

การศึกษาศถานการณ์การสอนภาษาอังกฤษ  
เป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ ณ วิทยาลัยครูหลวงน้ำทา  
An Investigation of EFL Teaching Situation  
at Luangnamtha Teacher Training College

*Sihnnakohn Srimuang*

อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาหลัก ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร.ศรชัย มุ่งไธสง

อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาร่วม อาจารย์ ดร.ณัฐพล สันธิ

หลักสูตรศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ

มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏเชียงราย ตำบลบ้านดู่ อำเภอเมือง จังหวัดเชียงราย

**บทคัดย่อ**

การศึกษาเรื่อง การศึกษาศถานการณ์การสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ ณ วิทยาลัยครูหลวงน้ำทา มีวัตถุประสงค์ เพื่อ 1) ศึกษาสถานการณ์การสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศในห้องเรียน 2) ศึกษาการใช้ภาษาเป้าหมายสำหรับการโต้ตอบในห้องเรียน

ประชากร ประกอบไปด้วย อาจารย์และนักศึกษาจำนวน 32 คน ที่เข้าร่วมระบบ 12+4 ของโปรแกรมวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ ในภาคการศึกษาแรกของการศึกษา 2557-2558 เก็บข้อมูลโดยใช้กรอบแนวคิดระบบการวิเคราะห์ปฏิสัมพันธ์ Flander ซึ่งประกอบด้วย 1) ความรู้สึกที่ได้รับ 2) การให้ความเชื่อถือและกำลังใจ 3) ความคิดของนักศึกษาที่ใช้ 4) คำถามปลายเปิด 5) การบรรยาย 6) การให้การเรียนการสอน 7) วิจัยหรือแสดงเหตุผลอันสมควร 8) การตอบสนองพุดคุยของนักศึกษา 9) การเริ่มต้นพุดคุยของนักศึกษา และ 10) ความเงียบ หรือความสับสน

ผลการศึกษาพบว่า ในห้องเรียน EFL ของวิทยาลัยครูหลวงน้ำทา (LTTC) ระดับการพุดคุยของอาจารย์ (TT) จะมากกว่านักศึกษาพุดคุย (ST) ในขณะที่การเรียนการสอนแบบผู้เรียนเป็นศูนย์กลางนั้นต้องการให้อาจารย์เป็นผู้ดูแล ควบคุมในห้องเรียนและให้โอกาสนักศึกษามากขึ้น ซึ่งสามารถเห็นได้จากสัดส่วนของปริมาณการพุดคุยระหว่างผู้สอนและผู้เรียน ต่างกัน คือ มากกว่า 60% สำหรับการพุดคุยของผู้สอน และ 25% สำหรับการพุดคุยของผู้เรียน

จากการสังเกตการณ์แบบเป็นผู้เข้าร่วม ได้ข้อสรุปว่า อาจารย์ทุกคนมักใช้คำถาม การบรรยาย การให้คำแนะนำ, การให้คำวิจารณ์หรือแสดงเหตุผลอันสมควรซึ่งผู้เรียนแสดงความคิดเห็นว่ามีโอกาสน้อยในกระบวนการเรียนการสอน

## ABSTRACT

The study of An Investigation of English as Foreign Language Teaching Situation at Luangnamtha Teacher Training College (LTTC) aims 1) examine the English as a Foreign Language Teaching situation in the classroom; 2) investigate the target language use for interacting in the classroom.

The subjects were 14 teachers, 4 females; 32 students 12 females who attended a 12+4 system of English Normal Course in the first semester of academic year 2014-2015. Data were collected and analyzed using Flanders Interaction Analysis System, which combines ten categories: 1) Accepted feelings 2) Giving credit and encourages 3) Ideas of pupils used 4) Expose questions 5) Lecture 6) Giving Instruction 7) Criticizing or justifying authority 8) learner talk response 9) Learner talk initiation 10) Silent or confusion.

The results of the study assert that in the EFL classroom of Luangnamtha Teacher Training College (LTTC), Teacher Talk (TT) is far exceeding Students Talk (ST). While student-centered teaching mode requires teacher to moderate their control of the classroom and offer more opportunities to the students, which can be seen from the time proportion of teacher-learner talk. Teacher talks account for more than 60% whereas students talk account for 25%. On the other hand, from the observation as participant concluded that all teachers always prefer using asking questions, lecturing, giving directions and criticizing or justifying authority, which affect learners with less chance to involve teaching-learning process.

## INTRODUCTION

### Rationale and background

English is considered as the major international language in various areas such as: science, communications, business and entertainment. Knowledge of Basic English level is required to people in many fields, professions, and careers worldwide. English language teaching is increasingly taking place not only in English spoken countries, but also countries that use English speaking as their second language. Teaching English as a foreign language usually occurs inside the classroom which is a setting that has particular contextual characteristics that deserve special attention.

The English language plays an essential role in communication in today's world, particularly in ASEAN region. Laos is a country that uses English as a second language. The

English language has been in Lao national curriculum for more than 2 decades. It is the key to accessing information and knowledge. In other words, it is used as a mean of exchanging facts, although, the process of English teaching-learning in the classroom is very complicated, particularly classroom language interaction. English Unit was established since 2002 in Luangnamtha Teacher Training College (LTTC). By the time it was responsible for organizing diploma students who enrolled in the major of English teachers. English teaching and learning process, however, has been setting up over 10 years but teacher and students still lack abilities of English language skill. They are not good at interacting with teachers and classmates. Chulam (2010), mentioned that to encourage learners to be advanced in communication, the language instructors might employ various teaching methodologies to improve learners' language skills, for instance, task-based language teaching together with communicative and functional-notional approaches shall being used.

To improve English language instruction in the classroom, many factors should be considered, for example, teaching content, teaching methodologies, students' strategies of learning, and the interaction between students and teachers in the classroom setting (Ajideh, 2009). A course design or curricular innovation is one important task for language instructors. This is required for each language instructor to keep improving the way of teaching, preparing materials, organizing interesting classroom activities. Different language instructors employ different teaching approaches for different learners although it is the same subject matter.

The discourse patterns in English classrooms are formed only by instructors and students and learners' socio-cultural background interactions. Likewise, the discourse patterns in EFL classrooms is comprised a socio-cultural issues embedded in language use such as: powerful relation, gender, social class, minorities, cultural awareness (Kim Eon-Jo, 2013 cited in Heberle and Meurer 2001; Johnson and Freeman 2001; Moita Lopes and Freire 1998), as well as lexical and grammatical aspects.

To be accomplished in interaction, Kohkaew (2004) a student must evolve the communicative competence that is enumerative to their roles as participants in their discourse which will create a difference to the learners' progress in the language obtained. Discourse patterns are related to how students listen and answer in appropriate time, how to create turn-taking, and when, whom it is proper to speak with.

In EFL classroom, students have to comprehend what they are to study and how to manifest their development (Kim Eon-Jo (2013) cited in Edwards and Westgate (1994)) and these are presented in instructors-learners discourse patterns. Classroom discourse is

mostly present in oral interaction between instructors and learners and among students in classrooms. Through their interactions like: instructors-learners create a linguistic common ground which stalks from L1 and L2, grasp their parts and relationships, and acknowledge the perpendicular and expectations for their involvement as members Richard (2005). So, discourse pattern in classroom interaction is an extra type of discourse that consists of both L1 and L2 attitude. Classroom discourse patterns are different in structure and functions from language used in other circumstance because of the particular social perpendicular which learners and their teacher have in classrooms and the types of activities they usually carry out.

English teaching-learning process has been becoming the problems in LTTC because teachers and students engage in the classroom without using the target language or second language (L2) in this case is English, but, they usually use first language (L1) more than English. Students are often assigned to listen more than speaking, practicing and doing role-play. Therefore, many negative effects have been occurred such as: students are not good at communication in English after graduation because they lack the chance to speak in the classroom. Therefore, it transits the negative effect to learners' final test results in Laos and many countries especially in Asian region. Wongsothon (2005), for example, stated that Thai students still have very low level of English language ability, they came to eighth in the nine Southeast Asian countries rated by Testing of English as Foreign Language (TOEFL) and the fourth in six countries by Testing English for International Communication (TEIC) and the results of the 2002-2005 university entrance exams also reflected Thais' poor English skills, with scores as low as 30-40 out of 100 scores. It could say that one factor is caused from teaching technique.

It has been understood clearly that a teacher is a crucial person who can play the essential role in classroom interaction but that was not adequate. Hence, it has advocated addressing the applied linguistic features used for interacting by the students in the classroom. In this study, the intention was to observe what kind of discourse patterns are typically found in the classroom and to identify which patterns can be more effective in getting students to participate that enables the encouragement both teacher's and learners' use of the target language.

## **Purpose of the study**

1. To examine the English as a Foreign Language Teaching situation in the classroom.
2. To investigate the target languages use in interacting in the classroom by using Flanders

## **Significance of the study**

1. The findings of the study will be utilized by the teachers who desire to develop the career.
2. This study can support teachers who teach English subject in Teacher Training Institute and oriented teachers in the Provincial Education and Sport Department and District Bureau Education who train teachers in local schools

### **a. Scope of the research**

1. Content: The research focuses on target language communication of three subjects: General English, Study-skill and Listening subjects.
2. Study sources: the 32 first year students general English and methodology textbooks for bachelor degree students, articles, thesis in the library and online.

### **b. Conceptual frame work**

The Flanders (1970) Interaction Analysis System (FIAS) is used in this study. FIAS is used for analyzing an interaction between teachers and students in the class, which consists of 10 categories: seven for teacher talk; two for students talk another one is for silent or confusion.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Target groups**

The target groups of this study consist of 14 English teachers, 4 females with 32 males and 12 females of the 1st year students. Their age range was 18-24 years old and they were learning major of English Teachers in Luangnamtha Teacher Training College (LTTC), Luangnamtha province, Lao P D R.

### **Research instruments**

The research tools implemented in this study: was observation form apart from that video was also recorded. Observation form was designed to totally the frequency of learn-

er-teacher interaction in the classroom instructional process by using Flanders Interaction Analysis System to describe how often each category appeared during the observation and evaluate how it reflected the learning process. According to Flanders (1970) the Flanders System, it consists of 10 categories: seven for teacher talk; two for students talk and one is for silent or confusion. The detail of ten categories shall be expressed. The procedure of observation is illustrated as below:

1. Video recording – the video recording is conducted by permission of subject teachers in each time to gather data of discourse and interaction among teachers and students while conducting teaching-learning in the class. After recording in each time, the data is jotted down by focusing on the discourse of target language used and the frequency of the interaction that appeared. The running activities in each stage of teaching are transcribed and narrated.

2. Turn-taking – to measure teacher's and students' tasks of interaction by the target language and frequency of interactional patterns in every stage of teaching: Presentation, Practice and Production.

3. Environment – to observe the atmosphere of teaching-learning and classroom objects supplied, for instance: teacher's sense of humor, supplementary materials used.

4. Equipment used – whether visual aids, non-verbal are used appropriately in the teachers' teaching process and whether it can raise teacher-students to use more L2 to involve in the activities.

5. Organizing activity – clear target language instruction to students; students have a chance to use L2 comprehensively.

### Procedure

To accomplish the purpose, the following steps are used in the study:

Firstly, three main subjects were selected to observe and collect data and then the video recordings were implemented with consent from the instructor and learners. The subjects consist of general English in which the main goal was to develop learner's four skills: speaking, listening, writing and reading; other subjects were study-skill-listening which focuses on learners' techniques of learning language and pronunciation.

Secondly, in order to get the data, the first two weeks of recording were disregarded. These two weeks the instructor and learners are familiar and adjust to the cameras so that they will forget about recording. To obtain authentic recording data, the teachers and learners were not given any special instruction. Then the video and audio recorded data were listened to plenty of times.

Finally, the procedure of observation/encoding procedure were conducted as below:

- The observer sits in the best position at the back of the classroom to hear and see the participants
- At the end of every three second the observer decide which category best represents the communication events just completed. Therefore, the time involves in coding one tally for every three seconds is 20 tallies in one minute. 100 tallies in 5 minutes and etc.
- In this process only the serial numbers of the categories are recoded.
- The serial number of that category is recorded on the data sheet by the observer.
- When the observation is over the observer shifts to some other room and prepares the details on the basis of those serial numbers of the categories.
- In the observation process, the writing of serial numbers of categories is known as encoding

#### Data collection and analysis

The data collected from instructor-learners interaction were followed by Flanders Interaction Analysis System, which combines with ten categories as follow: 1) Accepted feelings 2) Giving credit and encourages 3) Ideas of pupils used; 4) Expose questions 5) Lecture 6) Giving Instruction 7) Criticizing or justifying authority 8) learner talk response 9) Learner talk initiation 10) Silent or confusion and the discourse interaction that focuses on IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) For the quantitative analysis of data, the data were analyzed by frequency and percent and then compare among four lessons.

Here are the constructing interaction matrix and the interpretation of interaction matrix:

#### 1. Constructing interaction matrix

- After encoding or observe the procedure of interaction, the coded behaviors are written in 10x10 table. This 10 (rows)x10(columns) table is known as a matrix
- The category numbers of record sheet the tabulated in the matrix table. Each number is entered in the form of sequent pairs, being used twice, first as the first numbers and second as second number.
- The row of matrix represent the first number and the columns the second number.
- For instance: an observation recorded is 6, 10, 7, 5, 1, 4, 8, 4
- Thus, the beginning and the end of coding should have the same number of the

categories

- It is the tradition of adding number 10 in the beginning and at the end. Hence the above number will be written in this way 10, 6, 10, 7, 5, 1, 4, 8, 4, 10

|                      |    |
|----------------------|----|
|                      | 10 |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> pair | 6  |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> pair | 10 |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> pair | 7  |
| 4 <sup>th</sup> pair | 5  |
| 5 <sup>th</sup> pair | 1  |
| 6 <sup>th</sup> pair | 4  |
| 7 <sup>th</sup> pair | 8  |
| 8 <sup>th</sup> pair | 4  |
| 9 <sup>th</sup> pair | 10 |

## 2. Interpretation of interaction matrix

- Teacher talk ratio/percentage of teacher talk (TT)

The tallies of first seven categories are added and divided by the total tallies of the matrices (N) and hence the percentage can be calculated.

$$TT = \frac{C_1 + C_2 + C_3 + C_4 + C_5 + C_6 + C_7}{N} \times 100$$

- Indirect teacher talk ratio (ITT)

It asserts teacher actions in encouraging and supporting students' participation. Its percentage can be calculated by adding the tallies of the first four categories and dividing by the total tallies of matrix (N)

$$ITT = \frac{C_1 + C_2 + C_3 + C_4}{N} \times 100$$

- Direct teacher talk (DTT)

It indicates the teacher action restricting student participation. In this ratio, the tallies of 5th, 6th and 7th categories are added and divided by (N) to calculate the percentage.

$$DTT = \frac{C_5 + C_6 + C_7}{N} \times 100$$

- Student's talk ratio/percentage of Student talk (ST)

It indicates the teacher action restricting student participation. In this ratio, the tallies of 8th and 9th categories are added and divided by (N) to calculate the percentage.

$$ST = \frac{C_8 + C_9}{N} \times 100$$

- Silent or confusion ratio(SC)

$$SC = \frac{C_{10}}{N} \times 100$$

- Indirect and direct ratio (I/D)

$$\frac{I}{D} = \frac{C_1 + C_2 + C_3 + C_4}{N} \times 100$$

## Conclusion

The objective of this study was to determine the learners' and teacher's target language use for interacting in the classroom and how activities were organized during conducting 3 subjects: General English, Listening and Study-Skill.

According to the objectives, the study asserts that in the EFL classroom of Luangnamtha Teacher Training College (LTTC), TT is far exceeding ST, one second frequency. While student-centered teaching mode requires teacher to moderate their control of the classroom and offer more opportunities to the students, it can be seen from the time proportion of teacher-learner talk. The number of approximate difference is more than 60% for teacher talk, around 25% for student talk. For students they have less opportunity to participate in the learning process. All teachers always prefer using asking questions, lecturing, giving directions and criticizing or justifying authority. Nunan, (2001 : 221) indicated similarly about the difference in teacher's and students' utterance: "special features of classroom discourse consist of unequal power relationship, turn-taking at speaking language used in other situation because of special role which learners and teacher have in the classroom and the kind of activities they usually carry out there" that could be summed up as follows:

Asking question, a teacher asked questions based on the content, procedure and idea of their own. The display question was implemented because the teacher supposed that the students could comprehend and give them a reply. Liu Xin, Lou Luzheng, Shi Biru (2011) cited in Richard and Lockhart (1996) concluded that teacher's questions play a crucial role in language learning. Teacher's questions can keep the learners participating in the classroom discourse. However, in the real teaching-learning process, many questions were asked by the teacher but just a few of them were replied. This is a problem we might say that the teacher regards himself beside the textbook. These issues have been heaped since primary school education. On the other hand, the teachers attempt to check all the weak points of individual student, they don't have left time for teaching.

Lecturing, giving lecturing always govern the class that can be seen as center of learning. And the teachers in LTTC also believe that lecturing can help students study and

memorize anytime. Therefore the lecturing has been popular in used. Moreover, if a teacher allows the student to manage tasks by themselves, there may not be any achievement because the students are rarely allotted time to express or create any assignment with their own ideas. Derek Bruff (2008) displays that Lecturing is not simply a matter of standing in front of a class and reciting what you know, but a special form of communication in which voice, gesture, movement, facial expression, and eye contact can either complement or detract from the content. However, Charlton (2006:67) argues that the lack of a convincing rationale has been a factor in under-estimating the importance of lectures and there are many who advocate their replacement with written communications or electronic media. But the lectures are effective because they exploit the spontaneous human aptitude for spoken (rather than written) communications and because they are real-time, human-presence social events (rather than electronic media).

As the part of student talk (initiation and response), the students usually respond to only what the teacher asks. Freedom to express own ideas is limited. It can be confirmed definitely that the teaching style is based on teacher centered approach, which the teacher does not care what the students like and dislike. Furthermore, the teacher rarely provides the opportunity and various activities for students to express their own ideas and join them together.

The term of silence or confusion refers to a short period, in which no classroom interaction occurs. During this period, students sometimes did not communicate with the teacher or their friends and the teacher was not sure whether students could understand the lesson. Meanwhile, the observer noticed that students were confused about what a teacher was teaching because the teacher usually lectured without visual aids and the contents of the activities were not various. Consequently, there was a short period of silence and confusion happens. It signals to the teacher that should pay more attention to the learners. In addition, except silence and confusion, the students' using non-verbal communication such as eye contact, facial expression, gesture can be often signal whether for students can understand the lesson.

## Discussion

The discourse interaction of an instructor and learners in the classroom is an essential factor because well discourse interaction can move the teaching-learning process smoothly. Moreover, discourse interaction can be the bridge of communication between teacher and students.

The findings expressed that Teacher Talk is one second (1/2) frequency to Students Talk. It means that a teacher tries to influence students' actions by the discourse interaction in the classroom. These include asking question and lecturing without impressive exercises that cause students' silence and confusion.

The results showed that one of the Teacher Talk is Asking Questions in the classroom discourse interaction. It was used more often in every subject. This type is well known as eliciting information from students and evaluating the results of teaching. For instance,

T: Have you ever been to SAC?

L: yes, twice a week

T: what are you doing there? What kinds of book do you ...?

Another theme found was the lecturing. The lecturing was used a lot in General and Study-Skill subjects to express the cores of the lesson. A teacher usually plays as a key person to manage the classroom. For examples:

T: Today we learn about...The new language to day is about SAC

Ls: listen quietly

T: Now, we move on to the practice stage, in this one you will do some ... Ok, everyone, are you ready? So we go on the next ...

Ls: Listen and nod heads ...

The above examples indicate that student-centered teaching mode requires teacher to moderate their control of the classroom and offer more opportunities to the students because they have less opportunity to participate in the learning process: group works, pair work and games.

However, there are many limitations in this study that concerns with the supplementary materials because the college possesses lack of sources for teachers and students, low internet access. Moreover, the instructors have less opportunity for teachers to upgrade new knowledge and experience.

Recommendation

### **Recommendation for Application**

To improve their target language skills output and improves their communicative competence, unlike the traditional mode of teaching. Teacher should change what habits of teaching and revise their teaching techniques. Teachers should shift to students-center in the classroom. Student-centered mode calls on teacher to keep their students busy with

talking in class. To realize this, on the other hand, the teacher should have the awareness of changing the role of ‘dominating boss’ to the ‘considerate organizer and coordinator’ and at the same time, the classroom activities should be organized as much as possible, such as role play, debate, presentation to arouse students’ interests and enthusiasm to avoid the learners’ stuck: silence or pause or confusion

### **Recommendation for Further Study**

IRF structure used in teacher-centered interaction contributes little to improving students’ linguistic and communicative competence, because of the language used in this turn displays that little creativity of the students and their longer utterance are limited by the teacher’s quick and short feedback. So teacher of the EFL classroom in LTTC under investigation should try to replace IRF structure with more complex structure. In this way, the student’s ability to seek and maintain a turn and negotiate meaning is expected to be improved. Therefore, the student-centered notion can be better carries out and the students’ communicative competence can be improved greatly.

### **Reference**

- Ajideh, **The importance of strategy based on interaction on Iranian EAP students’ reading strategy user: development strategy EAP readers**, international of applied linguistic and English literature, school of linguistic, literature and translation, university of Sains, Malaysia, 11800, Penang Malaysia, 2009
- Amirabbas, G. **The first language use in foreign language classroom discourse**, faculty of management and accounting, Islamic Azad university, Iran, 2011.
- Bach, K. **Speech Acts** Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, n.d. Web.10 Feb, 2014.
- Doerge, Friedrich Christoph Illocutionary acts- Austin’s A count and what Searle out of Tuebingen 2006.
- Brown and Attardo, **Politeness: some universal in language usage**, university of press, 2003
- Chainara, P. **The use of task-based learning with focus on group interaction to improve students’ pronunciation of English words with initial consonant clusters**, M.Ed. Major English, Mahasarakham university, Thailand, 2009.
- Chaiwutti (2004) **EFL teaching in the classroom** Faculty of Education, Khonkhaen university, Thailand
- Chanpoom, D. Choprapan, S. Paraja, S. Chaleekrua, A. Upari, U 2005. **A descriptive study of interaction in EFL classroom by using poetry: a case study of secondary school students in Mukdahan province**, independent study (MA in English), Naresuanuniversity, Thailand

- Chen, X ( 2007) **The impact of teacher's follow-up moves on development of teacher-student interaction in a Chinese EFL classroom**, Payap university, Chiangmai, Thailand
- Churam, P (2010) **a Functional Analysis of Discourse Ability of 4th Year English Major Students**, Master of art, English, Khonkaen University, Thailand
- Dorelly, G (2005) **Developing Oral Skill through Communicative and Interaction Tasks**, Institution Education Distrita Britalia
- Douglas (2001) **towards dialogue teaching: rethinking talk**, North Yorkshire, dialogues,
- Edwards (1994) **common knowledge: the development of Understanding in the classroom**, London, Methuen,
- Ellis (1994) **syntax and semantic: vol 3 speech acts**, NewYork, Academic Press
- Gardner (2001) **teaching-learning in multicultural classroom**, the university of western Ontario, London
- Ghorbani (2008) **a First Language Use in Foreign language Classroom Discourse**", Faculty of Management and Accounting, Isamic Azad University, Iran
- Hall (1998) **how is conversation analysis studies?**, university of Sheffield
- Holiday ( 2007) **an introduction functional grammar**, Edward Arnold London
- John Langshaw Austin (2005) **How to Do Things With Words**, Cambridge (Mass.) 1962 – Paperback: Harvard University Press, 2nd edition.
- Johnson and Johnson (1998) **cooperation learning in the classroom**, A professional psychology, 60 Peik, university of Minnesota
- John, S (1991) **indirect speech acts**, In Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Acts, ed. P. Cole & J. L. Morgan, pp. 59–82. New York: Academic
- Press. (1975). Reprinted in *Pragmatics: A Reader*, ed. S. Davis, pp. 265–277. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Kennet, Gannicott and Claude, Tibi (2009) **secondary teacher research in Asia and in Lao PDR: priority and prospects**, Bangkok UNESCO Bangkok
- Kim Eon-ko (2013) **discourse Patterns in EFL Classroom Interaction**, the sociolinguistic journal of Korea, Dankook university
- Kohkaew, Ch (2004) **classroom Interaction** a case study of Rajamagala University of Technology Suphanhbulay Campus
- Liu Xin, Lou Luzheng, Shi Biru (2008) **EFL (English as a Foreign Language) Classroom Discourse Analysis of a Vocational College and Some Reflections** US- China Education Review B 6 (2011) 752-755 Thailand, April 8,

- Oshima, D. Y (2010-2011) **pragmatics** (Lecture on Language Education and Linguistic Information I) Speech Acts, Second Semester, DICOM-GSID-Nagoya University.
- Nunan (2001) **guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages**, Cambridge university press USA.
- Nuninard (2009) **Promotion interaction**: English language education and cultural exchange program, Worcester polytechnic institute, Thailand.
- Nystrand (1997) **Dialogue Instruction**: when recitation becomes conversation teachers college, Columbia university, New York and London.
- Richard (2005) **classroom language teaching**, managing second language classroom principles and strategy for effective management and instruction, Boston.
- Robin, L. Dam, Z. (2011) **the integration of lexical, syntactic, and dis course features in bilingual adolescents**, writing: an exploratory approach, language, speech and hearing service in school. Vol: 12
- Saville-Troike (2006) **social context of second language acquisition in introduction second language acquisition**, Cambridge UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J (1975) **indirect speech acts**, In Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Acts, ed. P. Cole & J. L. Morgan, pp. 59–82. New York: Academic Press
- Shoommoossi (2004) **Teacher’s questioning behavior and ESL classroom interaction patterns**, department of teacher education, faculty of education, university of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) **toward and analysis of discourse**: the English used by teacher of English speaker of other language in (TESOL), London, Oxford university.
- Supakaew, J (2006) **teaching grammar through interaction**, faculty of humanity, Chiangmai university, Thailand
- Synouane, C (2008) **classroom management and materials use in the classroom**, faculty of education, National university of Laos
- Valentine, T.M. (1991) **getting message across: discourse markers in India English**, World English 10(3): winter, 1991 ”Reprinted in Pragmatics: A Reader, ed. S. Davis, pp. 265–277. Oxford: Oxford University Press,.
- Vandijk (1997) **discourse studies**: a multidisciplinary introduction, library of congress, British, Library,
- Wilens, et. Al (2004) **effective question and questioning**, a research review, theory and research in social education
- Wongsathone (2005), **the result of TEFL**, TEIC, in higher education department, Ministry of Education and Sports, Thailand