Conversation Analysis of English Language Classroom Interaction at Public Schools in Punjab, Pakistan

Afsheen Nusrat[1], Nabila Akbar[2], and Aamir Aziz[2]*

[1]Department of English, Government College University Faisalabad, Sub-Campus Sahiwal, Pakistan
[2]Department of English, University of Sahiwal, Pakistan
*Corresponding Email: aamiraziz@uosahiwal.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

This Conversation Analysis (CA) study proposes to investigate the Initiation Response Feedback   (IRF),   forms in teacher fronted interaction, to investigate, the amount of teacher talk, teacher–learner interaction including, nature of initiation patterns, at middle level ESL classroom of public schools. All data, used in the study comes from transcription of the audio recordings to elicit the real classroom language. Conversation Analysis (CA) is adopted as the diagnostic approach to identify earlier mentioned features of classroom conversation. Data was recorded by the means of audio recorder and opportunity sampling was done for collecting data. The analysis is done by keeping the research focus in mind that is, identification of real classroom interaction. The findings of this study concludes that public sector classrooms offer very less scope to communication approach of learning as a result students remain unexposed to real life language use and remained stuck on rules of language rather use of language. Finding of the research also displayed that though, the EFL classrooms offer vast room for communication and interactional practices however, it is utilized inappropriately in public schools.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is believed that communication is base of language learning and EFL classrooms are supposed to offer interactive environment to equip the learners with language proficiency in all the facets of language use. So In this regard various features of classroom interaction are very important. These feathers include the teacher–learner interaction including, nature of initiation patterns, impact of teacher's question, effects of feedback, and error treatment. In addition to all former aspects the participation of the learners, learner-learner interaction, in form of pair and group work, and their involvement in topic and task-based activities is equally important.

This article is an attempt to investigate real classroom conversation of public schools in Sahiwal, Pakistan. Article is targeting public schools particularly for the fact; students of private institution have showed considerably higher marks than students of public institutions (Mansoor, 2005).   Naveed (2015) states that assessment of the current language skills in academic domain reveals that students from private institutions are good as compared to public students. Shamim (2011) also pointed out "higher levels English language proficiency might be attributed to student's earlier education in private English medium schools.

Since students of private school are comparatively more proficient in English there is a need to identify the language discourse in public school. In private schools English is official medium of instruction, bilingual discourse is commonly used while in public schools English is frequently taught by Grammar translation method (Shamim, 2011). According to Naveed (2015) the significant difference in the performance of students can be analyzed on the basis of teaching methodologies engaged in institutions. Pica and Doughty (1985) stressed teachers' role in creating comprehensible input and their talk is key source of input in SLA. Therefore, in language classrooms teacher questions serves as language input to students' answers and student's answers and question servers as language output further "the language of global communication is English" (Aziz et al., 2021, p.884).

Despite the above findings the prior literature is silent about recognizing distinctive features of EFL classroom conversation including interactional structure and interactional practices in public sector institutes**.** Here conversation analysis has been proved an ideal method for exploring the real interactions to spot the English language use between teacher and students in EFL classroom.

The study specifically emphases on the Initiation Response Feedback   (IRF),   forms in teacher fronted interaction, teacher–learner interaction including, nature of initiation patterns, and interactional practice in   middle level ESL classroom at public schools of district Sahiwal. Middle section EFL classrooms are targeted particularly, because language learning aims

at this level are more or less same and learners at this level are potentially able to decide whether teacher's explanation or reposes are enough to understated or they need to initiate the response on their own (Jack Sidnel, 2012).

1.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1.1 COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

Communicative language teaching CLT is an approach of teaching second language, it emphasizes on communication as both mean and goal of learning. The focus of this approach is to build an interactive environment through group and pair work (Wong & Waring, 2010). It is understood that interaction in the classroom is a major variable that affect second language acquisition in formal settings (Gündüz, 2014). Rivers (1987) states that "Through interaction, learners can increase their language store as they listen and read authentic linguistics material, or even output of their fellow students in discussions, cooperative problem solving tasks, or dialogue journals. In interaction, students can use all they possess of the language, all they have learned or casually absorbed in real life exchanges".

1.1.2 CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

Conversation analysis is a qualitative research growing approach to study human interaction. A sociologist Harvey Sack (1935-1975) is credited with founding the approach and is also known as ethnomethodology and talk-in-interaction . CA is used to examine classroom conversation and learning opportunities in L2 classroom activity, therefore it is essential to talk about the role of social context (Markee, 2004). CA at its core is a method that works with audio and video recordings of social interaction (Jack Sidnel, 2010). It is a way to investigate the process and structure of interaction between people in different social settings. The primary focus of CA is talk but, can also integrate the nonverbal aspects of communication in its design.

1.1.3 CONVERSATION ANALYSIS (CA) AS METHODOLOGY

Extensively, Conversation Analysis looks at the organization/order/orderliness of social activity, in verbose practices, in the /telling/saying/doings of individuals in the public arena. As talk is a fundamental feature of our life, CA endeavors to see how interactants comprehend and show comprehension to one another as their discussion unfolds. Generally perceived object of CA research, is to see the interaction from the members viewpoint, by venturing in their shoes, so to speak, with an aim "to discover how participants understand and respond to one another at their turn in talk, with a central focus on how sequences of actions are produced" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Such analysis proposes evidence of what participant themselves orient to, thus makes it possible to organize the machinery that "enables participants to attain the organization and order" (Seedhous, 2005).

1.1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF INTERACTION IN SLA

In the course of Second Language Accusation (SLA), classroom interaction plays a significant role. As the interaction between teacher and students has a strong influence on student learning (Seedhouse, 1996) , it is necessary to make classroom as much interactive as possible. Chaudron (1998) stated that teacher talks take the major proportion of classroom conversation; in fact, teacher talk time occupies about 66% to 72% of classroom interaction (Musumeci, 1996).

1.1.5 STRUCTURE OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION

One of the prominent feature of classroom talk is that how it pursues a predictable structure, involving three sections: teacher's Initiation, student's Response, and teacher's Feedback. This three-section structure was first advanced by Sinclair and Coulthard in 1975 and is commonly known as the IRF: Initiation, Response, Feedback/Evaluation exchange structure. IRF is otherwise called a recitation content or triadic structure (triadic basically refers the way that each exchange, is comprised of three moves, typically an inquiry or question, a reaction or response, and after that feedback or evaluation) (Sinclair & Coulthard,1975).

1.1.6 THE IRF CYCLE

In language teaching, the IRF sequence exchange is the commonplace succession of teacher-student-teacher turn-taking in classroom. In initiation (I) stage teacher for the most part makes an inquiry or asks a question, to which student reacts or responds(R). That is then trailed by a type of follow up or assessment/evaluation (F/E) by the teacher. Van Lier (2001) says, depending on the nature of questions are asked, the initiation stage may require learner, simply to present recently learned items.

1.1.7 FORMS OF ORAL INTERACTION IN CLASSROOM

Angelo (1993) states that, "classroom interaction, contains teacher-learner (T-L)/teacher-student(T-S) and learner-learner(L-L)/student-student(S-S) interaction, forms an active learning atmosphere, connect knowledge, focus attention, provides timely feedback; enable students to sort out their insight, offer motivation to learn, and help students to beneficially deal with their time. Students will get more information from the exercises when they effectively participate in learning" However, Van Lier 1996 (as cited in De Bot, 2001) added that two sorts of classroom communication present distinctive opportunities for arrangement, so each type should be assessed inside its specific setting.

a. Teacher-Learner interaction

In the classroom, the instructor frequently makes inquiries to students and students answer the inquiries and the other way around; or teacher takes participation in learning activities. These structures are called teacher-student (TS) interaction.

b. Learner-Learner interaction

The form of interaction that occurs among students is commonly known as learner- learner-interaction (LL) or student-student (SS) interaction. In this interaction teacher is more like a monitor or facilitator and learners are active participants. This interaction occurs in group and pair activities.

1.1.8 INTERACTIONAL PRACTICES

Interactional practices ought to be comprehended as what participants use traditionally and reflexively, both as an interaction organization for the generation of their social activities and for the understandings of their doings" (Seedhouse, 2011).

a. Turn taking practices

Turn taking practices indicate the method for building a turn and assigning a turn" (Wong &Waring, 2010). Turns are basic to connection, and comprise of at least one turn construction units (TCU), which might be word, phrase, clause or sentence. The last snapshot of a TCU is named possible completion point (PCP), which itself is a transitional relevance point (TRP), it is the place when another speaker may start another turn.

b. Sequencing practices

As interactants talk, turns meet to shape sequencing practices which are methods for initiating and responding to talk while performing activities, for example, asking, welcoming, storytelling or topic initiation (Wong and Waring 2010). According to Seed House (2011) these pairs are combined expressions where production of initial segment of the pair (for example question) the second piece of the match (reply) turns out to be restrictively pertinent.

c. Adjacency pairs

Adjacency pairs refer to "the pairs of utterances in talk, which are often mutually dependent, for example, greeting -greeting, congratulation - thanks. Usually, they are characterized as preferred or dis-preferred response. A dis-preferred response is often indicated by "a slight pause, or by a preface like 'Well' or 'you see', or by an explanation and justification of the response. The most commonly occurring adjacency pair is question-answer adjacency pair.

d. Overall structuring practices

Overall structuring practices are the ways of constructing conversation as the openings and closings (Wong & Waring, 2010). The openings usually observed are greetings, identification and recognition sequences. There is another sequence as well that is summon answer sequences. In classroom this sequence flow as initiation response sequence IRF.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this dissertation are:
1. To discover the forms of interaction practiced in EFL classroom conversation at public institutes.
2. To analyze the interactional   structure (IRF) in   EFL classroom at public school.
3. To identify interactional   practices occur in EFL classrooms at public school.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS
1. What are the forms of interaction practiced in EFL classroom conversation at public schools?
2. What are the interactional structure (IRF) followed in EFL classrooms at public schools?
3. What interactional practices occur in EFL classrooms at public school?

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE

The article will help to discover classroom interaction and EFL conversational structures occur in real classroom. Moreover, it will identify the reasons and classrooms practices that hinders students efficacy to learn L2 at public schools and lead us to know how to overcome loopholes of L2 learning environment at public schools.

1.6 LIMITATIONS

Data is collected from six and seven grade through opportunity sampling. Though this mode   is less-than-ideal environment for this study and recorded data is of negligible size, as Havranek's warning said that analysis of this nature would be much more valuable if research were conducted over a longer period of time (Enfield, 2007).

2. METHODOLOGY

This investigation is descriptive and has adopted Conversation Analysis (CA) as the diagnostic approach to identify interactional structures of conversation at middle section public EFL classrooms. Since Second Language Accusation (SLA) needs both interaction and introspection, CA is more worthwhile because such facets of language acquisition process are beyond its purview. In this scenario, interaction for better input and discussion for meaning plays a central role in L2 acquisition.

As this study aims to analyze the verbal features of teacher-learner and learners-learner interaction patterns by adopting the method of conversation analysis, written transcription of classroom conversation are used as primary data to delineate interactional structure of EFL classrooms. For this purpose an analytical framework is drawn by following the convention of Seed House's (2005) practice of analyzing the interactional practices, including the three-section talk structure (IRF) proposed by Coulthard and Sinclair (1975) and types of classroom interaction pattern defined by Van Lier 1996 (as cited in De Bot, 2017). The framework also contain structure of classroom interaction (Van Lier, 2002), forms of classroom interaction (Angelo,

1993) and Interaction practices (Wong & Waring, 2010). All these conversational structures have been discussed in literature section with references.   However, an additional column is integrated in framework to analyze other features of talk, like talk time, L1 interferences and use of target language.

2.1 PILOT STUDY

A pilot study was done to assess the quality of audio recording and how instrument in classroom works.   It also helped to test whether students and teacher's voice is loud enough to be captured by the device and at which distance it can be placed to record all the classroom conversations. The pilot study also helped the researcher to make possible changes related to quality of device.

2.2 DATA COLLECTION

Data was recorded by the means of audio recorder located in front of the class. Six grade public sector EFL classroom is considered for data collection. Researcher recorded the lessons for around ten minutes from three different public schools located in Sahiwal district.

2.3 DATA SAMPLING

Opportunity sampling is done for collecting data with prior permission of the heads of the institutes. Three EFL classes with different learning context were considered deliberately to analyze the versatility of interaction patterns. Learning context includes grammar, comprehension and phonetic lessons.

3. ANALYSIS

In the line with conversation analysis (CA) practice all the data, used in the study comes from transcription of the audio recordings to elicit the real classroom language. There is not any pre or posttest carried out, as CA never relies on, what analysts or participant think may or may not be relevant, as such sort of evidence ultimately results as vague and confusing perceptions of participants and analysts (Seedhouse, 2004). The objective of relying only on the transcripts is to develop emic perspective of how participants display their understanding to each other (Ramzan et al., 2021). Identified features of each extract are mentioned as found in the tables and detailed analysis is done with the help of transcription. Labeled features include turn taking, sequencing practices, structure of class interaction, forms of classroom interaction and Interaction practices.

Table 3.1 Conversation Structures Identified in Comprehension Lesson Transcription

Structure of classroom interaction	Initiation – Response-Feedback				
IRF (conventional)	✓				
IRF (non-conventional)					
Forms of classroom interaction					
• Teacher–student interaction	✓				
• Student–student interaction					
Model of interaction practices					
1 Turn Taking practices	Lexical One word turn	Phrasal Phrasal turn	Clausal/Sentential Single or number of clausal and sentential turn		
Teacher's turn			✓		
Students' or student's turn	✓		✓		
2 Turn patterns	Teacher's dominance T-S-T-T-S-T-S-T-S ✓	Equal participation	Student dominance		
3 Sequencing Practices	Topic initiation	Question Answer Adjacency pairs	Repair sequence	Repetition drilling	Substitution drilling
Teacher	✓	✓		✓	✓
Student				✓	✓

4	Overall structuring practices (IRF)	Initiation	Response	Feedback
	Teacher	✓		✓
	Student		✓	
Additional features		Talk time (min)	Use of target language	Use of L1
	Teacher	4.5	✓	✓
	Student	1.5		✓

Context of learning of this lesson is comprehension. Extract begins with T holding the floor and initiates the sequence in form of direct question S made the response and T closed the sequence by providing feedback "right" to the response and initiated another sequence in Line 3. The IRF pattern observed in line 1 to 3 is T-S-T. In line 4 T again made the initiation by asking the question "Who will tell?" S made the response in line 5 and in line 6 after getting the response T supplies the feedback along another initiation. In response of line 7 S responds quickly in line 9 and T again considers the response and added another initiation in the form of display question in line 10.

1. T: all of you open your books page number 28 all of you look into your textbook and guess which festival is in this picture?
2. Ss: Eid ul Adha
3. T: achha (right). Eid ul Adha Kisko kehte hain Eid al-adha
4. T: Kaun batayega
5. S: Jise hum Badi eid kehte hain
6. T: Badi eid b kehte hain aur Qurbani wali Eid bhi kehte hain doosri Eid konsi hoti hai?r
7. S: Eid ul Fitr
8. T:Eid ul Adha aur Eid ul Fitr mein kya Fark Hai Kaun batayega
9. S: Eid ul Adha Pe Hum Qurbani karte hain aur Eid ul Fitr Ramzan ke baad Aati Hai

Here the interaction pattern is T-S-T-T-S-T-S-T-S, the turns are rapid and floor is in continuous shift. Teacher asked question students responded and the same pattern is continuously followed. The IRF sequence is exiting in its conventional form. There is not a single instance where initiation (I) is happening from S. Every time the initiation is made from T, S responded and T again took the floor to provide Feedback (F). This fixed pattern of IRF is appeared as the prominent feature of the conversation.

10. T: achha baccho ki Eid ul Adha aur Eid ul Fitr me kya Fark Hai? wo kya cheez hai jo hum Eid-ul-Fitr par nahi karte lekin Eid ul Adha par Karte Hain?. Idhar Se Koi batayega yahan se nahi
11. S: Eid ul Adha Par Hum Qurbani Karte Hain aur   Eid ul Fitr par nahi karte

Line 14 suggests that teacher is exercising all the control and is very dominant in passing the turns to next participant. Teacher seems active and students are mainly respective participant of the interaction.

12. T: our festival, festival mean?
13. S: //tehwar
14. T://tehwar are cultural, cultural means?
15. S://sakafat
16. T://sakafti event ?
17. S: mouka
18. T:event kis ko bolty Han?
19. S: //muka

The prominent feature of the sequence organization in the lesson is question and answer adjacency pair. It takes major percentage of all the sequences. All the questions were asked by teacher and students were only respondent.

20. T: occasion, aik tehwar or aik sakafti muqa kya hy manaya Jata hy aik khas muky py to create a sense jis. Mai paida ki jati hy create kehty Han paida krna or sense kehty Han sahuor ko of brotherhood, brotherhood
21. Ss: bhaichara
22. T: paida krta hy shaour kis ka
23. S: bhai chary ka
24. T: bhai chary ka, selflessness
25. Ss: begharzi
26. T: ()ya beghari peace

27. Ss: aman
28. T: and sacrifice, sacrifice
29. Ss: qurbani
30. T: among the people
31. Ss: logon k darmian

From line 12 to 31 most of the responses are in the choral form. L1 use is also very prominent from both sides. Code mixing is observed in almost all utterances. Teacher hardly uttered any complete sentence in target language. The context of learning is comprehension lesson from text books but students are not involved in reading process but are engaged in translating the words while teacher is reading. Students are not involved in any interaction to each other; S-S pattern is missing.

Table 3.2 Conversation Structures Identified in Grammar Lesson Transcription

Structure of classroom interaction	Initiation – Response-Feedback			
IRF (conventional)	✓			
IRF (non-conventional)				
Forms of classroom interaction				
• Teacher–student interaction	✓			
• Student–student interaction				
Model of interaction practices				
1 Turn Taking practices	Lexical One word turn	Phrasal Phrasal turn	Clausal/Sentential Single or number of clausal and sentential turn	
Teacher's turn			✓	
Students' or student's turn	✓	✓	✓	
2 Turn patterns	Teacher's dominance T-Ss-T-Ss-T-Ss-T-Ss-T-Ss	Equal participation	Student dominance	
3 Sequencing Practices	Topic initiation	Question Answer Adjacency pairs	Repair sequence	Repetition drilling	Substitution drilling
Teacher	✓	✓		✓	✓
Student					
4 Overall structuring practices (IRF)	Initiation	Response	Feedback		
Teacher	✓		✓		
Student		✓			
Additional features	Talk time (min)	Use of target language	Use of L1		
Teacher	4.5	✓	✓		
Student	1.5		✓		

The context of this lesson is grammar, students are learning about present continuous tense. The IRF sequence is found in its traditional from. Teacher is initiating the sequence and students are mere respondents. Evaluation and feedback is teacher's domain and students are mainly receptive.

1. T:axha sab se pehly mujhe ye batao ky tense ki definition kaya ha tense ki definition
2. S:tense is tense is made a tense is made a complete sense of meaning
3. T: wo to sentence ki ho gai tense Asif
4. S:tense means division of time
5. T:han g division of
6. Ss:time
7. T:time kaya matlab hoa division of time bant dena taqseem kar dena clear or urdu me aaaa tense ka matlab kaya hota ha

Extract begins with T initiating the sequence by asking what is the definition of tense in Line 1, S responded inline two and T provide the feedback in Line 3 but instead closing the sequence T just call the name of another student to get the response. S then responded correctly and T repeats the utterance for the sake of feedback in Line4. Then T initiates the next sequence in Line 7 in the form of direct question.   The prominent feature of the sequence organization in the lesson is question and answer adjacency pair. It takes major percentage of all the sequences. All the questions were asked by teacher and students were only respondent.

8. T:basic tense kitny hoty hen basic tense han g basic tense three hoty hen kitny hoty hen
9. Ss: three
10. T: kon kon se
11. Ss: present,past,future
12. T: theak agy in ki agy kitni kitni kinds hen //four
13. Ss: //four
14. T: present indefinite
15. Ss: present continuous,present perfect,present perfect continuous tense
16. T:past indefinite
17. Ss: past continuous, past perfect,past perfect continous.

Here the interaction pattern is T-Ss-T-Ss-T-Ss-T-Ss-T-Ss, the turns are rapid and floor is in continuous shift. Teacher asked question students responded and the same pattern is continuously followed. The IRF sequence is exiting in its conventional form. There is not a single instance where initiation (I) is happening from S. Every time the initiation is made from T, S responded and T again took the floor to provide Feedback (F). This fixed pattern of IRF is appeared as the prominent feature of the conversation.

18. T: theak ha ok definition kaya honi chahea zara bolo sarry bachy
19. Ss: the present continuous is an action that is taking place at the time of ()
20. T: very good present matlab
21. S: zamana
22. T: present matlab mjooda contionious jaari
23. Ss: jari
24. T: present contioious kehty hen jis me bat jari ho theak ha ab urdu me is ki pehchan kaya ha kon batae ga urdu me hame aik sentence ha urdu ka dia hoa us me hame kesy pata chaly ga ye present indefinite ha present continuous ha kesy pata chaly ga is ki kaya pehchan hoo gi urdu me
25. S:teache urdu () aahir me raha ha,rahi he,rahen hen waghera aata ha
26. T:han g urdu me is ki pehchan ha jumly ka aakhir me shabash () urdu k jumly k aakhir me raha ha

The prominent feature of sequence organization in this lesson is question and answer adjacency pair. It takes major percentage of all the sequences. All the questions were asked by teacher and students were only respondents. Here every time T is providing the feedback along an initiation, so students are involved but very much dependent on what T says. So floor is in control of Teacher's and is not a single instance where S is taking the turn by himself. As above mention part of extract from Line 10 to 26 is showing the rapid movement but all the responses are stimulated by T and students are only respondents. Teacher remains active and students' participation is mainly receptive.

Table 3.3 Conversation Structures Identified in Phonetic Lesson Transcription

Structure of classroom interaction	Initiation – Response-Feedback
IRF (conventional)	✓
IRF (non-conventional)	
Forms of classroom interaction	
• Teacher–student interaction	✓
• Student–student interaction	
Model of interaction practices	

1	Turn Taking practices	Lexical One word turn	Phrasal Phrasal turn	Clausal/Sentential Single or number of clausal and sentential turn		
	Teacher's turn			✓		
	Students' or student's turn	✓	✓			
2	Turn patterns	Teacher's dominance T-T-T-T-S-T-S-T ✓	Equal participation	Student dominance		
3	Sequencing Practices	Topic initiation	Question Answer Adjacency pairs	Repair sequence	Repetition drilling	Substitution drilling
	Teacher	✓	✓			
	Student					
4	Overall structuring practices (IRF)	Initiation	Response	Feedback		
	Teacher	✓		✓		
	Student		✓			
Additional features		Talk time (min)	Use of target language	Use of L1		
	Teacher	5.5	✓	✓		
	Student	1.5		✓		

In the beginning of the lesson the pattern of interaction is following T-T-T-T-S-T-S-T movement as teacher is active and students are mere receptors. Turns are not rapid. The extract begins with S answering a question as a response to teacher right after the response teacher took the floor and disusing the concept of syllable vowel and consonant. T took a lot of long pauses while holding the floor.

1. S: sir g do alfaz() syllable kehty han
2. T: So if you find when you are utterance "aa" sound consonant it means (0-0) you ha you need some other aa sound that is called vowels there is no word which can be completed without vowel so if you uttered any word definitely you will uttered vowel sound too
3. T: so as you know (.2) agar do vowel sound jo ha wo mukhtalif (0-0) aaap ko mehsoos hon or aik vowel sound dosry k sath ja k takra ja consonant is ka it means aik syllable aap ka mukammal hy.
4. T: maslan dekhen () aap dekh rahy ho you have to not look at the letter vowel you have to figure out the sound of vowel aap ne sound jo vowel ki us py ghor karna ha na k aap ne us k letter py ghor karna ha abb aik dafa awaz jab aap ne nikali BAS kit
5. T: definitely aik aap k mun se wo nikal rahi ha k ye vowel ab aik KIT kehty ho KITto aik oor vowel ki awaz nikalti ha to now there are two
6. Ss: syllable
7. T: in this word (0-0) so () how many syllable in this word

Here, after Line 1, 4 continuous Lines from 2 to 5 are comprised on teacher's turn and when students took the floor, in Line 6 it's not an initiation but was a response for completion of the utterance that is left incomplete by the teacher. T again took the turn and made an initiation in Line 7, S responded T instead providing the feedback made another initiation. So teacher is having control and authority over floor and much active students are mainly receptive and dependent.

8. T: koe beta bata sakta ha more or most kahan lagy ga is word k sath most aaa more or most lagy ga shabash
9. S: beautifull ka sath

10. T:beauifull k sath more
11. S:more //oor most lagy ga
12. T://oor most lagy ga q lagy ga
13. S:sir g//
14. T: //() yahan q lagy ga more or most ye dekhen aap kehty ho he is a brave man he is a…
15. S:brave man
16. T:agar hum ne braver kehna ho to kaya ye braver brave how many syllables are here kitny hen syllable
17. Ss: tw two two one one one one

The prominent feature of the sequence organization in the lesson is question and answer adjacency pair. It takes major percentage of all the sequences. All the questions were asked by teacher and students were only respondents. Here every time T is providing the feedback along an initiation, so students are involved but depending on T to make any speech move. So floor is in teacher's control and there is not any instance where S is taking the turn by itself. As above mention part of extract from Line 8 to 17 is showing the rapid movement but all the responses are stimulated by T and students are only respondent. Teacher remains active and students' participation is mainly receptive

Teacher asked question students responded and the same pattern is followed continuously. The IRF sequence is exiting in its conventional form. There is not a single instance where initiation (I) is happening from S. Every time the initiation is made from T, S responded and T again took the floor to provide Feedback (F). This fixed pattern of IRF is appeared as the prominent feature of the conversation.

4. FINDINGS

The analysis of the data illustrates how talk in interaction occurs in different learning context of EFL classrooms in public schools. It also assisted to explore not only the forms of interaction, but also how participant orient themselves towards certain identities and roles. Particularity, expert / novice and teacher /student dichotomies to understand how this interaction facilitates language learning. After the detailed analysis of the transcription, following findings are deduced.

4.1 FORMS OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Teacher–student interaction is dominant in all three extract except different learning contexts. Student–student interaction is completely absent. Students are interacting only to teacher and look up to them for all of their responses.   Such interactions also suggest limited group and pair activities that offer a room for student – student interactions.

4.2 TURN TAKING PRACTICES

Analysis of transcripts suggests turns of lexical nature, commonly known as one word turn; these turns are frequently observed from students' side in all learning contexts. Few instances of phrasal and sentential turns are also found in grammar lessons but phonetic lesson only showed lexical and phrasal turns from students' sides. However teachers' turns are of clausal and sentential nature in all the learning contexts. These turn taking practices proves that grammar lessons offer more chances of student participation than phonetic and comprehension lessons.

4.3 TURN PATTERNS

Teacher's dominance is apparent in the all learning contexts. Teacher is experiencing control over the floor and has authority of floor passing to student according to the context and response required from students. The observed turn patterns in comprehension, grammar and phonetic lesson are T-S-T-T-S-T-S-T-S, T-Ss-T-Ss-T-Ss-T-Ss-T-Ss, T-T-T-T-S-T-S-T respectively. In given turn patterns teacher is found far more dominant and students are depending on teacher for taking the turn.

4.4 SEQUENCING PRACTICE

The prominent feature of the sequence organization found in transcripts is question answer adjacency pairs mainly in choral form but there are sequences that showed the individual responses as well. Transcription analysis depicts that teacher is involved in sequencing patterns like topic initiation, question answer adjacency pairs repetition and substitution drilling. However repair sequences barely found in teacher's sequencing practice. Students are found involved in repetition and substitution drilling in comprehension lesson but this sort of participation is not seen in grammar lesson.   In phonetic lesson teacher is using topic initiation and question answer adjacency pair of sequencing practices, repair sequences and repetition and substitution drilling is completely out of practice.   Sequencing practices offer vast scope for conversation and interaction but other than topic initiation and adjacency pairs such practices are scarcely practiced by teacher.

4.5 STRUCTURING PRACTICES

Analysis of transcripts suggest that structuring practices of classroom conversation is existing in Initiation-Response-evaluation (IRF) pattern where teacher is initiating the talk students are giving response as per the initiation and then get evaluated from the teacher this pattern of talk is existing in similar order in all lessons.

4.6 L1 INFLUENCE

L1 use is prominently exists in all learning context. Students were taught through traditional GTM method that offers very less opportunity of student participation and offer teacher centered approach. Both teacher and students are found

interacting in L1. Proper English sentences are rarely spoken by teacher and if there are proper sentences teacher is found translating it in Urdu language. The utterances produced by students in L2 were the result of repetition or substitution drilling and most of them are in lexical and phrasal form. However, L1 use overshadowed communication in all the lessons and teachers are found switching the code recurrently.

4.7 TALK TIME

The average of talk time in both student and teacher end showed that teachers are dominance over student talk. In comprehension and phonetic lesson this different is much prevalent. However in grammar lesson students' participation is comparatively better than other lessons.

4.8 FLOOR MOVEMENT AND CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

The floor movement is noticeably visible in grammar lessons. However Comprehension lesson did not depict such rapid movement of floor as students were strictly under teachers' influence and were not free to hold the floor. Teachers asked questions students responded and the same pattern is continuously followed. As IRF sequence is exiting in its most conventional form, all activities are led by teacher and students are not engaged in any activity that can lead to S-S interaction pattern. Thus, interaction is occurring between teacher and student (T-S) and students to student (S-S) interaction is completely missing.

4.9 TEACHER AND STUDENT'S ROLES

Analysis suggests that teachers' role is more of an initiator and evaluator, all the initiations (I) are offered in the form of questions and all evaluations (E) are in the form of statements. Students being passive participants are only making responses (R). Overall impression of learning is narrow and rigid with a lot of repetition of teachers' sentences. Elicitation of already learned content is also prominently visible and gives rise only to memorization rather creative production of language.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The present study tried to investigate the interactional structure and interactional practices in public sector institutes with the help of conversation analysis approach. Transcriptions of classroom conversation were examined on the principles of conversation explained by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Van Lier 1996 study (as cited in De Bot,2001). These criterions include turn taking, sequencing practices, structure of class interaction, forms of classroom interaction and Interaction practices. Researcher tried to encompass all possible existing characteristics of classroom conversation identified so far.   Finding of the study revealed that IRF sequences exist in conventional form and all activities are teacher fronted. These sequence organization found in transcripts is question answer adjacency pairs, mainly in choral form and the use of L1 is found dominant over L2. Along use of L1 findings also conclude that though, the EFL classrooms offer vast room for communication and interactional practices however it is utilized inaptly in public schools. Teachers' interactional practices are found to influence the process of language learning negatively. Teacher holds the floor and students remain passive learners. GTM approach of language learning is also found dominant over CLT approach in almost all the lessons irrespective of learning contexts, as a result students remain unexposed and passive participant and remained stuck on rules of language rather use of language.

The study opens doors for future researcher to study nature of classroom conversation in multiple leaning contexts and can be used to identify language discourse at secondary and higher secondary EFL classroom conversations. Besides multiple context and contents, this approach can be applied in identifying private sector EFL classrooms to set forth the distinctive features of classroom interaction and how they differ from public sector schools. Moreover the study has also introduced a comprehensive framework that can be proved beneficial while analyzing classroom conversation in future.

CREDIT AUTHOR STATEMENT

Afsheen Nusrat: Conceptualization, Methodology, Data Collection, Writing, Original draft preparation. **Nabila Akbar.**: Proof reading and Editing.   **Aamir Aziz:** Supervision, Reviewing and Editing.

COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

It is declare that all authors don't have any conflict of interest. Furthermore, informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

REFERENCE

Angelo, T. A. (1993). A" Teacher's dozen. *AAHE Bulletin*, *45*(8), 3-7.

Aziz, A., Mahmood, M.A., Ahmad, S., & Akbar, N. (2021). A corpus-based study of genre-specific discourse: M.A. TEFL thesis abstracts. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17*(Special Issue 2), 884-898.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge University Press. De Bot, Kees. "Interaction in the classroom." *Tesol Quarterly* 35.4 (2001): 602-603.

Enfield, N. J. (2007). Meanings of the unmarked: How'default'person reference does more than just refer. In *Person reference in Interaction: Linguistic, cultural, and social perspectives* (pp. 97-120). Cambridge University Press.

Gündüz, M. (2014). Analysing language classrooms through classroom interaction. *Journal of human sciences, 11*(2), 1149-1166.   Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Polity.

Mansoor, S. (2005). *Language planning in higher education: A case study of Pakistan*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*,   *88*(4),491-500.

Musumeci, D. (1996). Teacher-learner negotiation in content-based instruction: Communication at cross-purposes?. *Applied linguistics*,*17*(3), 286-325.

Naveed, M. S., Sarim, M., & Ahsan, K. (2015). On the Felicitous Applications of Natural Language. *Science International*, *27*(23), 2643-2646.

Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1988). Variations in classroom interaction as a function of participation pattern and task. *Second language discourse: A textbook of current research*, *4155*.

Ramzan, M., Aziz, A., & Ghaffar, M. (2021). A study of code-mixing and code-switching (Urdu and Punjabi) in children's early speech. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17*(2), 869-881. Doi: 10.52462/jlls.60

Rivers, W. M. (1987). *Interactive language teaching*. Cambridge University Press, 40 West 20th Street, New York,

NY 10011 (hardcover--ISBN-0-521-32216-2; paperback--ISBN-0-521-31108-X).

Seedhouse, P. (1996). Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities. *Elt Journal, 50*(1), 16-24

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

Seedhouse, P. (2005). "Task" as research construct. *Language learning*, *55*(3), 533-570.

Seedhouse, P. (2011). Conversation analytic research into language teaching and learning. *The handbook of research in second language teachings teaching and learning*, *2*(1).

Shamim, F. (2011). English as the language for development in Pakistan: Issues, challenges and possible solutions. *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language*, 291-310.

Sidnell, J. (2010). Conversation analysis. *Sociolinguistics and language education*, 492

Sidnell, J., & Enfield, N. J. (2012). Language diversity and social action: A third locus of linguistic relativity. *Current Anthropology*, *53*(3), 302-333.

Sinclair, J. M., Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press, USA

Skuse, G. E. (2012). A conversation analysis approach to interaction within an english as a foreign language (efl) class information gap task.

Ten Have, P. (2007) Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide. London: Sage

Van Lier, L. (2001). The role of form in language learning. *Eds. M. Bax and J. Zwart. Reflections on language and language learning: In honor of Arthur van Essen. Amsterdam: John Benjamins*, 253-266.

Van Lier, L. (2002). A tale of two computer classrooms. *Ecology of language acquisition*, 49-63.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*: Routledge.