two different speakers.

Adjacency pairs are sequences of two related utterances which are given by two different speakers and the second utterance is always a response to the first. Richards and Schmidt (2013) defined adjacency pair as a sequence of two related utterances by two different speakers; the second utterance is always a response to the first. Adjacency pairs are the patterns which occur in conversation

when the utterance of one speaker is likely to be followed by a particular kind of response and the response can be either a preferred response or a dispreferred one (Burns, 1998). In conversation, the two turns together are called an adjacency pair (Johnson & Tayler, 1998).

That is to say, a question (FPP) makes relevant an answer (SPP) next. Similarly, an offer makes relevant an acceptance or rejection next so as a greeting and a return greeting. A turn projects a relevant next action (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). However, the second pair part of adjacency pairs may not always appear as strictly the next turn. For instance, an interlocutor can follow a question with another question. Thus, an insertion sequence appears in between the first and second pair parts and the relevant second pair part of such insertion sequence follows in the next turn.

In the contrary, in reference to the participants' orientation to the relevance of adjacency pairs and insertion sequences, Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) noted that participants show to one another their understandings of what is being said to have a successful conversation. Thus, the adjacency pair concept does not simply have to do with the bare fact that some utterances come in pairs. Rather, adjacency pairs have a main significance for one of the most basic issues in Conversation Analysis. The question is how mutual understanding is achieved and displayed in conversation. The adjacency relationship such as question-answer, greeting-greeting, and request-acceptance or rejection have the rules that make a SPP immediately relevant once the production of a FPP is proposed and displays

the property of conditional relevance. Thus, a SPP is accountably due immediately on completion of the first (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Schegloff, 1996).

Turn Design

Turn design is a structural organization in which the alternatives are suited in a certain slot of system or sequence (Sacks, 1987). It is similar in adjacency pair; an FPP and SPP must be interconnected. For instance, invitations can be either accepted or rejected properly. Requests can be either granted or refused properly. However, characteristically, these alternative second parts to first parts of adjacency pairs are not equivalent. Rather some second turns are preferred and others are dispreferred (Levinson, 2000). For example, an invitation prefers an acceptance and disprefer a rejection. This explains the concept of preference in conversation analysis is not intended to show the psychological motives of persons, but how structural features of the turn design deal with particular activities.

Furthermore, there are some circumstances where agreements and disagreements are not always exhibited as preferred or dispreferred, which turns shape respectively in compliment responses. Pomerantz (1978) stipulated that this kind of response serves a complex function and response is complicated acceptances or rejections of compliments and actions of self-deprecation including avoiding self-praise, downgrading praise, and shifting the referent of the praise are observed. For example, accepting a compliment by saying 'thank you' is easy. However, many English speakers considered that a simple 'thank you' is not the right way as a response to compliment. Instead, 'self-praise avoidance' should be

selected as an alternative response to a compliment and the preference for agreement may be expressed by lessening self-praise. Therefore, not all adjacency pairs are subject to the preference organization. Preference become significant when the First Part Pair (FPP) makes conditionally relevant distinct alternative types of responding actions.

Repair organization

The term repair can be used in different ways; first, repair mechanisms are utilized to deal with errors and obvious violations (Sacks et al., 1974). Second, repair is used in preference as an alternatives such as corrections (Schegloff, et al., 1977). They further stated that not all repairs of talk-in interaction involve any errors on the part of speaker. Moreover, the practice of repair debarred the ongoing process of turns in order to attend to some problems, they also noted that various types of repair devices in conversation are created for to address problems in turn taking patterns.

Likewise, Richards et al (1992) provided a definition of repair organization in which mistakes, unintended forms or structures, or misunderstandings are corrected by the speakers or other persons who are involved in the conversation. However, the concept of repair is not limited to error corrections. It is because the organization of repair is a complicated system for doing maintenance work to avoid misunderstanding (Schegloff et al., 1977). Therefore, the goal of repair is to clearly understand the utterance of the persons, check and verify their understanding and correct something.

On the other hand, Thompson (1995) listed the different types of repairs such as self-repairs, which refers to the problematic item which is produced and corrected by the same person who participated in the conversation, and other-repairs addressed by a participant other than the one who has produced it. There are two additional subclasses differentiated in each of the above mentioned: self-initiated and other-initiated. In the first case, the producer of the trouble-item signals its presence to the other interlocutor(s), whereas in the case of other-initiated repairs, a party other than the one that produced the violation highlights the need for repair.

This study between tutor-tutee makes a comprehensive inquiry of knowledge and practices using the framework of Conversation Analysis in the sequence of actual human social interaction, which points out the mechanism or findings that are related to the talk-in interaction of participants. Thus, the significant body of knowledge from different related studies about conversation analysis have been developed from oral type of interaction which is embodied with some practices, and their consequences have been recognized in online discourse but it needs further study. This means that most of the researchers have been framed in terms of sociological and linguistic aspects, theories and debates, and reported in sociological and linguistic publications. However, these proofs remain vastly confined within its academic fields. These related studies support the current phenomena which are related to online discourse in learning English language.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents an overview of the methods used in the study. These are the research design, the role of the researcher, the research participants, data collection, data analysis, measures to provide trustworthiness and ethical considerations.

The main focus of my study is to analyze the turn takings between tutor and tutee in an online classroom; therefore, the research approach is qualitative in nature. Polit and Hungler (2004) state that methodology is ways of obtaining, organizing and analyzing data.

In the same manner, Henning (2004) describes methodology as the ability of the researcher to deliver data and findings that will reflect the research question and suit the purpose. In the same way, Holloway (2005) highlights that methodology is a framework of theories and principles on which methods and procedures are based.

Research Design

The study employed descriptive qualitative method of research utilizing Conversation Analysis (CA) of Tutor- tutee in online Learning of the English. Bryman (2007) notes that qualitative research is a characteristic of data gathered more on verbal and visual than numeric form. When analyzing the gathered data, statistical procedures are also not used, but instead predominantly qualitative analysis, the essence of which is searching for codes in the analyzed materials.

The main part of the qualitative analysis of the material as explained by Charmaz (2006) is formed by the coding process, interpreting the analyzed text and attributing the meaning to its individual parts respectively.

Creswell (1998) stated qualitative research is the research process designed according to a clear methodological tradition of research, whereby researchers build up a complex, holistic framework by analyzing narratives and observation, conducting the research work in the habitat. On the other hand, Walle (1997) draws attention to the fact that qualitative researchers mainly focus on the examination of characteristics, traits or properties of a certain activity, group, situation, or materials, respectively, but they are not much interested in the frequency of appearance of this activity, group, situation, or material.

Educational research involves different approaches. These are based on different philosophical assumptions that guide the studies and which speak of different ways of understanding knowledge (Creswell, 1998). Reality is different by individuals taking part in the research. All involved have their own reality and the researcher needs to report these realities. It is my aim to get a diversity of perspective on the analysis between tutor and tutee in learning the English language in an online classroom.

Role of the Researcher

As a qualitative researcher, I am responsible for the data collection and analysis though my study deals with secondary data, an analysis of talk-in interaction between tutor and tutee learning English online were gathered from three tutors who currently worked in the same online school. Further, I was one

the one who transcribed, organized and analyzed the data to facilitate a deep understanding of talk-in interaction occurred in online English learning. In conversation analysis, it is the naturally occurring data established as the fundamental source. I consider myself as an outsider because it is beyond my jurisdiction what is really happening in the conversation. Throughout the process of listening the audio, I also possessed the role of insider as I worked as an online home-based tutor as my part-time job. Therefore, my experience motivated me to consider discourse analysis aspect and norms which was influenced my analysis of the talk-in interaction of the participants.

Research Materials

The material used in this study were archival retrieved recorded lessons from three online tutors currently teaching in the same online school. It involved 15 lessons from tutors who are handling tutees belong to beginner class, since most of the clients belong in that category of English proficiency.

Moreover, 15 lessons were only included in this study because as stated by Braun and Clarke (2013) fifteen is the smallest acceptable sample in qualitative study. Moreover, the transcribed recorded lesson were analyzed using the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA) by Sacks et al (1974). All recorded lessons were described and coded comprehensively and were included in the section of the appendices.

On the other hand, I made use of purposive sampling in choosing the material of the study, since this type of sampling is commonly used in qualitative

research for identifying and selecting information effectively especially if the resources are limited (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

Data Analysis

In my study, I utilized conversation analysis in analyzing the data following some steps: determining the data from the archived recorded audio lesson, classifying the data based on the formulated research questions, analyzing data through conversation analysis, transcribing the data, describing and interpreting the data to answer the research questions and to draw implication from there.

The data were analyzed using the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA) by Sacks et al (1974) which includes different turn-taking patterns. Further, data analysis is the process of systematically searching and arranging the script, notes, and other materials that researcher accumulated to increase the researcher's understanding of them and to enable the researcher to present what he/she has discovered to others.

Trustworthiness

In establishing the validity and reliability of my study, it is my call as a researcher to demonstrate trustworthiness by presenting the accurate language experiences of men. According to Streubert and Carpenter (2003), qualitative research is trustworthy when it accurately represents the experiences of the research participants. In like manner, the research demonstrates trustworthiness when the experiences of the participants are accurately represented. Trustworthiness of data in method was demonstrated through careful attention to

and confirmation of the information that I discovered along the process in analyzing my data. This is referred to as rigor. The goal of rigor in qualitative research is to accurately represent the conversation occurred between the tutor and tutee in virtual classroom discourse.

In my study, I adopted the model of Lincoln and Guba (1985) which identifies the following four criteria for establishing trustworthiness. It has been further divided into four. First, Credibility corresponds roughly with the positivist concept of internal validity; second, Dependability relates more to reliability; third, Transferability which is a form of external validity; and fourth, Conformability which is largely an issue of presentation. For the purpose of this study, Guba's model for establishing trustworthiness of qualitative research will be used because it is well developed conceptually and has been extensively used by qualitative researchers, particularly in the academic community for a number of years.

Confirmability is a neutral criterion for measuring the trustworthiness of qualitative research. If a study demonstrates credibility and fittingness, the study is also said to possess confirmability (Lincoln & Guba 1985; Streubert & Carpenter, 2003). It is a criterion for evaluating data quality and refers the neutrality or objectivity of the data by an agreement between two or more dependent persons that the data are similar (Polit & Hungler, 2004). The purpose of confirmability is to illustrate that the evidence and thought processes give another researcher the same conclusions as in the research context (Streubert & Carpenter, 2003). Holloway (2005) suggested that the following auditing criteria be utilized for examining the information of the study: the MP3 archived audio file as the corpora

of the study; findings of the study through analyzed data; coding system, for the research process, designs and procedure used; early intentions of the study, for instance proposal and expectations.

Dependability is another criterion that will be used to measure trustworthiness in qualitative research. Dependability is met through securing credibility of the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Streubert & Carpenter, 2003).It is the stability of data over time and is obtained with stepwise replication and inquiry audit (Polit & Hungler, 2004).

It is my professional belief that there can be no validity without reliability and thus no credibility without dependability, a demonstration of the former is sufficient to establish the latter. According to Holloway (2005), dependability is related to consistency of findings. This means that if the study is repeated in a similar context with the same participants, the findings would be consistent. In qualitative research the instruments to be assessed for consistency are the researcher and the participants. In connection to this, I will recommend to future researcher to conduct similar study considering the other factors that are not included in the study.

Peer debriefing is a process of exposing oneself to a disintegrated peer in a manner paralleling an analytic session and for the purpose of exploring aspects of the inquiry that might otherwise remain only implicit in the inquirer's mind. Peer debriefing exposes a researcher to the searching questions of others who are experienced in the methods of inquiry, the phenomenon or both (Polit & Hungler, 2004).

Ethical Considerations

It is my moral obligation to strictly consider the rights of the tutors and tutees who are involved in classroom interaction. It is noted in the articles of Speziale, Streubert and Carpenter (2011) that the researcher considered it very important to establish trust between the participants to respect them as autonomous beings, enabling them to make sound decisions. Faithfully speaking, ethical considerations are important aspect in my study because it is a sensitive endeavor to carry out, so careful steps must be given with extra attention to possible risks and should be continuously examined to increase sensitivity to the participants and not to expose them. I fully understand that ethical measures are as important in qualitative research as in quantitative research and include ethical conduct towards participant's information as well as honest reporting of the results. The ethical measures in this study include consent, confidentiality and anonymity, privacy, dissemination of results and the right to withdraw from the study.

Confidentiality and Anonymity

In my study the real names of the working tutors, tutees and the school were not mentioned, but codes were used. Polit and Hungler (2004) stated that confidentiality means that no information that the participant divulges is made public or available to others. The anonymity of a person or an institution is protected by making it impossible to link aspects of data to a specific person or institution.

Privacy

In this study, I ensured that the participants in this study were secured in terms of their identities and their conversation in the classroom was not divulged. Also, privacy was maintained throughout the duration of the study by not attaching participant's names to the information. Privacy refers to the freedom an individual has to determine the time, extent and general circumstances under which private information were shared with or withheld from others (Burns & Grove 2003). In the same way, De Vos (1998) enunciated that privacy refers to agreements between persons that limit the access of others to private information.

Dissemination of Results

Results are disseminated in the form of a research report. The report should stimulate readers to want to study it and also determine its feasibility for implementation (De Vos, 1998). The report should not expose the secrets or weaknesses of the institution to the readers, but should recommend improvements of the service.

Furthermore, this study was subjected for review of the Ethics Committee of institution. This study used secondary data and the identified archival retrieved recorded audio lessons. I asked permission to the tutors to retrieve their lessons by sending letters. They were formally informed that their identities will remain confidential throughout the study. It has little or no risk and it was able to pass the Ethical Review Committee of University.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

In this chapter are presented the turn taking patterns utilizing the Conversation Analysis (CA) framework by Sacks, et al (1974). The turn taking patterns were identified in order to reveal the sequential order of the talk-in-interaction between the tutor and tutee in online English classroom interaction.

Turn Taking Patterns in Online Teaching

Table 1 shows the turn-taking patterns in online teaching. Turn-taking means following a simple set of rules, enacted through a perhaps more complicated system of signals. The most significant aspect of the turn-taking process is that, in most cases, it proceeds in a very smooth fashion. Speakers signal to each other that they wish to either yield or take the turn through syntactic, pragmatic, and prosodic means.

The mechanism of this system is that the turns are distributed in systematic ways among participants. These are divided into two; turn allocations and turn allocation. Turn construction unit is constructed out of units which include linguistic categories such as sentences, clauses, single words and phrases. These grammatical units can be considered as building blocks since turns may be constructed out of one or multiple units. TCU includes gaps, silence, overlaps and interruption. On the other hand, turn allocation sets these rules; if the current speaker selected a particular next speaker, then that speaker should take a turn at that place; if no selection has been made, then any next speaker may self-select at that point. If self-selection occurs, then the first speaker has the right to

the turn; and if no next speaker has been selected and no self-selection occurred,

then alternatively the current speaker may continue talking with another Turn

Construction Unit (TCU). Whichever option operates, these rules come into play

again at the next Transition Relevance Place (TRP).

Table 1
Turn- Taking Patterns in Online Teaching

Turn-Taking Patterns	Frequency	Percentage
1. Turn Construction Unit		
a. Lexical TCU	15	100%
b. Phrasal TCU	15	100%
c. Clausal TCU	15	100%
d. Sentential TCU	15	100%
2. Turn Allocation Unit		
a. Current speaker selects next speaker	15	100%
b. Next speaker self-selects:	0	
c. Current speaker continues	15	100%
3. Adjacency Pair		
a. Greeting-greeting	15	100%
b. Question-answer	15	100%
c. Offer-acceptance	15	100%
d. Opinion-agreement	15	100%
e. Request-acceptance	15	100%
f. Suggestion-Acceptance	15	100%
g. Farewell-farewell	15	100%
4. Sequence Organization		
a. Pre-expansion	15	100%
b. Insert-expansion	15	100%
c. Post-expansion	15	100%
5. Turn Design		
a. Preferred organization	12	88%
b. Dispreferred organization	15	100%
6. Repair Organization		
a. Self-initiated self-repair	10	90%
b. Other initiated self-repair	15	100%

The mechanism of this system is that the turns are distributed in systematic ways among participants. These are divided into two; turn allocations and turn allocation. Turn construction unit is constructed out of units which include linguistic categories such as sentences, clauses, single words and phrases. These grammatical units can be considered as building blocks since turns may be constructed out of one or multiple units. TCU includes gaps, silence, overlaps and interruption. On the other hand, turn allocation sets these rules; if the current speaker selected a particular next speaker, then that speaker should take a turn at that place; if no selection has been made, then any next speaker may self-select at that point. If self-selection occurs, then the first speaker has the right to the turn; and if no next speaker has been selected and no self-selection occurred, then alternatively the current speaker may continue talking with another Turn Construction Unit (TCU). Whichever option operates, these rules come into play again at the next Transition Relevance Place (TRP).

T: Hmm:: Do you want to transfer another place someday?
S: Ah :: I want to move in Tokyo a little.
T: mhm :: why?
S: Ah ::
T: Tokyo is very crowded.
S: Ah:: because (0.2) there is a lot of works**.**

(OCD$_1$ lines 120-125)

The turn construction unit reveals from OCD$_1$ is that, delay occurred in lines 122, 123, 125 where the speakers used some gap fillers such as mhmm and ah-it is an indication that both speakers have the hesitation in expressing their ideas. This means that hesitations are pauses with varying length, which are not usually

left unfilled. They occur when the speakers are in the need of words or when they plan their next utterance. Speakers do this by stretching sounds, repetitions or fillers (Rabab'ah, 2013). They might be characterized as silence, but these places are reasonable completion points. Both the speakers anticipate the relevance of turn transfer to find out where to start their own turn. By the production of the next actions, the speakers show an understanding of a prior action.

In the data above, both speakers are producing their assessments at every line however gaps and delays are evident. This is to say, both speakers are still monitoring their talks to find possible points of completion but rather the speaker projects to signal the upcoming possible completion place to the next speaker and the next speaker anticipates that the possible completion place is due.

On the other hand, mhmm and ah have long been called filled pauses in contrast to silent pauses (Goldman, 1968; Levelt, 1983). These are discourse markers speakers use when they think and/or hesitate during their speech. Clark and Tree (2002) claimed that fillers serve a communicative function, having a place in the speaker's vocabulary. Nonetheless, they are not for primary message in a communication. They rather convey collateral messages. In other words, the use of a filler only helps the meaning. It's not the meaning in the communication. The unstated assumption is that they are pauses (not words) that are filled with sound (not silence).Yet it has long been recognized that mhmm and ahh are not on a par with silent pauses. In one view, they are symptoms of certain problems in speaking. In a second view, they are non-linguistic signals for dealing with certain problems in speaking. And in a third view, they are linguistic signals–in particular,

words of English. If mhmm and ah are words, it is misleading to call them filled

pauses but instead they are fillers.

On the contrary, what a speaker wants to convey while using fillers may be

actually a signal showing that he is in a cognitive process; in other words, he is

thinking. As suggested in O'Connell and Kowal (2005), Chafe (1980) claimed that

the main reason for hesitating is the creation of speech production. She also added

that hesitations do not interfere with the speaking like pauses, false starts,

afterthoughts, and repetitions do not hinder the goal in conversation, but are steps

on the way to achieving it. In other words, the use of a filler only helps the meaning.

It's not the meaning in the communication

T: The car is parked outside the house. I am not surrounded with so many
   greeneries but I have a potted plant.
S: Plants pot?
T: I have very small herb garden, very small. Like spices, vegetables and water
   spinach. I have water spinach.
S: mmm ::
T: Yeah and I like planting so I envy your place. Lucky!

(OCD₅ lines 95-99)

On the other hand, in an excerpt in OCD₅, lines 96, 97, 98, 99 show

overlapping. In lines 2 and 3 progressional onset occurred where there is some

disfluency like having troubles or delays in responding the utterances. In line 5,

even if the speaker was apparently interruptive the speaker understood and

sensitive enough to connect her ideas in order to complete the turn. The speaker

changes may occur and the turn passes to another speaker, thus keeping the

progression of turn motion. This is to say, that the transition point between the end

of a turn and the beginning of other turn of other speaker. So, TRP makes it easy for each participant to recognize when he will be able to start or end the turn in each turn constructional unit.

From the data presented above, transitional overlap is being shown which a by-product is two occurring activities: a next speaker starts talking at a possible completion of the ongoing turn while the current speaker decides to continue his/her turn. Jefferson (2004) viewed that transitional overall occurs at a possible transition place of the ongoing turn which refers to the surroundings of a possible completion point rather than to a completion point as such. This means that in practice transitional overlap may come into being when the incoming speaker starts talking at or near a predicted transition-relevance place and when the current speaker decides to continue beyond it. Thus, transitional overlap seem to be non-competitive with respect to turn-taking.

Furthermore, in an excerpt in OCD_8, line 265 the tutor self-selects by offering an adjacency first pair part to the tutee. However in line 266, delay was occurred as the listener accepts the turn at the TRP, the tutee adds a tag question- "type?" and in line 267, delay and gap are evident because the tutor used the filler "hmm". Such overlap can only take place in a two-way system, since in a one-way system the messages would be displayed in their entirety and sequentially on the screen in the order in which they were received by the system. The tutee in line 266 then refreshes one line and pauses which gives the two an ample opportunity to respond with second pair parts.

T: What type of nature is your favorite?
S: Ah :: type?
T: hmm ::
S: You mean? Water? Or mountain? Like this?
T: Yeah, Like that.
S: mmm ::: my favorite, my favorite one is the forest.

(OCD$_8$ 265-270)

Sequence Organization

Sequence organization is another type of sequential organization. Its scope is the organization of course of action enacted through turn-at-talk, coherent, orderly, meaning successions or sequences of actions or moves. This is concerned with the relative ordering of speakers of Turn-constructional units, and of different types of utterance.

Furthermore, speakers use their turns to perform actions in order to understand each other's conduct in talk-in-interaction. When analysts focus on the ways in which a speaker designs a turn to implement a particular action, they focus on how a speaker designs her turn so that a recipient may easily understand the action to be performed in the next turn. Thus, talk is highly organized and highly ordered. In other words, conversation is to be understood that turns are organized to be fitted to prior turns in the context set up by the turns which precede them.

An adjacency pair is sequence organization that has series of two turns produced adjacently and sequentially related to each other. Each of the turns is produced by different speakers and the turns are ordered as the first pair part (FPP) and the second pair part (SPP). The turns can be specifically pair typed so that the first pair part of a particular type requires the second pair part of the same type. The most common examples of adjacency pairs observed in online

classroom conversation are *greeting*-greeting, question-answer, opinion-agreement, request-acceptance, suggestion-acceptance, opinion provide-comment and farewell-farewell. Thus, the adjacency pairs are considered to be one of the factors that contributes to the flow of conversation.

Furthermore, the pattern of greetings as an introduction is commonly used in opening conversation. The first participant greets and responds to the second participant or to the other participant. The process of adjacency pairs happen automatically as a common system in conversation. In the first extract, from OCD_2, a greeting (FPP) occurs in line 1-the tutor says Hi. Given the initial condition of the FPP being uttered, the SPP is then relevant- then the tutee automatically responds hello. A mutual understanding is accomplished and displayed in talk. It obtains the rules that make a SPP immediately relevant once the production of a FPP is proposed and displays the property of conditional relevance. Thus, a SPP is accountably 'due' immediately on completion of the first (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973).

(1)

T: Hi
S: Hello

(OCD2 lines 1-2)

In the second extract form OCD_4, it can be seen that in line 1, the tutors produces a first pair part greeting "hello". Now, it is conditionally relevant that this particular first pair part also requires a greeting as a second pair part. However, this is not forthcoming and there is a pause of around seconds' duration in line 2. The tutor then repeats her previous first pair part greeting in line 3. That she does so may be taken as evidence that the failure of the tutee to produce a recognizable

second pair part is noticed. The tutor now increases the loudness of her utterance and produces the greeting "Hi" in line 4. Again, this so-called upgrading of her talk can be taken as evidence that tutee's failure to produce a relevant second pair part is noticed.

(2)

T: Hello
 (0.1) S.
 Hello
 (0.1)
T: **HI**
S: Hi

(OCD4 lines 1-4)

In the third extract from OCD4, the greeting hello is not answered; instead, there is an overlapping occurs. The greeting word hello is connected with a formal greeting of good morning so there is an overlapping occurs. Supposedly, the responder is expected to provide a word greeting of Hi. However the first utterance in the pair added another utterance by adding a formal greeting of Good morning. Since the FPP will in some way determine or limit the choices for the second utterance the pair. But in this case, the SPP has not been achieved at all according to the rule. Instead line 2 responded line 1 in a formal form of greetings like good morning – in order to make the conversation flow completes.

T: ⌐Hello, good morning
S: └Good morning

(OCD4 lines 1-2)

Another kind of adjacency pair is the question-answer. Basically in conversation the activity of asking and answer is needed to get the information.

The first participant asks and the second participant answers. In this extract, the first participant asks the second participant by saying – "Can you tell me about the temperature in your city?" -- and the second participant answers by saying – "I think the temperature is 15 degrees Celsius." Thus, the first participant's expectation to get information is accomplished. The first participant plays role as an information seek and the second participant as an information provide.

> T: Can you tell me about the temperature in your city?
> S: I think the temperature is 15 degrees Celsius

(OCD$_5$ lines 35 & 36)

The next adjacency pair is opinion-agreement. The first participant expresses his feeling, judgment or evaluation about certain events, people or objects. Moreover, the response to this pattern is an agreement, stating that the second participant agrees to what the first participant's opinion. In these extracts, it can be seen from excerpt 1, 2 and 3 the speaker (FPP) make an assessment on the recent condition of a certain situation and the second participant tells the first participant that she/he accepts or agrees what the first participant says about the condition that she has been thinking by saying — yeah, yes, exactly and I agree with your opinion. These expressions indicate that the second participant agrees with the first participant. Moreover, the token responses differ like yeah, yes, exactly! and I agree with your opinion. This implies that Japanese tutees are conscious enough to place different tokens at the grammatical completion points of prior talk to avoid sounding overly interested or uninterested. Repetition of the same token responses can give an impression of boredom when they don't intend

to. They are to use a variety of token and do so for different purposes this is an important part of one's interactional competence.

(1)
T. Your two dogs are very cute.
S. Yeah

(*OCD₁ lines 288-289*)

(2)
S. She is brave.
T. Yes, exactly!

(*OCD₂ lines 166-167*)

(3)
T. Boeing offers the price which is very expensive. I think it is not reasonable
S: (laugh) I agree with your opinion.

(*OCD₃ lines 126-127*)

Another type of adjacency pair found in this kind of discourse is request-acceptance. This pattern, the first participant asks for request by asking the question -- "Can you read the title first?" The modal can signals to make polite request and it is often used for small things. In the second part pair accepts the request by saying- "okay". Okay is a typical acknowledgment token. This is more likely to be used when prior talk is more complete.

T: Okay so:: Can you read the title first?
S: Okay, NASA Astronaut trained for Commercial spaceflight.

(*OCD₃ lines 45-46*)

In conversation activity the participants may propose the suggestion to give the options about the topic being discussed. The suggestion pattern looks like the Question – Answer, however the meaning is different in contextual. In the extract,

the first participant gives a suggestion to the second participant by saying – May I suggest a brooch if your girlfriend like clothes and accessories? This kind of brooch might look good on her. This expression is a suggestion and the second participant express her acceptance by saying – Ahh I think so too, if she will be happy with it. I'll take it. The expression indicates that the SPP accepts FPP's suggestion.

> T: May I suggest a brooch if your girlfriend like clothes and accessories?
>   This kind of brooch might look good on her.
> S :Ahh :: I think so too, If she will be happy with it. I'll take it.

(OCD$_{13}$ lines 65-66)

Farewell-farewell is another category of adjacency pair. In every conversation there is a concluding parts to end the conversation. In excerpt 1, the first participant provides a signal statement that the conversation is about to end- Thank you very much for coming over XXX. Bye, see you next time. Automatically the second participant response appropriately to completely end the talk-in interaction.

> (1)
> T: Thank you very much for coming over XXX. Bye, see you next time.
> S: Thank you so much. Bye.

(OCD6 lines 295-296)

Sequence organization

This is an adjacency pair that comes between the first and second pair parts of the base adjacency pair to either clarify the first pair-part or seek preliminary information before doing the second pair-part. This is to say that an insertion

sequence kicks in between the first and second pair parts and the relevant second pair part of such insertion sequence follows in the next turn.

In conversation, speakers may interrupt themselves and insert an utterance which is not related to the main conversation .This utterance is often referred to as an insertion sequence. In extract 1, turns 2,3,4,5 are insertion sequences and the adjacency pair question-answer is completed in turn 6.

Likewise, token responses are also observed in both speakers specifically in lines 3 and 4. Basically, these tiny bits of language behavior are what we rely on in daily conversation to ensure on going mutual understanding. There is also a tendency that utilizing these tokens repeatedly can give impression of boredom when they don't intend to.

(1)
T: What do you wish for your today?
S: What do I wish?
    (0.4)
T: Hmm::
  (0.3)
S: Umm:: you mean, lesson number?
T: No, no, no. in your work. What do you wish for work today? Do you wish to have and easy job today? Do you wish to have difficult job today? What do you wish for?
S: I just wish a normal day.

(OCD₂ lines 19-24)

In extract 2, turns 2 and 3 are insertion sequences. Tutee's utterance "what?" is not a question but it is such surprise feeling. The closed ended question is not answered appropriately; instead, in line 2 insert an utterance that is not related to the question being asked. However in line 2, the same question is being

raised and the adjacency pair completed in line 4. In which the tutor's expected answer.

(**2)**

T: That's very good. Do you like warm weather?
S: What?
T: Do you like a warm weather?
S: A Little

(OCD₄ lines 6-10)

In reference to the participants' orientation to the relevance of adjacency pairs and insertion sequences, Hutchby & Wooffitt (1998) conformed that participants display to one another their understandings of what each utterance is aiming to accomplish. Thus, the adjacency pair concept does not simply have to do with the bare fact that some utterances come in pairs. Rather, adjacency pairs have a fundamental significance for one of the most basic issues in CA: the question of how mutual understanding is accomplished and displayed in talk.

Turn Design

The concept of turn design in conversation analysis is not intended to reveal the psychological motives of persons, but how structural features of the turn design deal with particular activities. This is to say that not all the potential SPP's of adjacency pairs are equal - some SPP's are preferred to other ones. Turn designed are divided into two preferred organization and dispreferred organization. A question is expected to complement by an answer. This is considered the preferred options which is unmarked. Not to answer a question, or to answer at inappropriate length, either too shortly or at excessive length, or to answer a question with

another question, are considered dispreferred responses and tend to interrupt the smooth flow of a conversation which is considered as unmarked (Levinson, 2000).

In the following extracts, OCD$_2$ lines 166-167, OCD$_2$ lines 97-98 and OCD$_{13}$ lines 220-221 the responses are given directly without any delays or interruptions. The first participant received the intended response from the other which is short, not hesitant and no elaboration.

> S. She is brave.
> T. Yes, Exactly
>
> *(OCD$_2$ lines 166-167)*

> T: Do you want to improve your work, your sentence?
> S: Okay
>
> *(OCD$_2$ lines 97-98)*

> T: Bye
> S: Bye,see you again.
>
> *(OCD$_{13}$ lines 220-221)*

Contrastively, in the following extracts OCD$_3$ lines 39-40, OCD$_{13}$ lines 198-199 and OCD$_{13}$ lines 198-199. The Second part pair (SPP) are marked which characterized some preface signalling dispreferredness. From the extract in OCD$_3$, the request was obviously rejected by saying- "no, no, no". Moreover, extract OCD$_{13}$, the tutor's talk is apparently some of compliment and the structure of the utterance is constructed in order to prefer an affirmative answer. However, having received no immediate response from the recipient the speaker treats this as a signal of a negative answer and rejection by saying oh ↓ with some laughter.

> S:……….Should I read?.
> T: No, no, no
>
> *(OCD$_3$ lines 39-40)*

T: Ah..wow! You're very thoughtful to your parents.

S. Oh ↓ (..) (laugh)

(OCD₁₃ lines 198-199)

Repair Organization

Repair in conversation analysis, is 'a term for ways in which errors, unintended forms, or misunderstandings are corrected by speakers or others during conversation (Richards et al, 1992). However not all repairs of conversation involve any factual error on the speaker's part. The practice of repair suspends the ongoing turns or sequences in order to attend to some troubles. Repair procedures are grouped in two separate classes: self-repairs, those in which the problematic item is produced and corrected by the same interlocutor; and other-repairs, in which the problem is addressed by a participant other than the one who produced.

In excerpt OCD₁₆ line 100-103, it is showed that the tutee addresses his trouble source He's a carelis, and the produces the repair careless* writer. In line 4, Borris writes carele, carelessly. The tutee did a self-initiated repair. On the other hand, the practice of self-initiated self-repair is implemented within the same turn. In other words, the concept of same-turn-repair means a repair initiated by the speaker in the same turn as the trouble source element appears before the completion of the current turn. The occurrence of repair within the same turn or within the boundaries of sentences which contain the trouble source is not incidental but the systematic product of other sequential features of conversation.

(1)

T: mmm

S: Borris makes a lot of mistakes when he writes. He's a carelis, careless*

 writer

T:Yes correct

S:Borris writes carele, carelessly*

(OCD16 line 100-103)

In excerpt OCD$_{13}$ line 97, self-initiated repair is an evident because the tutee

itself consciously corrected herself the appropriate pronoun which is his.

(2)

S: … to buy ahh a suitable gift for my girlfriend

T: To buy a suitable gift for her his* girlfriend

(OCD13 lines 96-97)

In excerpt OCD$_{16}$ line 141-142, other-initiated repair occurs in the next turn

of the trouble source correcting the subject verb agreement of the sentence in turn

T: The flower look. The repair occurred in turn 2 – looks*.

S…………….. The flowers looks.

T: look*

(OCD16 line 141-142)

Repair practices are the various ways of addressing problems in speaking,

hearing or understanding of the talk (Schegloff et al, 1977). The notion of repair

includes but is not limited to error correction. The organization of repair is complex

system for doing maintenance work that avoid miscommunication. Repair helps us

clarify what we say, check understanding of what another has said correct

something we said and so on.

Overall Structural Organization of the Interaction

Research question 2 sought to explain the overall structure of the interaction

in online learning English between tutor and tutee and investigate oral discourse

at a micro-level of analysis. To examine talk at this level, particular moments from

the transcripts of the 15 meetings were identified as times when structures emerged from the discourse. The overall structure of a conversation are: greetings, small talk, main section, wrap up and farewells.

As an opening phase of the class, it basically starts with greetings. Greetings are by nature formulaic and to a good degree predictable. As a standard operating procedure, the tutor is the first one who greets the tutee. In the following excerpts, it is observed that adjacency pairs of were informal greetings were utilized such Hi and hello and formal greetings like good morning and good afternoon.

T: Hi
S: Hello

(OCD2- lines 1-2)

T: Hello
S: Hi

(OCD3- lines 1-2)

T: Hello, good morning
S: Good morning

(OCD4- lines 1-2)

Next is inquiry, this sequence provides an early opportunity for the tutee who received the first part of the sequence to talk about some matters which might be of joint priority concern. This is a part where the tutor and tutee build rapport so that her tutee feels a good atmosphere in the class. This would also set the tutee's mindset to relax while learning English. Moreover, in this phase the tutor usually addresses the tutee's name and in a form of questions like how are you?

T: Good morning XXX! How are you?

(OCD2 line 3)

To formally introduce the topic in class, the next sequence is topic initiation. In this phase, the tutor gives signals to formally start the topic of the lesson. The tutor basically asks or confirms the tutee's preference topic of the lesson based on her level.

> T: What do you wish for today?
> S: Hmm, I want to read the story Alice the Adventure in the Wonderland.

(OCD2 lines 9-11)

Next, is the main section of the lesson where tutor formally start the discussion of the topic by introducing the vocabulary used in the material. Here, it is more on repeat after me exercise. Next is, dialogue exercise, followed by evaluation by answering the comprehension question.

Free talking is used to insert another related topic in main conversation sequence and then return to the main topic Teachers should offer more chances for students to practice the sequences mentioned above. Students could be more active and find conversations more interesting, more informative with better expressing and understanding

> T: Yes alright so congratulation to that lets proceed to exercise exercise Five conversation question number one have you ever bought a gift for your parents?
> S: Hmm ahh yes I have

(OCD13 lines 194-195)

Farewell, the whole turn taking ends with a closing, where the tutor initiated to end the conversation. It is fairly clear that there are certain strategies that conversational partner specifically the tutor used signals to indicate their readiness

to terminate a conversation. When closing conversation, we usually accompany the act of leaving with phrases like goodbye, take care, see you later and see you next time so forth without really having to address the person. Sometimes, it is not necessary to address people with words at all. Other means exist to express that you are saying goodbye to a particular person or to a group, for example eye contact or waving the hand (Crystal, 2001).

T: Good bye
S: bye

(OCD6- lines 263-264)

S: Thank you very much, good night.
T: Bye!

(OCD8- lines 326-327)

S: Ahh thank you XXX
T: Thank you. Thank you bye.

(OCD14- lines 176-177)

S:….. Thank you very much for coming over Niko San Bye see you next
T: Thank you so much so bye.

(OCD15- lines 295-296)

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, conclusions based on the qualitative data collected, summarized and analyzed, the implications for teaching, the implications for further studies, and the researcher's concluding remarks are presented.

Turn taking Patterns

Based on the findings, the talk-in interaction between tutor and tutee in learning English online utilized the CA framework by Sacks et al (1974). These are turn-taking system, sequence organization, turn design and repair organization. In particular, the participants' turn taking system reveals that most of the turns constructed are in one word, clause and a phrase. A sentence turn occurs for tutor's utterances. Exceptions were incomplete utterances resulting from interruptions and delays. Trudgill (1983) states that in a conversation, participants speak one at a time alternatively taking turns, providing the turn taker not only the right but also the obligation to speak.

In sequence organization, the common adjacency pairs revealed in the study are greeting-greeting, question-answer, request-acceptance, suggestion-acceptance, farewell-farewell. However the Insertion sequence in conversation also occurs. This in line with the viewpoint (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998) that utterances in conversation conventionally come in pairs. The obligation that a speaker has constructed and allocated the turn-taking system of the conversation. Therefore, the adjacency pairs creates an obvious meaning in social interaction

through conversation. The pattern determines the meaning being delivered and minimize the misunderstanding between participants

Turn design patterns mostly are preferred organization questions. Most of the tutees' preference in completing the second part pair (SPP) is simple and delivered with no delay. This is to say that speaker of a first part pair (FPP) tries to project or anticipate the response of a SPP and the speaker may prevent a dispreferred response to be produced. This is congruent to the idea of Pomerantz, (1978) that participants show their affiliation by choosing not to express their views and statements strongly and straightforwardly but rather by carefully displaying their views and statements in a modest manner.

Most of the repair organization found in the conversation is other initiated repair. This is mean that tutor has the control in fixing tutor's flaw. This type of repair often appears in classroom conversations between a teacher and a student. Jefferson (1987) stipulated that embedded correction is a part of the ongoing talk. This means that embedded correction makes correction without referring to the trouble source, thereby, it makes the talk continuous without collapsing the sequence of the turn in ongoing interaction. This type of repair correction may be used as a technique to pursue potential information from the other speaker or to elicit a pre-emptive statement or question from the other speaker which may be constructed by her inference or anticipation.

Overall Structure of Online Classroom Discourse

The overall structure identified between tutor and tutee in learning English in virtual classroom setting is: it starts with an opening in a form of greeting, inquiry

used in building rapport, topic initiation where the tutor asks the tutee's preferred topic, main discussion of the lesson where language use and pedagogic purpose coincide and learning opportunities are facilitated, free talking where communicative competence is emphasized and lastly closing when tutor formally ends the talk-in interaction. This is in line with the viewpoint of McCarten (2007) that the pedagogical goals are to transmit information, to organize the physical learning environment, to refer learners to materials, to introduce or conclude an activity, and to change from one mode of learning to another. These goals are to enable learners to express themselves clearly, to establish a context and to promote oral fluency.

Conversation analysis gives an explicit and deep understanding of the structures and processes of conversation which is essential to an understanding of language understanding and improving speaking in pedagogical contexts. Virtual classroom activities derived from conversational analysis highlight the micro-interactional level of talk, and teachers are able to explore language performance in the following ways: discussing speakers' roles and rights to turns in spoken interactions in different contexts; observing and discussing how interactants get to keep and retain turns; practicing the language that signals one's wish to speak; Noting, predicting, and practicing the different types of turns that are likely to follow one another; comparing norms for getting, taking, and keeping turns cross-culturally; recognizing signals that others wish to speak (Burns,1998).

Implications for Educational Practice

Talk-in interaction in online classroom discourse has different turn-taking patterns such as turn-taking system, sequence organization, turn design and repair organization. Sequences can then be brought together in overall structuring practices to organize a conversation. Explicitly, these patterns involve turn construction unit such as lexical, phrasal, clausal and sentential units and turn allocation unit like current speaker selects next speaker, next speaker self-selects and current speakers continues. It also involved different types of adjacency pairs such as greeting-greeting, question-answer, offer-acceptance, opinion-agreement, request-acceptance, suggestion-acceptance and farewell-farewell. In sequence organization, it covers pre-expansion and insert expansion and post-expansion organizations, for turn design, preferred and dispreferred organizations and lastly self-initiated self-repair and other initiated self-repair for repair organization.

In the light of sequence organization, adjacency pairs provide learners with the tools to answer critical questions of how to do things with words in a second language. It is also build up with pre expansion, insert-expansion and post-expansion. For the second language teachers, understanding the complexities of sequencing practices is an important component of one's pedagogical repertoire.

In like manner, closing a conversation is not always as simple as just saying goodbye or if a conversation was close too quickly, speaker may think that there is something erroneous. Teachers may consider actual pedagogical decisions on what or how teaching should be tailored to specific learner populations. Therefore,

specific activities may be designed to target difficult areas such as formulating pre-expansion or producing dispreferred responses.

In view of turn design, what is being revealed in my study is that preferred or dispreferred organization is often misunderstood for without considering what kind of sequence is in, whether preference is related to that sequence and how that treatment is used to perform particular social actions since not all ESL/EFL learners do not necessarily know these subtleties. It is noteworthy that teachers may steer clear the simple way of mapping form to functions and give their students the truly dynamic gift of using language as a resource. It is important to understand the rejections are not always done with delay, mitigation, or accounts.

In this study, it shows the importance of the initiation of repair to resolve the troubles and reconstruct utterances (Schegloff et al., 1977; Schegloff, 1997) and in particular, the third position repair is clearly beneficial. It is because the third position repair enables participants to implement topic shift in a covert way in emergent local context, which prevents a sequence suspension and maintains discourse coherence. Thus learners may engage in the fine-grained analysis of sequences through conversation analysis, which turn provides language learners with vivid description of how talk unfolds.

The overall structure of online discourse involves segments such as greetings, enquiry, topic-initiation, main discussion of the topic, free-talking and farewells. The results show that in every segment, overall structure of the discourse is observed such as overlapping, gaps, use of token responses by each participant in order to complete the turns, are utilized. Through conversation

analysis teacher's ability to teach the language will certainly strengthen and heighten their awareness concerning the ways in which online classroom discourse or traditional classroom may encourage or hinder learning.

Implications for Further Studies

The main focus of my study was on conversation analysis with further interpretation on the different turn-taking patterns occurring between the tutor and the tutee. Non-verbal cues between the participants were not a part of the scope. It was only focused on verbal interaction. Hence, I would like to recommend to future researchers that they would include non-verbal interaction to determine the context meanings.

In terms of online language classroom task design, tutees need to complete such tasks. These sequential resources may otherwise have been ignored during task creation, and may positively influence future task design. One example relevant to this research may be to pre-teach question/answer adjacency pair sequences relevant to asking for and giving information on differences within the task and by extension, make learners aware of preference within the answer slot, which may facilitate smoother flow of the task.

This research has also shown that tutors interactional practices may influence learner participation within a task, therefore, CA informed tutor should do reflections to some practices to improve opportunity for learning. Tutors' unfinished turn constructional units facilitate student participation within the discourse, and therefore allow them to become agents in the learning process. Explicit positive assessment potentially negates learning opportunity by closing down sequences.

Therefore, tutors should be aware of employing such practice. Thus CA can aid in the better understanding of what actually happens during classroom interaction and in doing so, aid our understanding of the processes involved in language acquisition. Additionally, interested researchers can utilize the findings of this study as their guide to uncover other organization patterns and the overall structure of different types of language learners.

Concluding Remarks

Conversation has been of primary interest to language researchers; since natural, unplanned, everyday conversation is the most commonly occurring and universal language genre, in that conversation is a speech activity in which all members of a community routinely participate. Among the approaches to discourse analysis in speaking, conversation analysis is one of the practical devices in teaching spoken English in EFL classroom.

The use of conversation analysis in language research may have freed me from strenuous ethical reviews unlike those with human subjects; however, this kind of research created in me a lot of sleepless nights and headaches. At first, I was bewildered on how to comprehensively analyze my data one by one. It is because my main concern is to analyze the turn-taking patterns of the conversation which is very complicated. I kept on reading different researches for me to have an idea how to analyze the data easily.

However, as I go further with the analysis of my data, I found out that there are some rules which govern every structure of the conversation between the tutor and the tutee. Additionally, conversational structures are in fact somehow

primordial, in that they transcend linguistic and cultural differences. Indeed, I realized that Conversation analysis contributes to further understanding of the relationships between languages and social interaction, providing detailed production of participants' real activities through the organization of turn-in interaction. Hence, future researchers on language may check on my recommendations for future research.

The researcher has acquired much awareness at the end of this work on evaluating how to make conversation learning more attainable or reassessing the need for English conversation skills and create more realistic and purposeful English classes that can be attainable within the different context in learning the language. The researcher is so deeply thankful for giving her the opportunity given to accomplish this study with the help of her mentors.

REFERENCES

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guifor beginners*. Sage.

Brown, H. D. (2001) *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.2* ed White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc

Bryman, A. (2007). Barriers to integrating quantitative and qualitative research. *Journal of mixed methods research*, *1*(1), 8-22.

Burns, A. (1998). Teaching speaking. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *18*, 102-123.

Burns, N. H. & Grove, J. W. (2003). Experimental assessment of factors affecting transfer length. *Structural Journal*, *100*(6), 740-748.

Cazden, C. B., & Beck, S. W. (2003). Classroom discourse. *Handbook of discourse processes*, 165-197.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Language teaching approaches: An overview. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, *2*, 3-10.

Chafe, W. L. (1980). The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production.

Charmaz, K. (2006). Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative research. *SagePublications Ltd, London*.

Clark, H. H., & Tree, J. E. F. (2002). Using uh and um in spontaneous speaking. *Cognition*, *84*(1), 73-111.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). Designing a qualitative study. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*, 13-26.

Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, C. (2011). for the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research. *Best practices for mixed methods research in the health sciences*, 1-37.

Cruz, B. C., & Thornton, S. J. (2013). *Teaching social studies to English language learners*. Routledge.

De Vos, A. S. (1998). Conceptualisation and operationalisation. *Research at grass roots: a primer for the caring professions. Pretoria: JL van Schaik*.

Develotte, C., Guichon, N., & Vincent, C. (2010). The use of the webcam for teaching a foreign language in a desktop videoconferencing environment. *ReCALL*, *22*(3), 293-312.

Downes, S. (2005). E-learning 2.0. eLearn Magazine, 10.2005. *Online http://elearnmag. org/subpage. cfm*, 29-1.

Given, L. M. (Ed.). (2008). *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Sage Publications.

Goldman, E. F. (1968). *Psycholinguistics: Experiments in spontaneous speech*. London: Academic Press.

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual review of anthropology*, *19*(1), 283-307.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry (Vol. 75). *Beverly Hills, CA: Sage*.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. *Second language acquisition: A book of readings*, *2*, 383-400.

Henning, J. E. (2004). The" bow tie": a conceptual tool for opening up classroom discourse. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, *6*(1), 59.

Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. *Handbook of language and social interaction*, 103-147.

Holloway, I. (2005). *Qualitative research in health care*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). Conversation Analysis: Principles, practice and applications. *Cambridge, England: Polity*.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis. Cambridge, England: Polity*.

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. *Talk and social organization*, 86-100.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. *Pragmatics and Beyond New Series*, *125*, 13-34.

Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, M., & Tyler, A. (1998). Re-analyzing the OPI: How much does it look like natural conversation. *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency*, 27-51.

Lerner, G. H. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society*, *32*(2), 177-201.

Levelt, W. J. (1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition*, *14*(1), 41-104.

Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry* (Vol. 75). Sage Publication New Park London.

Lundquist,L. (2008). Learning spoken english in half the time. Retrieved: August 3, 2016 .www.FreeEnglishNow.com/help14.html.Midraj, S.,

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings?. *The modern language journal*, *82*(3), 338-356.

McCarten, J. (2007). *Teaching vocabulary: Lessons from the corpus, lessons for the classroom.* Cambridge University Press.

Medina, R. A. (2009). Interaction in online tutoring sessions: An opportunity to knit English language learning in a blended program. *Profile Issues in TeachersProfessional Development*, *11*(2), 117-134.

Menchén, F. (1999). El tutor. *Dimensión histórica, social y educativa. 1er ed. Madrid: Editorial CCS*, 1-152.

Noor, N. M., Aman, I., Mustaffa, R., & Seong, T. K. (2010). Teacher's Verbal Feedback on Students' Response: A Malaysian ESL Classroom Discourse Analysis. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *7*, 398-405.

Nunan, D. (2006). Task-based language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

O'Connell, D. C., & Kowal, S. (2005). Uh and um revisited: Are they interjections for signaling delay?. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *34*(6), 555-576.

Paltridge, B., & Burton, J. (2000). *Making sense of discourse analysis.* Gold Coast.

Polit, D. F., & Hungler, B. P. (2004). Evaluating research reports. *Nursing research: principles and methods*, *7*, 655-672.

Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: Notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints. *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*, *7*, 112.

Pomerantz, J. R. (1978). Global and local precedence: selective attention in form and motion perception. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *112*(4), 516.

Pusack, J. P., & Otto, S. K. (1990). Applying instructional technologies. *Foreign Language Annals*, *23*(5), 409-417.

Qi, S., & Tian, X. (2011). Conversation Analysis as Discourse Approaches to Teaching EFL Speaking. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, *6*(4), 90-103.

Rabab'ah, G. (2013). Strategies of repair in EFL learners' oral discourse. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(6), 123.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Routledge.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, *10*(1), 195.

Riggenbach, H. (2001). Discourse analysis in the language classroom: Volume 1. The spoken language. *AVAILABLE FROM*, *13*(205), 200.

Ruhleder, K., & Jordan, B. (2001). Co-constructing non-mutual realities: Delay-generated trouble in distributed interaction. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, *10*(1), 113-138.

Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters International Journal of Educational Management, *14(5), 216-223*.

Sacks, H. (1992). Lectures on conversation vol. 1 & 2.London: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *language*, 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on language and social interaction*, *26*(1), 99-128.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American journal of sociology*, *102*(1), 161-216.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context?. *Discourse & society*, *8*(2), 165-187.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, *8*(4), 289-327.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 361-382.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). Conversation analysis methodology. *Language Learning*, *54*(S1), 1-54.

Shelley, M., White, C., Baumann, U., & Murphy, L. (2006). " It's a unique role!" Perspectives on tutor attributes and expertise in distance language teaching. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *7*(2).

Shelly, G., Cashman, T. J., Gunter, G., & Gunter, R. (2007). *Teachers discovering computers: Integrating technology and digital media in the classroom.* Cengage Learning.

Speziale, H. S., Streubert, H. J., & Carpenter, D. R. (2011). *Qualitative research in nursing: Advancing the humanistic imperative.* Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Spitzberg, B. H. (2006). Preliminary Development of a Model and Measure of Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) Competence. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *11*(2), 629-666.

Streubert, H. J., & Carpenter, D. (2003). Qualitative research in nursing. *Third Editionth edition. Philadelphia: Williams & Wilkings Co.*

Ten, H.P. (2001). Doing conversation analysis: a practical guide. Second Edition. London, etc.: Sage More.

Thompson, T. O. S. A. (1995). What can conversation tell us about syntax?". *Alternative linguistics: Descriptive and theoretical modes*, *102*, 213.

Thornbury, S. (1996). Teachers research teacher talk. *Elt Journal*, *50*(4), 279-289.

Thorne, S. L., & Black, R. W. (2007). Language and literacy development in computer-mediated contexts and communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *27*, 133-160.

Thorne, S. L., & Payne, J. S. (2005). Evolutionary trajectories, Internetmediated expression, and language education. *CALICO journal*, 371-397.

Trudgill, P. (1983). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society*. Penguin UK.

Tutoring. (2005). In *Cambridge dictionary of American English.* (4th Edition). Cambridge University Press.

Volery, T., & Lord, D. (2000). Critical success factors in online education. *International journal of educational management*, *14*(5), 216-223.

Walle, A. H. (1997). Quantitative versus qualitative tourism research. *Annals of tourism research*, *24*(3), 524-536.

Warayet, A. M. (2011). Participation as a complex phenomenon in the EFL classroom. Newcastle University.

Yu, W. (2009). An analysis of college English classroom discourse. *Asian Social Science*, *5*(7), 152.