Interaction in EMI Business Lectures: An Investigation of the Effects of Reflective Practice on Interaction in Saudi Arabia

Applied Linguistics PhD

English Language and Applied Linguistics, School of Literature and Languages

Asma Almuuawi

May 2021

Declaration

I confirm that this is my own work and the use of all material from other sources has been properly and fully acknowledged.

Acknowledgements

All praise is due to Allah the Almighty for allowing me the opportunity to achieve my goals and complete this thesis.

I owe my gratitude to a number of people for the help, support and encouragement that I have received from them during this long journey. I would like to begin by thanking my supervisor, Professor Rodney Jones, for his patience, encouragement, and insights into my thesis. I would also like to thank Dr Tony Capstick and Dr Christiana Themistocleous for their help and support. This thesis would not have developed in the way that it has without their support.

I offer my appreciation to the Saudi Ministry of Higher Education and the Saudi Cultural Bureau for all their support. I would also like to extend my gratitude to my family, my mother, and my brothers and sisters for their continuous support and prayers overseas. I am also grateful to my husband, Khalid, for his unconditional support, love and encouragement throughout my PhD journey. A special thank you goes to my dear son, Alwaleed, for his love that gave me strength throughout this journey.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to the lecturers and students who gave me access to their lectures. Without their kindness and trusting involvement, this thesis could never have been completed.

Dedication

To my mother, Atha Alqarni

Abstract

This thesis is an investigation of interactional practice within an English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) context in Saudi Arabia. Previous investigations of EMI classrooms in Saudi Arabia have focused on implementation challenges and describing the final product of learning rather than examining the language used inside the classroom. The previous literature pays insufficient attention to how teachers and learners use available language resources in EMI classrooms to communicate and negotiate meaning in the presence of other linguistics difficulties. Examining interaction within EMI classrooms to explore several implementation practices about which relatively little is known in a context like Saudi Arabia is the research gap that this study aims to address. The thesis investigates research questions related to the characteristics of interactional practices in EMI business lectures in Saudi Arabia. Moreover, it explores the effect of employing Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) on interactions in EMI business lectures and the perspectives of Saudi faculty members about the impacts that reflective practice frameworks have on their interactions. This study was carried out in EMI business lectures in a public university in Saudi Arabia and data was collected in two different phases. In both phases, the audio-taped lectures were transcribed and analysed qualitatively using Conversation Analysis (CA) and quantitatively by using pre-defined modes of the SETT framework with a special focus on the lecturers' talk. The findings suggest several pedagogical and methodological implications for the EMI context. The pedagogical implications suggest that self-observational instruments like SETT can help lecturers to identify interactional challenges and facilitate interaction by creating interactional opportunities. On the institution level, the results imply that SETT can be adopted and amended to design training programmes. The methodological implications demonstrate that SETT also provides a valuable tool when applied with CA to track and observe interactional changes to provide research-based support that can influence practices in different EMI contexts.

Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

AMI	Arabic Medium of Instruction
CA	Conversation Analysis
CBI	Content-Based Instruction
CIC	Classroom Interactional Competence
CLIL	Content and Language Integrated Learning
EMEMUS	English Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings
EMI	English as a Medium of Instruction
ESL	English as a Second Language
ICLHE	Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education
IRF	Initiation-Response-Feedback
L1	The Participants' Native Language (Arabic)
L2	The Foreign Language Learned (English)
MOHE	Ministry of Higher Education in Saudi Arabia
SCT	Vygotskyan Social-cultural Theories
SETT	Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk
SLC	Second-language Classrooms

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction:

This chapter aims to establish the purpose and the context of this research. To do so, the first section of this chapter will first present a brief research overview of the different core concepts that formulate this thesis. These concepts concern the literature in the field of English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) and classroom interaction to illustrate the relevance and the significance of the current study. This will be followed by a discussion of the main objectives of the current study. The final section of this chapter will demonstrate the organization of the thesis.

1.2 Research Overview:

The growing interest in introducing and implementing English in higher education programmes is mainly linked to the emergence of English as the international lingua franca of academia (Coleman, 2006; Crystal, 2003). Different countries where English is a second or foreign language represent the outer and the expanding circles in the Three Concentric Circles Model of English language (Kachru, 1985). In these circles, English is implemented through different approaches in which the English language is the basic vehicle. Literature uses various terms such as EMI, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education (ICLHE), and English Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings (EMEMUS) (Costa & Coleman, 2013). These terms are used to describe the learning programmes that use a different language for instruction other than the native language of the students. While all these different approaches offer great benefits to the teaching of subject content through English, higher education in Saudi Arabia supports the implementation of EMI in various institutions (MoHE-Ministry of Higher Education, 2010; Aljarf, 2008). EMI refers to "the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English" (Macaro et al., 2018, p. 37). Like the rest of the world, countries in the Gulf region want to implement EMI in their academic institutions for scientific, economic, and linguistic reasons (Aljarf, 2008). Existing research recognises the critical role played by EMI in promoting multilingualism in academic settings to achieve a high position in international university rankings, to facilitate collaboration between academics from different universities around the world, and to have access to up-to-date academic materials and scientific research (Coleman 2006). In addition, the EMI approach is beneficial for university students because bilingualism is essential to

enhance future opportunities in the labour market and pursue postgraduate studies around the world (Costa & Coleman, 2013). For these reasons and more, English has become a basic academic skill rather than just a language to acquire in countries like Saudi Arabia.

Investigating aspects of the implementation process has received much attention from researchers around the globe (Collins, 2010). Many of these studies have revealed different concerns about the effects of adopting an EMI approach for language learning, content learning, teaching approaches, local languages and other multi-faceted aspects of EMI in Europe, Africa, and Asia (Klaassen & De Graaff, 2001). In Saudi Arabia, implementing English in higher education is still problematic, and a clear language policy is indeed required (Aljarf, 2008). It seems that recent literature has a common theme that the rise of EMI in Saudi Arabia has implications for policy and practice but more empirical studies are still needed because they are limited in number. Previous research examing the implementation of EMI in the Saudi context have identified problems concerning translation, the use of L1, poor lexical capacity, pronunciation, and low levels of motivation (Al Kahtany, Farouk, & Al Zumor, 2016; Ebad, 2014). Such findings suggest that previous investigations of EMI classrooms have focused on the product of learning rather than the process of learning and have dominated the research that has been done. There is insufficient attention in the literature to how teachers and learners used the available language resources in EMI classrooms to communicate and to negotiate meaning in the presence of the above difficulties. Additionally, we still lack knowledge about how appropriate these language exchanges are as means of creating constructive learning experiences. A useful outcome of these studies for the present study is emphasizing the need to examine "the practice" itself, by looking into what happens within EMI academic classrooms in Saudi Arabia and acknowledging the uniqueness of each classroom. That calls for greater recognition of the role of social interaction within EMI classrooms. Learning in these classrooms is not only meant to track the state of cognition such as knowledge but also how understanding is achieved and displayed through social interaction (Markee & Kasper, 2004). The literature included in this thesis is informed by Vygotskyan's (1978) social-cultural theories (SCT) of learning. These theories view understanding as being an emergent facet of talk and hold that meaning is negotiated in an environment where both instructors and students are expected to use a second language. It is argued that the understanding "is always based on situated negotiation and renegotiation of meaning in the world" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 51). Observing and tracking changes in interactional practices over time is significant because it gives us a powerful lens through which to examine how learning is achieved (Sidnell,2010). Therefore, the present study aims to investigate classroom interaction within EMI. Investigating interaction within the EMI context is important because it might help explain

several aspects of the effect of implementing EMI about which relatively little is known in a context like Saudi Arabia. Findings might provide research-based support that influences EMI practices in higher education in Saudi Arabia.

Therefore, a variable method for collecting and analyzing data is required. Conversation analysis (CA) is employed along with one aspect of the reflective practice framework called Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT), which is informed by CA to understand and describe the classroom interactions within EMI classrooms over a short period. Different methods to investigate classroom interaction are presented in the literature to highlight the existing gap in this area of research. Conversation Analysis is a valuable method that allows researchers to examine and describe how talk in any classroom is organized, revealing how participants co-construct meaning (Seedhouse, 2004). However, Conversation Analysis investigates instances of classroom discourse isolated from the temporal context and the temporal purpose of the discourse (Walsh, 2006). Moreover, researchers often find Conversation Analysis to be a time-consuming methodological tool that requires long, extensive training to understand its complex details (Seedhouse, 2007). Despite all the benefits gained by using Conversation Analysis to examine and describe interactions, this thesis is also concerned with moving from general examinations to identifying the role of specific observable features of interaction in carrying out temporal pedagogical purposes. Hence, providing EMI instructors with a well-defined structural tool to observe their own interactional practice and identify areas for improvement. As a reflective practice approach that is informed by Conversation Analysis, SETT is a tool that enables teachers as well as researchers to observe interactional practices and their changes (Walsh, 2002, 2003, 2006, 2011). It is a tool that is used by teachers to reflect on their practice and by researchers to analyze classroom interaction; it also works as a framework that brings up the underlying relationship between pedagogical goals and the use of language (Walsh, 2011). SETT is employed with Conversation Analysis to evaluate the possibility of employing this tool which was used originally in second-language classrooms (SLC) in EMI in higher education. SETT is claimed to provide a theoretically-informed instrument that is accessible and beneficial to language teachers (Ghafarpour, 2016; Walsh, 2006). To my knowledge, SETT is not used to study interaction in other EFL contexts like EMI lectures in Saudi Arabia. Research into the field of classroom interaction has focused mainly on second-language classrooms rather than content-based ones like academic lectures. Less attention has been given to other types of classrooms. There are few studies of interaction in subjects other than language, and most of the work that has been done is concerned mainly with teacher led-classrooms (Seedhouse, 2011). This thesis is concerned with observing interactional practices in lectures that value interaction (business lectures). Saudi Arabia's higher education is affected by the move from

adopting traditional teacher-fronted academic classrooms to more student-centred academic classrooms (Al-Ghamdi & AlSaadat, 2002). Hence, lecturers could include phrases that are influenced by both student-centred pedagogies as well as teacher-centred pedagogies. While the roles of teacher and student remain relevant to the institutional experience, the interaction could reflect a variety of episodes in which the nature and the organization of the speech are different according to the pedagogical goal intended (Walsh, 2011). There is a wide range of classroom speech exchanges where teachers and students are supposed to ask more questions, initiate talk, and engage in discussions (Mori, 2007). Therefore, SETT could offer many benefits within the context of EMI as it acknowledges that there is a wide variety of interactional features to be used in the service of different pedagogical goals.

As mentioned previously, much of the existing research has focused on describing the final product of teachers' and students' language competencies, overlooking the developmental phases that they go through to communicate meaning. The justification for using conversation analysis with SETT is mainly influenced by the view that EMI classrooms in Saudi Arabia need evidence-based and data-led approaches that investigate practices over time and are of assistance to EMI instructors. Yet, these would be validated only if the perception of the instructors is taken into consideration. Therefore, the present study employed stimulated-recall interviews during the recording and usage of SETT and semi-structured interviews at the end of the data collection phase to examine the perceptions of the lecturers regarding SETT.

1.3 Research Purpose:

The present study aims to fulfil different purposes. The first aim of this thesis is to evaluate interaction in EMI classrooms in terms of turn-taking and sequence and provide descriptions of the interactional practices. Investigating interactional practices in EMI in Saudi Arabia is a context under-researched, as discussed previously. Within this singular context, there are multi-layered contexts in which interaction takes different forms and performs different functions. Therefore, a description of the multi-layered contexts in relation to the pedagogical goals is the first step in the investigation. A second objective of the thesis is to track and observe interactional changes over time when lecturers are given the chance to evaluate the language they used according to SETT. The significance of this objective as illustrated previously is to provide research-based support that influences real pedagogical practice. In doing so, I will also be able to move towards achieving another important goal of this thesis, which is evaluating the applicability of SETT in EMI classrooms in Saudi. Another valuable objective is identifying the effect of using SETT to describe the frequency of interactional features on interaction in EMI contexts in Saudi Arabia. Finally, eliciting the lecturers' views

on employing reflective practice regarding their interactions is needed to propose contextually-appropriate pedagogical changes.

1.4 Thesis Outline:

This thesis is composed of eight chapters. Following this brief introduction, the literature review will consist of two separate chapters. Chapter Two gives a brief review of the context of the study, outlining EMI around the globe and reviewing EMI in Saudi Arabia with a particular focus on local language policies and the effects of implementing EMI. Chapter Three presents the literature review related to the focus of this research: classroom interaction. It explores related issues from different theoretical perspectives and methodological orientations. To identify aspects where new contributions could be made, a description and illustration of different methods to investigate classroom interaction are presented to highlight the existing gaps in this area of research.

The research methodology and research design of the study are described and discussed in the fourth chapter. A discussion of the research methodology is presented to provide an overview of how this study was carried out, which includes a consideration of my ontological and epistemological stances. Chapter Four presents the methodological framework and information on participants, the research context, and data collection and analysis procedures. Ethical concerns are discussed in the final part of this chapter.

The research results are also presented in two separate chapters. Chapter Five provides a detailed analysis of the data collected in the first phase of data collection. Chapter Six summarizes the second phase of data collection, describing the phase after introducing SETT materials to the faculty members.

Chapter Seven is the discussion chapter, which refers to the contribution made by the research regarding interaction in EMI business lectures and argues for the benefits of using the research methodologies applied. The thesis concludes with Chapter Eight, which summarizes the study's key findings and contributions to the current body of knowledge ad also discusses pedagogical implications, limitations, and suggestions for future research.

2 Literature Review (I)

The focus of this chapter is to provide background about the context of the study and review all the relevant research into the concept of English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) around the world and in the context of Saudi Arabia. As well as reviewing research relevant to EMI that was undertaken in Saudi Arabia, this chapter also discusses the country's language policies. The final section of the chapter explores the problematic aspects of implementing EMI in higher education in Saudi Arabia, and current work that identifies those concerns is presented.

2.1 Contextualizing the Study:

In order to gain a better understanding of Saudi Arabia in an EFL context, it is necessary to review literature that examines the current language policy in both school and higher education. For that purpose, this section will first demonstrate current language policy in education in Saudi Arabia followed by a discussion of Saudi higher education as an EMI context.

2.1.1 Current Language Policy in Education in Saudi Arabia:

Saudi Arabia's focus has changed since 2005 where the country is trying to reduce its dependence on oil and invest in a knowledge-based economy. In an attempt to match the education level of developed countries, the Saudi education system has undergone revolutionary changes. The number of universities has increased from 8 in 2001 to 100 in 2019 (Worldlistmania, 2020). Most of the investment is made towards teaching English and using it as the language of advancement in higher education. The Saudi government encourages its institutions providing higher education to get into partnerships with international universities. The government positions English as a basic tool for gaining and disseminating academic knowledge (Alrasheed, 2000). The government has also adopted an international curriculum for universities providing higher education in different disciplines such as medicine (Al-nafisah, 2001). Materials that are used in institutions such as textbooks are written and taught in English (Alhazmi, 2003). Activities like joint programmes and franchising are highly promoted in the higher education sector (Barnawi, 2017; Le Ha & Barnawi, 2015). The evidence reviewed here seems to suggest that English plays a significant role in the higher education system in Saudi.

However, Saudi Arabia's current education policy that deals with the use of the English language in higher education is struggling to maintain the balance between the use of the Arabic language and the English language. The country intends to preserve its culture by

preserving the Arabic language, yet due to forces of globalization, there is a need to gain higher access to an international level of information and communication. While Arabic is the only official language in the country, influenced by the religion practised in the country, decision-makers and policymakers in Saudi Arabia are conscious of the important role of English and are even encouraging the learning of a foreign language to contribute to the spread of Islam and gain knowledge from different parts of the world. Yet, for political reasons, English is not supported to be a second language because of the threats that a foreign language might pose to the religion and cultural heritage of the country. However, in 2003, the Ministry of Higher Education passed a law to introduce English at school level from grade 5 because it can help many students in further education (Barnawi & Al-Hawsawi, 2015). This struggle is reflected in the statement given by the MoE (formerly Ministry of Higher Education):

“Arabic is the language of instruction in universities. Another language can be used if necessary; however, this should be made by a decision from the council of the university concerned ''(MoHE-Ministry of Higher Education, 2010).

Some scholars refer to the new movement of implementing English in education as a ''cultural catastrophe'' because of the possible effect of English on the Arabic and Islamic culture (Al-mengash, 2006; Alsultan, 2009). There seems to be evidence that the role of English is recognized and encouraged in education, yet also a belief that it should be monitored in order to maintain the dominance of the Arabic language and Arabic culture in Saudi Arabia.

2.2 English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI):

2.2.1 The Impact of EMI on Higher Education in Non-anglophone Countries:

“EMI is the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English” (Macaro et al., 2018, p. 37). Using EMI to reflect emphasizes the medium of teaching educational subjects and not English as a language thus clearly separating EMI and other types of language teachings. Another concept of EMI is given by Dafouz and Smit (2014). They describe it as EMEMUS (English Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings), which “focuses on English medium education because of the particular role that English plays both as an academic language of teaching and learning as well as a means of international communication” (Dafouz & Smit, 2014, pg. 399). This concept takes into account the multilingual nature of higher education and the different pedagogical approaches

that the language entails. Research on EMI has observed a sudden growth in the last few decades. A team of researchers from Oxford University found that before 2000 there were only 19 studies done on EMI, however, between 2000 and 2016 the number of studies increased to 299 (Dearden, 2015). The number continues to grow exponentially. There are various reasons cited for the growth of EMI that include the impact of the colonial legacy, student mobility, globalization, and internationalization. It is part of different significant international sectors such as international politics, entertainment, academia, trade, diplomacy and even media (Mauranen, 2010). This sudden growth has a strong impact on EMI in higher education in non-English speaking countries. In 2016, more than 8,000 courses undertaken in non-anglophone countries used English as a medium for teaching (Doiz et al., 2013). The number of such courses has displayed considerable growth since then. The number of subjects taught in English in non-English speaking European countries has reached 2,900, up from just 55 in 2009 (ibid). This exceptional growth has led to an increase in the mobility of both teachers and students (Walkinshaw et al., 2017). Around 7.2 million students are expected to study away from their home country (Doiz et al., 2013). In this era of tough international competition, many higher education institutes are adding English to display their international appeal and draw more international students. According to Wilkinson and Walsh, it is, without doubt, the most obvious choice for a university in order to be part of the international community (2008).

2.2.2 EMI in Saudi Arabia:

EMI is increasingly being used to teach academic subjects in countries where the first language (L1) of the population is not English (Dearden, 2015). Saudi Arabia, like most of the non-anglophone countries, is facing the need to use EMI following the worldwide shift. In fact, Dearden (2015) reported that public opinion in Saudi Arabia towards EMI is mostly positive, and that English is recognized as a basic skill with a prestigious status attached to it. Public and private universities are making an increasing effort to implement EMI because many subject areas that involve science, business, and technology depend on English in their industry (Sulaimani, 2016). Up-to-date knowledge and future employment opportunities are two of the main reasons behind the need to implement the English language at the tertiary level (Alhamzi, 2005; Sawahel, 2010). According to Alsultan (2009) introducing EMI in Saudi is encouraged because of the lack of up-to-date resources for medicine, engineering, and computing in the Arabic language. However, economic reasons are far more important explanations for why some Saudi universities resort to EMI to help students have better language competence in specific disciplines that are in demand in the labour market (Shamim et al., 2016).

The policy of implementing EMI in Saudi Arabia's higher education system has gone through different phases. For many years, universities have introduced English in two to four separate courses during undergraduate degrees (Aljarf, 2006). Thus, since 2010, improving students' proficiency in English is one of the main goals of the preparatory year programme in all universities in the kingdom (Yushau & Omar, 2007). The preparatory year programme is a general introductory year where students are required to take English, science, and Islamic courses to prepare them for their specific undergraduate degrees. English is introduced as an intensive 20-hour per week course, which constitutes a large portion of the preparatory programme. However, the number of hours differs from one university to another, but an emphasis is laid upon improving students' reading, writing, speaking, and listening abilities. However, the fact that the context of the preparatory year is highly exam-oriented and no clear teaching approach is available to teachers has led several universities, such as Princess Noura University, to cancel the preparatory year programme because it did not help students improve their English proficiency (ibid). Nevertheless, in most universities, graduate students are required to carry out a research project, and many of them are required to write their thesis in English. In addition, many graduates pursue their postgraduate studies abroad and believe that EMI is a necessity for their studies.

Collectively, these studies outline different critical reasons and phases of EMI in Saudi Arabia's higher education. It can be claimed that the reasons for introducing EMI in Saudi Arabia are not different from the reasons for implementing EMI in other non-English-speaking countries. Yet, there is more emphasis placed in Saudi Arabia on students' readiness for future careers and postgraduate studies. In the next section, the discussion involves reviewing the different local challenges that are faced while implementing EMI.

2.2.3 Challenges of Implementing EMI in Higher Education in Saudi Arabia:

The literature presents various challenges of using EMI in higher education teaching in Saudi Arabia. The majority of local studies are aware that EMI in higher educational institutions necessitated the improvement of language proficiency and content knowledge. Factors that challenge the implementation of EMI have been explored in several studies in the context of Saudi Arabia with different theoretical perspectives and methodological orientations (Aljarf, 2008).

Previous research findings in the Saudi context about the challenges of implementing EMI have identified among its problems the students' low levels of English proficiency. Although many universities have acknowledged among their values the importance of effective

communication and successful interdisciplinary teaching in English, this sudden shift in language produces a barrier that challenges many students in different Saudi institutions (Aljarf, 2008). Research in the field of EMI in the Saudi context is mainly challenged by the fact that English is formally introduced as the language of instruction at the undergraduate level (Alkhazim, 2003). There is a need to bridge the gap between the English taught at the school level and the level required at the university. Al-mengash (2006) claimed that teaching in a foreign language displays a psychological defeat as, according to the author, most of the graduates in Saudi Arabia are not capable of writing even a single page of a paper in English without making mistakes. The findings associate poor performance, poor grades, and poor knowledge learning with using EMI. Classroom observations have shown that students seem confused, distracted, and show no interest in lectures. The sudden change to using EMI negatively affects their knowledge learning as well as their motivational level. Further, due to their lack of proficiency in the language, students at a higher level struggle with academic reading because of their low lexical capacity. Their academic reading is slow due to which most of the students do not read journals and articles but rely on reading summaries which limits the knowledge that they gain (Barnawi & Al-Hawsawi, 2015). Shamim and his colleagues (2016) examined the use of English in Taibah University and found that both students and teachers struggle with weak English and this poses challenges in learning science content. The majority of staff members are using coping strategies, which mostly involve the use of L1 and translation glossaries. Most institutions believe that a lengthy and diverse EFL programme is required to improve students' English language competencies. However, many universities have failed to make these programmes as effective as was expected (Al- Abdaly, 2012). According to Alhawsawi (2014), students were more focused on passing the exams and being assigned to colleges than learning the English language itself. One of the main reasons is the low level of language proficiency of students and other learning-related problems which lead to difficulties comprehending the content of subjects. This suggests that implementing English in higher education poses difficulties and a clear language implementation plan that acknowledges the previous challenges of teaching English at a school level is needed.

Other studies focus on insufficient number of competent instructors in Saudi Arabia. One of the most common challenges includes a lack of proficiency in English. Teachers lack confidence in speaking English, and they are expected to provide instruction in this language in EMI classrooms (Barnawi & Al-Hawsawi, 2015).

Another perspective on EMI in Saudi Arabia is concerned with the use of EMI or Arabic medium of instruction (AMI). Al Kahtany, Farouk, and Al Zumor (2016) argued that the use of English results in the marginalization of the Arabic language and suggested universities

should enrich their linguistic potential by improving the use of the Arabic language. They investigated the attitudes of 162 teachers and 702 students in King Khalid University regarding the use of EMI. The study showed that teachers have positive attitudes towards EMI, while students do not share the same opinion, believing that it is the reason that their academic performance is affected negatively. Interestingly, the teachers surveyed believed that English is the language of science, and it is especially important in all colleges of science, technology, and medicine. Some teachers even chose to ignore students' problems while others preferred to investigate ways to help them. The division in the teachers' opinions is perhaps reflected in their practice as well. In that study, teachers used EMI differently depending on their overall competence and lecturing style. Students, on the other hand, accepted the minimal use of English as long as it did not impede their understanding of the subject content. In fact, some students suggested limiting the use of EMI to terminologies only. This shows that they avoid the use of EMI to communicate ideas, negotiate meanings, and debate concepts. Regardless of other teaching approach problems, that in itself could infer that this might be the only study that refers to the role of interaction and communication in EMI in this context. The paper concluded by suggesting "a blend of policy and practice" in order to create constructive solutions to current real problems in the context. Ebad (2014), on the other hand, identified the differences between using EMI and AMI. Research is encouraging a flexible language policy and establishing new strategies for protecting and developing the Arabic language. While the study focused on the practical integration of Arabic and English in academic classrooms and the advantages of possessing "the level of survival English [required] to at least communicate", it does not refer to students' abilities to negotiate meanings, debate complex concepts, and demonstrate understanding. In contrast, the seven teachers and nineteen students included in the study of Shamim et al. (2016) have positive attitudes towards using EMI because, to them, English is an important language to learn. Different attitudes in different institutions reflect the conflicting attitudes among teachers and students in Saudi Arabia. However, it seems that previous studies have a common theme that the rise of EMI in Saudi Arabia has implications for policy and practice. They also use similar methodological tools to examine the language barrier for students in EMI in higher education. It seems that empirical examination is required through extensive research to support the current rise of EMI. Many scholars have emphasized the need to look into the real practice and the unique nature of the context in order to make language policies that face the current challenges of implementing EMI. It has been recommended that decision-makers have clear implementation plans before making language policies and access to institutional research-based support. Yet, investigating "the real practice" has often been associated with describing the implications of implementing EMI in the context with a

focus on the attitudes of the stakeholders (e.g., universities, the Ministry of Education, lecturers, and students). The methodological tools that are often used are interviews and surveys regarding stakeholders' views on the growth of EMI. It seems that linguistics frameworks that focus on the product rather than the process have dominated the research that has been done to date.

Therefore, it is recommended in this study that decision-makers have clear implementation plans before making language policies and access to institutional research-based support. A useful implication that this review of the previous studies has for the present study is the emphasis it places on the need to examine "the practice" itself, by looking into what actually happens within EMI academic classrooms. Therefore, the present study aims at investigating classroom discourses and interactions within EMI contexts. Investigating interactions within an EMI context is important because it might help understand a different aspect of EMI-related challenges about which relatively little is known. The findings might provide the research-based support that can influence the real practice of higher education in Saudi Arabia.

2.3 Conclusion

This chapter has described the current policies regarding implementing EMI at the level of higher education in Saudi Arabia. The most obvious observation to emerge from this review is that the context of the study still faces various challenges in terms of using EMI in higher education. Hence, this strengthens the idea that there is only little we know about this context, and further research is still needed to explore and examine various aspects of the university classrooms that are implementing EMI. The majority of the data collected in previous studies can be grouped into two main types: observational and descriptive. While these offer great insights into EMI in Saudi Arabia, they also have many disadvantages. The conflicting results that are explained above can often be associated with the subjective biases of the researchers. More experimental studies that explore the process of EMI are needed to provide a new understanding. One area that might fill that gap is an examination of interactional practice in EMI university classrooms. Therefore, in the chapter that follows, I present a review of the literature in the general field of classroom interaction and the different methods employed to study it in various contexts.

3 Literature Review (II)

In the previous chapter, I described the context of this study. In the current chapter, the overall goal is to firstly establish the significance of the general field of classroom interaction and then critically evaluate how classroom interaction has been understood in different contexts from different theoretical perspectives and methodological orientations. To identify aspects where new contributions could be made especially in EMI context, a discussion of different approaches to analyzing classroom interaction and a description and illustration of different methods to investigate it are presented to highlight the existing gap in this area of research. The chapter describes how Conversation Analysis (CA) is utilized in classroom research and then explains the Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT), explaining in detail how it is highly relevant to the current study. The chapter concludes by presenting the research questions.

3.1 Studies in Classroom Interaction:

Interaction in the classroom is a form of 'institutional discourse' where the interaction and participants of the interaction are determined by the institution's goals and aims which differ from everyday conversation in key ways (Seedhouse, 1996, 2005). To investigate this form of interaction it is necessary to review theories of learning related to classroom interaction to establish the underlying approach of the present study. In addition, the second section provides a brief overview of interactional studies and as ESL and CBI. The argument of the section draws attention to the limited and restricted studies of CBI in comparison to ESL which has been thoroughly studied in the literature.

3.1.1 Interaction and Theories of Learning:

Examining the relationship between interaction and the development of the learning process has been guided by different theoretical perspectives. In the last 20 years, interaction has been examined in relation to L2 learning as both a cognitive and social process. The cognitive view of learning has focused on three hypotheses: the input, interaction, and output hypotheses. Regardless of the differences between these theories, they all highlight the role of the modified language in cognitive development (Gass, 2004; Swain, 1985, 2005; Long, 1983, 1996). These hypotheses will be explained in the next section in more detail, yet the main idea here is that comprehensible input is important but opportunities to produce and practice language are equally as important to language acquisition and, specifically, to the facilitation of learning.

On the other hand, the social dimension of learning in interaction can be explored by looking into how learners and teachers exchange, reflect and rationalize new knowledge. Interaction could also be viewed in relation to the learning process, which requires participation and engagement in the classroom (Seedhouse, 2004). Several studies that have examined interaction considering social aspects of learning have drawn on the sociocultural theories of learning proposed by Vygotsky (1978) and Lantolf (2000). Vygotsky's (1978) influential theory suggests that higher mental functions are developed through social interaction, highlighting the important role of linguistic interaction in the process of socialization. Since the idea of "co-construction" is an essential part of classroom interaction, the relevance of the sociocultural theory might be fundamental as the participants together create a discourse that is meaningful to all of them (Walsh, 2006). Hence, according to this theory, it is essential to participate in socially mediated activities. For this thesis, it is important to look at learning as a social process, and I chose to investigate contexts where both learners and instructors are expected to be present and take part in the tasks and discussions. Exploring such issues might reveal the reasons behind some learners and teachers' interactional choices to transmit, discuss, or clarify new ideas and concepts in academic contexts. Therefore, in the next section, I will present what has been investigated in relation to language learning and interaction.

3.1.2 Interaction and Language Learning:

Interaction has long been a question of great interest in the field of language learning. It has been subject to investigation since 1980 (Krashen, 1982). Three hypotheses highlight the role of interaction in the development of language. Providing an elaborate account of the principles of the hypotheses that have dominated many studies in ESL is critical to reflect on the significance of interaction in language learning. These are Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1983, 1996), Swain's Output Hypothesis (1985, 2005) and the Input-Interaction Hypothesis (Gass, 2004).

Long's (1983) Interactional Hypothesis argues that the negotiation of meaning between teachers and students is especially important for learning. His research involved three steps of logical argument to link the importance of linguistic adjustment to language acquisition. He claimed that comprehensible input is the key to language acquisition. Later, his argument was questioned by Swain's work (1985). She argued that only focusing on the quality of the input provided in the language classroom might not be a sufficient approach to lead to language acquisition. Although Swain's focus was on immersion classes, she shifted the attention to the role of the comprehensible outputs produced by the student. Her arguments, which emphasized the importance of the dialogue or "discussion" in language classrooms,

lead to the establishment of the Output Hypothesis. Swain claimed that when given opportunities, students have the ability not only to acquire meaning through semantic processing but also to concentrate on the forms. Gass (2004) agreed with the previous hypotheses. She proposed that they both complement, rather than contradict, each other. Gass suggested that interaction should be considered a valuable resource to practice a language and lead to the development of the student's morphology and syntax. She clarified that modified "input" led to a change in students' knowledge of the language, which is the underlying thread developed in her Input Hypothesis (2004).

Each of these hypotheses has different views on the association between language and interaction. However, it can be concluded that the majority of these studies acknowledged the critical influence of interaction on the language learning process. Whether it is through the modified input, the opportunities to produce output or the input that leads to the acquirement of knowledge about the language, interaction is an inseparable part of language development.

3.1.3 Interaction and Content Learning:

As stated in the section above, a considerable body of literature has developed around interaction and language learning. Nevertheless, the relationship between interaction and content learning has received little attention from scholars in comparison to research on language learning. Yet it is still important to review some studies identify the contribution of interaction to content learning.

Content learning involves learning subject knowledge rather than just learning a second language. Various focuses and contexts have been targeted is studying the relationship between content learning and interaction such as; school classrooms, university classroms, classrooms that adopt L1 as a medium of instruction, classrooms that adopt L2 as a medium of instruction like EMI/CLIL. Bearing in mind that CBI is a broad term that could cover different approaches that divide the attention between linguistic abilities and content knowledge. This term is used to in this section to distiguish language classrooms that divide the attention between linguistic abilities and content knowledge which is the focus of my research. It is important to mention that the nature of a language classroom is quite different from that of a CBI classroom. The function of the interaction, the quality and amount of interaction, the role of both teacher and students, and most importantly its role in the interaction are different among the two types of classrooms (Gass, 2004). In a language classroom, both the subject content and the medium of interaction are the same, and students are expected to acquire the language based on that principle. Hence, the amount of interaction is as important as the quality of interaction to facilitate learning in a language

classroom. On the contrary, interaction in CBI emphasizes that even when content and the language of instruction are different, they should both receive the same amount of attention. However, when put into practice, instructors focus on content more than language development (Walsh, 2006). Consequently, the quality of interaction becomes far more important than the amount of interaction in most CBI.Both ESL classrooms and CBI classrooms involve many participants in the interaction, unlike other social settings. In both contexts, teachers or instructors have the right to require students to contribute to the interaction. Bax (2003) claimed that in language classrooms, teachers generate the communication "from and with" learners. Teachers use the language to facilitate conversation not only between themselves and the students but also among students as well (Walsh, 2003). In CBI, most studies argue that instructors use language to facilitate transmitting the information about the content, and the students will learn the language as a result. As a result, instructors focus on their role to deliver the content rather than their role as language teachers. However, limited research has been completed on this area.

In content-based classrooms has revealed two different perspectives. Some researchers argue that interaction is limited because there are minimal opportunities to practice a language in CBI classrooms (such as Musumeci, 1996; Pica, 2002). Pica collected her data over seven weeks from two classes with two instructors in an American university. The results showed that teachers in CBI classes pay more attention to the knowledge, rather than "forms", of language. Even though the study was concerned with how teachers modify their language, interactions between the interlocutors were still limited. This group of researchers has overlooked the variety of teaching methods that could influence classroom interaction. Their views could be justifiable if we are concerned only with classrooms that are highly dependent on instruction and the transmitting of information. However, their views oversimplify the classroom's context and consider it as fixed rather than dynamic.

Unlike previous research, current studies support the idea that content-based classrooms might provide a meaningful context for interaction. For instance, Roger (2006) argued for the positive impact of CBI contexts on interaction. He examined the oral production of university students in Italy over 12 weeks. The students' performance in the course was evaluated both at the beginning and the end. Roger found out that the students' academic achievements in the course, as well as their language abilities, had improved over the weeks, contradicting results from previous studies. His explanation for students' development is that some CBI classrooms are indeed meaningful communicative contexts that could potentially enhance language as well as subject learning.

3.2 Studies of Interaction at University Level:

The previous section reviewed literature that is concerned with studies of interaction in both ESL and CBI. However, this section sheds light on interactional studies in the tertiary content classroom and describes the quality of interaction that the present study examines in that context.Several studies have found that interaction had a positive impact on the learning process. For example, Parkash (2010) made a comparison between the didactic and constructivist lectures of MBBS students in a Malaysian university by conducting post-tests after the lecture. Parkash noticed that the constructivist lectures that involved the extensive use of questions and a more interactive contribution from students resulted in a better academic performance in the course compared to students who were taught using didactic lectures. However, his study was carried out over a short period without identifying all the external factors that could lead to students' improvement.

Similarly, Morell (2004) found that students' contributions in lectures at the University of Alicante increased in classes that had the following linguistic features: personal pronouns, discourse markers, questions, and negotiations of meaning. While her findings are important, her study is more a description of interactive lectures by looking only at the linguistic features that she trained the lecturer to use. She does not refer to its relation to interlocutors or the role of her context, even though these are essential parts of interaction practice as Young identified (2003).

Walsh, one of the leading scholars who related increased interaction to the improvement of the learning process, has looked at interaction with O'Keeffe (2010) in academic seminars in Ireland. They combined Corpus Linguistics (CL) and Conversation Analysis as their methodological approach. They identified four distinct micro-contexts that can be found in this academic context: organizational, instructional, discursive, and argumentative talk. These micro-contexts are summarized as adopted from Walsh and O'Keefe (2010) in the table below.

Table 1: Micro-contexts in Academic SGT

Micro-context	Description	Aim	Interactional Features (Conversation Analysis)	Language Use (Corpus Linguistics)
Organizational Talk	Talking about upcoming tasks and activities to organize the course.	To inform students about different procedural matters, such as the dates of examinations or preparing certain materials.	• Long turns dominated by tutors. • Tutor performs both roles in the initiation-response-feedback (IRF) cycle by questioning and providing answers.	Frequent references to time ''next time, next week''. Frequent use of the work ''okay'' to check if students understood all the necessary information.
Instructional Talk	To provide students with feedback.	To question individual participants.	• Turn-taking and turn allocation are controlled by the tutors. • The IRF interactional cycle dominates.	Frequent use of the discourse markers ''Tell me, I want you'' by the tutors to provide evaluative feedback.
Discursive Talk	Students contribute to discussion and tutors build on them to link the pedagogical goals of the seminar.	To reinforce discussion by creating space for learning.	• Both students and tutors have equal roles. • Turns are evenly distributed.	Frequent use of interpersonal pronounces. Frequent use of the discourse markers ''yeah, you know" (to signal shared knowledge) and "you see" (to signal new information).
Argumentative Talk	Negotiate meanings about existing principles or new	To foster criticality and individual thinking.	• Marked by equal turn-taking. • High frequency of	Discourse markers ''You know, But, Right but, Yeah, No but''.

	concepts.		latched turns and interruption. • Rapid exchange with few pausing.	

In their study, Walsh and O'Keefe claimed that these interactional patterns are available in higher education seminars, and they are usually used to promote criticality and engage learners in academic debates.

Interaction in lectures can use a variety of structures and patterns based on different aspects that include the language being used, the teaching approach adopted, and the discipline taught. Therefore, it is crucial to examine these elements in this context in detail to understand the role and effect of interaction on university classrooms.

3.2.1 Interaction in L1 Lectures vs Interaction in L2 Lectures:

The medium of interaction plays an important role in the interactional practice in lectures. Studies of interaction in L1 lectures have been mostly conducted within the medical field and little research has been done in other fields of study. Huxham (2005) investigated medical undergraduate classrooms where L1 is used in the United Kingdom. His investigation showed that native speaker students perceived increased interactive discussions in the lecture positively. In fact, when students were examined, they performed well when questions were related to the part of the lecture where there was an interaction between the instructor and the students. While Huxham's study focused on the students' perception and comprehension of the lecture, another study by Pedrosa de Jesus and da Silva Lopes (2009) focused on the interactions of the students. Pedrosa de Jesus and da Silva Lopes (2009) found that biology undergraduate students are often involved in longer extended exchanges when the instructor makes the effort to ask students more questions about the content subject to stimulate interaction. The more the teacher adopts a student-centred approach to their teaching, the more interaction they have with their students in lectures. The work of Pedrosa de Jesus and da Silva Lopes (2009) is one of the very few studies conducted in L1 academic classrooms regarding interaction. To date, few studies have investigated interaction in L1 or L2.

However, research on interaction in L2 in university lectures has focused on how L2 can also be a barrier that challenges students around the globe and affects interaction. The use of L2 could lead students to make fewer contributions when their level of competence in English is low. Flowerdew and Miller (1996) demonstrated that students in Hong Kong

performed a passive role and their interaction was limited. When those students were questioned about their reasons, they mentioned that the use of new terms and the speed of delivery by the instructor were two of the main reasons that stopped them from joining any discussion. However, when students have a good level of English proficiency, they expressed different concerns. Miller (2009) pointed out that the undergraduate students in his study hoped for a more ''talkative'' lecture and more visual aids. Although they were able to understand the content of the lectures, they still preferred more discussions, debates and visual materials to make the lecture more interesting and to make it easier to comprehend the subject content quicker.

It can be claimed that not only are publications limited but also that they concentrate on teachers and students' perceptions or cognitive aspects of learning. Most research adopts either interviews or exams as the measurement tool to assess the effect of the language being used in the classroom. We know that previous studies have argued that, regardless of whether L1 or L2 is used in lectures, the preference for a more interactive environment is significant for participants in the interaction. However, very little is currently known about the effect of using L1 and L2 on the interaction quality in lectures.

3.2.2 Interactive Lectures vs Non-interactive Lectures:

A formal lecture is usually described as a pre-planned monologue that is highly informational in content, which gives little or no opportunity for negotiations of meaning (AlMakoshi, 2014). Most academic lectures aim primarily to transmit information (Lake, 2001). Many researchers have studied the features of a lecture and found that lectures are usually hedged (Poos & Simpson, 2002) and highly reflexive (Mauranen, 2001) and that most instructors tend to signpost and use formulaic expressions (Swales, 2001). There are so many different styles to delivering a lecture and choosing one is usually dependent on the instructor and the subject being studied. Yet, the prototypical genres of lectures have been criticized for being monologic with students having limited participation (Hyland, 2009). But some academic classrooms can be student centred and adopt an interactive mode of teaching. In these classrooms, which are different from academic teacher-centred classrooms, the learning responsibility lies with both the students and instructors (Trigwell et al., 1999).

Therefore, interactive classrooms might be central to participation and engagement in lectures, and many contexts are affected by the new trends toward interactive modes of teaching. Interaction might help students to maintain concentration, as some scholars have pointed out that students often lose their interest and focus after the first ten to twenty minutes of a lecture (Baumal & Benbassat, 2008). Others suggest that an interactive

environment could lead to meaningful learning by promoting criticality and critical thinking through the negotiation of meaning, allowing "students to try out their new ideas" (Walsh, 2006, p.107). Similarly, van Dijk and Jochems (2002) demonstrated that it might offer a good strategy to help students retain the content material of the lecture. However, there is still little research on the effect of verbal or non-verbal interaction on the learning process.

Interactive classrooms are challenging irrespective of whether L1 or L2 is being used (Morell, 2004). Many lecturers prefer non-interactive lectures because they believe that interaction with students will affect the time of the lecture as well as the accuracy of information being transmitted (Huxham, 2003; Lake, 2001). Recent research suggests an alternative practical solution to make lectures more interactive through a dialogic teaching approach that does not affect the accuracy of the information transmitted, thus adopting a moderate position. For example, Murphy and Sharma (2010) proposed conducting phases of the lecture interactively to achieve a better balance of the benefits of an interactive approach while being able to allow lecturers to introduce new aspects of content information.

As discussed above, the most obvious finding to emerge from these studies is that interaction has a positive impact on the quality of learning. Another significant aspect of this discussion that needs elaboration is the effect of different disciplines on the amount and quality of interaction.

3.2.3 Interaction among Different Disciplines:

It is important to understand the level of significance of interactive classrooms to the discipline being taught and to the educational institution. Not all academic disciplines can depend in the same way on interaction to achieve their pedagogical goals. The monologic parts and dialogic parts might play different roles in the lesson (Walsh & O'Keeffe, 2010). It is important to consider that the interactional pattern within one discipline might differ from the other even when adopting dialogic teaching approaches. For example, in some science subjects like accounting, the nature of the subject does not allow for a great amount of interaction in comparison to humanities subjects. The current study focuses only on the interaction within business academic lectures that involve a great number of interactive segments.

3.2.3.1 Interaction in Business Classrooms:

Interactive teaching is valuable and desirable in different disciplines in higher education. Business is one of the disciplines that requires students not only to learn content knowledge but also to be able to negotiate and socialize in today's global economy (Dearden, 2015). Hence, business is a major discipline of EMI growth (ibid). Learners need not only the skills

to read, write, listen to and speak English fluently they also need to be able to communicate in an international industry. Most of the research done in the field of interaction focuses on science and medicine. There is a relatively small body of literature that is concerned with interaction in L2 in academic business. However, one of the studies that investigated the discipline of business in an EMI context showed that there is a lack of awareness among lecturers implementing EMI in their undergraduate degrees (Unterberger, 2014). The academic staff were criticised for their limited awareness in terms of the discipline-specific language learning that business requires (ibid). Similarly, another recent study conducted at the Copenhagen Business School (Mees, Denver, & Werther, 2017) showed that faculty members who have both a good level of English and a good level of pragmatic competence are considered competent lecturers by their students. It seems that academic business within EMI is acknowledging the need to enhance lecturers' use of L2 to achieve teaching and learning goals. Research into academic business within university lectures has been conducted mostly in European countries. Therefore, investigating the discipline of business within EMI university classrooms in other parts of the globe might provide an understanding of how it is implemented worldwide and the effect of the interaction on learning the subject content. The present study focuses on the interactional process within EMI in interactive lectures. I chose business as a discipline because it is an academic context that values an interactive educational environment. It is important to fill the research gap by providing an investigation of academic business within EMI classrooms in Saudi Arabia.

3.3 Methods of Investigating Classroom Interaction:

There is a long history of research that analyzes classroom interaction employing a variety of approaches such as discourse analytical approaches, ethnographic approaches, and interactional approaches. As mentioned in the first section, most of the interactional research has been done around ESL classrooms. Several interactional studies in ESL have based their methodology decisions on different approaches, including psychometric studies, ethnographic analysis, interaction analysis, and discourse analysis (Chaudron,1988). Psychometric studies apply experimental tests on groups of learners and teachers. Ethnographical analysis examines different learning contexts to provide more subjective insights into what is happening inside the classroom. However, interactional and discursive analyses are the two most well-known approaches used to study classroom interaction. Interactional analysis focuses on the social elements of the interaction while discursive analysis focuses on the linguistic elements of the interaction. While other approaches lack the ability to account for the unpredictability of classroom interaction, conversation analysis is widely used in research to investigate the micro-level and acknowledge the multi-layered

contexts of interaction. It is important to understand how that form of analysis could be accompanied by other forms to gain a better understanding of classrooms.

3.3.1 Conversation Analysis and the Analysis of Classroom Interaction:

CA emerged from Harvey Sacks's lecture in 1960 and the subsequent work of Schegloff and Jefferson (1977). An examination of the conversation analysis literature on classroom interactions reveals a variety of research interests. Most studies aim to reveal social, cultural, and institutional aspects reflected in the interactional decisions made by participants in a particular context. Recent SLA research on interaction has investigated varied contexts: L2 novice learners in an ESL literary programme (Hellermann, 2006, 2007), ESL learners in tutorial situations (Young & Miller, 2004), teacher-to-student and peer-to-peer interactions in a foreign-language classroom (Ohta, 1999, 2001a, 2001b), student-teacher interactions outside the language classroom (Masuda, 2009), and peer interactions in study abroad (Ishida, 2007, 2009).

A conversation analytical perspective is a useful way to analyze classroom interaction because it examines data to describe features of spoken discourse at a macro (text) level. The analysis must be carried out within the context of certain standards and regulations. Talk is structured and organized rather than an arbitrary act. Looking into interaction, CA's focus is only on the local context, how speakers design their turns in response to the turns of others in the interaction. Therefore, interpretation of data is local and driven by the data itself rather than relying on other external interpretations of participants' actions.

There is order at all phases of interaction, and contributions are shaped by the context in which they occur. Therefore, under a CA lens, what matters about classroom interaction is not that it is happening in a classroom but rather that the participants are taking the roles of teacher and student to pursue the goal of learning. Whether in a language classroom or a content-based classroom, the interactional architecture of the talk within the classroom aims to expose the relationship between interaction and pedagogy and how participants orient to that relationship (Seedhouse, 2005).

3.3.2 Studies of CA and Classroom Interaction:

In recent years, there has been an increasing amount of literature on the interdependence of the quality of interaction and the process of learning. Ellis (2000, p.209) demonstrated that "learning arises not through interaction but in interaction". Many researchers have claimed that interaction is an essential part of the learning process because participating actively and being engaged in the classroom benefits students (e.g., Allwright, 1984, 2005; Pica,1987; van Lier, 2008; Walsh, 2011). Therefore, it is necessary to look at the details of what

constitutes the process of participation through CA. Looking into central organizations of interaction, turn-taking and the sequence of organization, will help to expose many interactional features that lead to an understanding of the learning process. Different studies have shed light on different interactional features, such as turn-taking, adjacency pairs, and repair, and these will be addressed below.

3.3.2.1 Turn-taking:

Turn-taking is one of the most crucial aspects of many research studies employing CA perspectives. While early studies focused on the initiation-response-feedback (IRF) cycle, recent studies have looked into a more complicated IRF cycle in different classroom contexts. Complicated versions of IRF are often associated with a different mechanism of turn-taking and how turn-taking design functions in relation to different elements in the classroom, such as different multimodal resources, gestures, and eye gaze.

One of the recent studies that investigated the complicated versions of IRF was carried out by Garton (2012) who argued that students sometimes self-select to seek clarification and further information in a recurrent IRF sequence. The study showed that CA can clarify that turn design or the IRF cycle specifically might have different versions at different phases of the classroom. Interestingly, that study also agreed with Walsh's (2011) perspectives that even though there are different types of classrooms, all classrooms are made up of different micro-contexts that are consistently constructed by the teachers and students.

Initiation and feedback in IRF can be used in different ways by teachers which affect the structure of turn-taking in the subsequent turns. Another study that challenges the IRF is by Petitjean (2014) who noted that initiations in the IRF cycle might not always expect a response from an individual student. Petitjean differentiated between group questions which are questions to the whole class where every student is welcome to join the turn-taking and individual questions which are questions that the teacher intends that only one student can answer. It can be argued that each question is influenced by a different pedagogical objective that the teacher might want to illustrate. Similarly, another study that used CA to examine the effects of turn design on the quality of classroom interaction claimed that the teachers in the study who used "pass-on-turns" are able to elicit more responses from different students during class discussions (Willemsen et al.,2019). Pass-on-turn is a turn produced by teachers returning the floor to the class following one student's contribution. The CA showed that pass-on-turns might seem to hinder students' interaction but it encourages the activity of having a whole-class discussion in which students can both discuss the topic at hand and at the same time challenge the contributions of their classmates.

Other studies have focused on the effect of non-verbal resources on turn-taking. One of those studies examined the interactional and epistemic challenges in a mathematical homework support session (Svahn & Bowden, 2019). CA was used to track four phases of students requesting help using different epistemic resources. The student used her laptop to structure the interaction. The turns to seek clarification were initiated using the electronic device. The study showed the significant role of visual resources in science to structure turn design and also highlighted that their effect often results in facilitating sequential patterns of help-seeking.

3.3.2.2 Repair or Feedback:

It has been argued that many learning opportunities are created through the third stage of the IRF cycle. Several researchers have used CA to investigate the role, effect, and influence of feedback and repair. Wong and Waring (2008) identified the role of explicit feedback on the structure of the next turn. If feedback is both positive and explicit, it will often result in the teacher producing another question. Margutti and Drew (2014) examined feedback in a more detailed manner than Wong and Waring and classified five different types of feedback and their influence on students. The five types are assessment, repetition of an answer, expanded versions of answers, response particles, and direct transition to the next turn. They argued that a positive assessment, such as "good", is produced when the teacher accepts the student's response. On the other hand, a teacher who wants to correct a student's response will use different types of feedback in different turns to help the student reach the final required information. Similarly, a different study noted how code-switching might be used to help students as a form of feedback. Can Daskin (2015) used CA to analyze how teachers shape their students' interactions by translating them into L1/L2. Sometimes response tokens are used as a repair strategy. Using these interactional strategies, teachers can provide students with the opportunities to participate in an extended learner's turn. Creating space for learning by holding the third turn of evaluation is an interactive decision, but it influences the quality of student interaction while negotiating meaning.

3.3.3 Conversation Analysis and Language Alteration:

When it comes to looking into what CA can tell us about language alternation in classroom interactions, most studies have found that L1 is usually associated with low proficiency students and functions which L1 is used for such as explanation, socializing, and raising students' attention. Guthrie (1984) identified many different purposes for teachers to use L1, including translation, creating solidarity, checking and clarifying understanding. On the other hand, Lin (1990) found that there are other discursive functions of using L1 in

classrooms, such as changing the topic, the role of the speakers, and participation frameworks. One of the most influential studies in this field was by Peter Auer (1988) who investigated different functions and structures of code-switching employing CA. He classified the types of code-switching into two main groups: participant-related and discourse-related. According to Auer, when code-switching is discourse-related, it is often concerned with the ongoing interactional organization. Language alternations can occur at the same turn or can occur within the sequential structure. Some of the discourse-related functions are summarized by Auer (1988) below :

"Some important types of discourse-related switching found in our materials are: change in participant constellation, change in mode of interaction (for instance, between a formal interview and a casual conversation, or between a move in a game and conversation), topic change, sequential contrast (for instance, between an on-going sequence and a subordinated repair sequence, or side remark), change between informative and evaluative talk, for instance, after stories (including formulations and other summing-up techniques)" (p.199).

Many of the studies have focused on EFL contexts. Interactional functions of language alternation have been rarely examined in EMI contexts.

3.3.4 Conversation Analysis and other Methods of Analysis:

Recent interactional research encourages the use of CA with different methodological approaches (Walsh, 2011). Recent studies (Can Daşkın, 2015; Dipplod, 2013; Seedhouse, 2004; Sert, 2013; Walsh, 2006, 2011) have expanded their perspectives by trying to examine interaction and the features of interaction more comprehensively in the light of alternative methodological approaches that are believed to be appropriate for use with conversation analysis, such as corpus linguistics (CL), ethnography, and other qualitative methods such as retrospective interviews. To provide enhanced descriptions of spoken interaction in the context of higher education, Walsh and O'Keeffe (2010) investigated how participants in small group teaching achieve mutual understanding. Their study shows how the two approaches can be combined in an iterative process to account for features of spoken discourse at both the micro (word) and the macro (text) levels. It is argued in their study that combining approaches provides powerful insights into the ways in which participants establish a common understanding in educational settings.

However, although many of these studies have well described and demonstrated interaction and interactional features, CA is unable to provide assistance to instructors or inform their practice. As discussed earlier, the sociocultural view of learning considers

interaction as a valuable tool in the learning process. Even though interaction is "co-constructed" by both the teacher and learners, in CBI teachers have the right to assign participation to learners and a major role in the management of the interaction (Edwards & Westgate, 1987; Walsh, 2006). Accordingly, reflective practice modules might have more to offer to the analysis than what CA is capable of at present. Up to now, far too little attention has been paid to analytical tools that could examine pedagogical aspects and their relation to the interactional process. There is still a need for more research to help instructors manage the interactional process in ways that facilitate learning. In her study of interaction in internationalized university classrooms, Dippold (2013) called for:

"Researchers and practitioners in applied linguistics and in educational studies to join forces to investigate interactions in academic settings not only for the sake of academic discovery but with the explicit aim of using their insights for designing staff development programmes to improve the classroom interactional competence of tutors and students. Insights from applied linguistics will be necessary to aid reflection about the effectiveness of different interaction patterns, whilst those from educational studies will provide insights into the decision making processes of tutors and students" (p. 23).

From that perspective, in the next section, I present the Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework, which is a form of reflective practice that allows teachers to systematically reflect upon their oral discourse.

3.3.5 Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk and Classroom Interaction:

SETT was designed by Walsh (2006) and consists of four classroom micro-contexts, called modes, and thirteen interactional features. Each mode focuses on a particular area of interaction, representing a specific micro-context in an L2 classroom. Teachers can use modes as a way to code their own talk. SETT, as shown in Appendix D, is designed to help teachers describe and evaluate the way they interact in classrooms with their students and become aware of any uncooperative use of language. Being aware of their practice, the final stage that SETT aims at is to change teachers' perceptions of their own interactions after identifying the episodes of interaction that need improvement (Walsh,2006). SETT works as a framework that brings up the underlying relationship between pedagogical goals and the use of language (Walsh, 2011). It is considered a more comprehensive framework than IRF because it is flexible enough to be adapted in any micro-context (Howard, 2010).

The SETT framework by Walsh (2006) concentrates on creating adequate grounds for teachers to get acquainted with every possible circumstance of a classroom. SETT analyses how the teachers can develop their teaching approaches and be reflective teachers with

better contemplation under classroom interactional competence (CIC). According to Walsh (2010), to be a teacher, there is the need to understand the responsibilities and stay aware of various modes to accomplish pedagogical and interactive aspects of teaching: managerial, materials, skills and systems, and classroom context. In research, SETT is not usually used as a methodological tool on its own but rather as a tool in stimulated recall interviews to question the teachers about their own interactional choices (Dippold, 2013; Howard, 2010; Lee & Ng 2010; Poorebrahim et al., 2015; Walsh, 2006).

Table 2:SETT Framework

Modes	Pedagogic Goals	Interactional Features
Managerial	_ To transmit information. _ To organize the physical learning environment. _ To refer learners to materials. _ To introduce or conclude an activity. _ To change from one mode of learning to another.	- A single, extended teacher turn that uses explanations and/or instructions. _ The use of transitional markers. _ The use of confirmation checks. _ An absence of learner contributions.
Materials	- To provide language practice around a piece of material. _ To elicit responses concerning the material. _ To check and display answers. _ To clarify when necessary. _ To evaluate contributions.	-Predominance of IRF pattern. _ Extensive use of display questions. _ Form-focused feedback. _ Corrective repair. _ The use of scaffolding.
Skills and systems	- To enable learners to produce correct forms. _ To enable learners to manipulate the target language.	- The use of direct repair. _ The use of scaffolding. _ Extended teacher turns. _ Display questions.

	_ To provide corrective feedback. _ To provide learners with practice in sub-skills. _ To display correct answers.	_ Teacher echo. _ Clarification requests. _ Form-focused feedback.
Classroom context	_ To enable learners to express themselves clearly. _ To establish a context. _ To promote oral fluency.	_ Extended learner turns. _ Short teacher turns. _ Minimal repair. _ Content feedback. _ Referential questions. _ Scaffolding. _ Clarification requests.

(Source: Walsh, 2006)

3.3.5.1 The Interactional Features of SETT:

By analyzing the corpus, four patterns of modes have been identified by Walsh (2006): the managerial, material, classroom context, and skills and system modes.

Managerial Mode:

The pedagogic goals of the managerial mode are to transmit information related to the management of learning, to organize the physical conditions for learning to take place, to refer learners to specific materials, and to introduce or conclude an activity. The interactional features that characterize the managerial mode are single, extended teacher turns, frequently in the form of an explanation or instruction, the use of transitional markers, confirmation checks, and the absence of learner contribution.

Materials Mode:

The principal pedagogic goals of the material mode are to provide language practice around a specific piece of material, to elicit learner responses in relation to the material, to check and display answers, to clarify, and to evaluate and extend learner contribution. The principal interactional features are the predominance of the IRF sequence, closely managed

by a teacher, display questions to check understanding and elicit responses, form-focused feedback for "correctness" rather than content, repairing to correct errors, and scaffolding.

Skills and System Mode:

The pedagogic goals of this mode are to enable learners to produce correct utterances, to enable learners to manipulate the target language, to provide corrective feedback, to provide learners with practice in essential sub-skills, and to display correct answers. The interactional features are as follows the use of direct repair, the use of scaffolding, extended teacher turns, teacher echo used to display responses, clarification requests, and form-focused feedback.

Classroom Context Mode:

Pedagogic goals are to enable learners to talk about feelings, emotions, experiences and attitudes, to establish a context, to activate mental schemata (MacCarthy, 1992), and to promote oral fluency practice. The interactional features are as follows: Extended learner turns, relatively short teacher turns, direct repair, content feedback, extended use of referential questions rather than display questions, scaffolding to help learners express their ideas, and requests for clarification and confirmation checks.

As the SETT framework gets critically analysed, it has been noted that the four aforementioned modes are intended to remain representative. There is no scope for being comprehensive. However, as established by Ghafarpour (2017), a language teacher needs to have interactional awareness for the establishment of practical knowledge, along with the needs of the respective institution and the learning setting. These are the aspects that cannot be ignored in any circumstance (Ghafarpour, 2017).

There is also no room for being extensively comprehensive in connecting the pedagogy and interactive approaches. In a very representative manner, the SETT framework remains tightly knitted to the classroom practices led by the teacher. It is through this framework that the relationship between the process of learning and the interactions needed for learning is established in a very objective manner (Sali, 2014; Tsay, 2011).

In terms of educating the teacher for initiating a class for learning a language, this framework is appropriate and unambiguous. In relation to the involvement of the learner in the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom, Shamsipour and Allami (2012) established that teacher talk can support the learning process of EFL. While dealing with the teachers for Iranian foreign language, Shamsipour and Allami (2012) claimed that teacher talk is effective for optimising the contribution of the learner, and thus the implementation of a strategic SETT framework is highly recommended.

3.3.5.2 Employing SETT to Investigate Higher Education Classrooms:

While referring to the application of the SETT framework at the university level, Moser et al. (2012) and Aghajanzadeh and Hemmati (2014) pointed out that, for pedagogical purposes, 'teacher talk' for EFL is an approach of teaching that must remain collaborative with evaluation and the recovery of ideational and linguistic structures through text or non-text directed. Moreover, Astuti and Selti (2018) collected the trainees' points of view about SETT and established that there is a need to offer a comprehensive induction, along with systematic integration in this framework, especially towards SETT metalanguage. Thus, in relation to the application of SETT for higher education, it is necessary to consider the relevance in the domain of metalanguage. In this context, Korkut and Ertas (2016) initiated research at Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University. From their analytical approach, these scholars noted that the SETT framework is very much necessary for the process of learning in the teacher, but at the same time, there is also the need to add on certain pedagogical features at higher education (see Table 3).

Table. 3: Additions for Higher Education

Mode	Pedagogic Goals	Interactional Features
Managerial Mode	Giving instructions and homework Arranging the physical environment Managing the behavior of students Transition between the phases of lesson	A single extended teacher turn in L1 or L2 Short, formulaic language for familiar situations (routines) Transitional markers both in L1 and L2 Learner contribution in the form of clarification request, offer and collaborative thinking
Materials Mode	Conducting the material (becoming the voice of the material) Making the material accessible (becoming the inner voice of students) Opportunistic teaching	I-R-F pattern Form focused feedback Error correction Scaffolding Translation
	(the line between materials mode and skills and systems mode gets blurred)	Both modes have the same interactional features
Skills and Systems Mode	Bringing the focus on form. Providing language practice Making explanations	Teacher echo metalanguage
Classroom Context Mode	Sharing opinions, feeling and experiences Communicating in the shared history of the classroom community	Mostly in L1 Teacher-led Topic nomination by learners but topic termination always by teacher Topic returns to conventional language work
	(a sub-mode?) Providing feedback on students' performance	Mostly in L1 Initiated by teacher Not always produces a next turn

Source: Korkut and Ertas (2016, p. 46)

It is in the same context that Markee (2015) emphasized that there is a need to make additions to the "comparative re-production research for a wider understanding of generality

and prototypically" modes of learning, especially in cross-cultural languages and respective institutional contexts. Application of SETT at the university level is still not widespread as it was used by Humphries (2014) in terms of dealing with code-switching in Japanese contexts and implied by Howard (2010) in terms of comparing observed along with non-observed lessons paradoxically offered by two teachers. Wang (2012) used it to analyze the young learners in an online manner. On an advanced platform, Ellis (2012) suggested the implementation of system-based approaches of implementing SETT. The approach of Meunier (2015) in using SETT for the construction of the English language for local understanding can be effective while implementing EFL in higher education. Eventually, it can be concluded that the SETT modes are representative in terms of delineating both the pedagogical objectives of teaching and the need for interactive participation of the teacher in meeting the determined pedagogical goals. It has been noted that the four modes do not mean to make any determined or specific declaration for classroom discourse. However, as there are limited resources in understanding the scopes of developing EFL in higher education, it is necessary to construct an appropriate strategy to meet this gap.

3.3.5.3 SETT and the Development of Interaction:

Walsh conceptualized CIC on the basis of employing SETT in language classrooms. In that context, Walsh (2011) established CIC to promote strategies that influence the interactional practices within SLC. Before constructing the concept of CIC, interactional competence was the main concept that attracted the attention of many scholars for twenty years and continues to be a controversial notion (Walsh, 2011). According to Walsh (2011) L2 proficiency is not related to interactional competence because some people are able to communicate better than others who can struggle to convey simple meanings. The main concern and focus of Walsh was the context of L2 classrooms. He argued that many studies and scholars were more focused on individual performance rather than the collective performance of L2 learners, and that was influenced by the design of recent teaching materials adopting, for instance, the task-based approach (Walsh, 2011). While the task-based approach seems to be effective in developing L2 learners' skills, the argument here demonstrates how it can have some limitations when considering the development of interactional competence. In many situations in everyday conversation, both interlocutors and their contribution are equally important to make effective communication. Therefore, the collective performance of L2 learners should be taken into an account in research, and that can mean looking into their interactional competence and their ability to communicate rather than just their ability to produce accurate forms of language.

Karmsch (1986) was the first scholar who introduced the idea of interactional competence and linked it to the learner's ability to communicate their intended meaning. Following Karmsch's study, other researchers have continued to investigate interactional competence, focusing on how this new concept is more related to the context and all the interlocutors as a whole, rather than just focusing on one speaker's performance. When referring to interactional competence, there has been an attempt to separate it from the communicative competence that was focusing on individual performance (Walsh, 2011). Walsh summarized the different features of interactional competence and communicative competence. While communicative competence introduces certain rules and stimulated ready conversation to teach L2 learners how to communicate, interactional competence supposes that the L2 learners themselves need to explore the communication in different contexts with different learners.

In the last twenty years, the area of interactional competence has attracted a great amount of attention. Interactional competence was first examined by Kramsch (1986), who believed that there was a need to examine interactional competence as an essential part of L2 acquisition. After Kramsch, many researchers have attempted to define interactional competence and its major features (e.g., Hymes, 1972; Canale & Swain, 1980; Young, 2003; Markee, 2008). In most of their work, they provide more of a descriptive approach to interactional competence. The concept of interactional competence was debatable and there was a struggle trying to define it. One of the first attempts to come to a workable definition was made by Young (2008). Young combined three important elements in the definition: linguistics resources, interactional resources, and specific context.

Walsh (2011) has used the previous research on interactional competence and communicative competence to construct a new concept that acknowledges the process of teaching and learning. Walsh conceptualizes CIC to help the use of discourse to assist learning by using the descriptive aspects of interactional discourse and putting them into ''action'' (ibid).

CIC is defined as '' teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning '' (Walsh, 2011, p. 16). There are a number of features by which we can identify CIC in the discourse. The first feature involves having evidence in the teacher discourse that it is convergent to the pedagogic goal and, at the same time, appropriate to the learners. Secondly, the discourse of the teacher must facilitate interactional space, which refers to the maximization of the wait-time before giving the learners feedback. The third feature reflects the teachers' ability to ''shape'' the learners' contribution. All these features are signs of CIC in the classroom discourse. Checking the existence of these features in any

discourse can be done through an analysis of classroom discourse using the Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework.

3.3.6 The Integration of CA and SETT to Analyze Classroom Interaction:

Unlike other methodological approaches that have been used with CA, SETT is a relatively new framework that has been used as a methodological and analytical tool to inspect interaction (Poorebrahim et al., 2015). It was originally used as a tool for the teacher to reflect on their practice. Although SETT and CA are different, there is a common aspect between the two modes of analysis because they both emphasize the significant relationship between pedagogy and interactional features in the classroom. Drawing on the CA literature on classroom interactions discussed earlier, it has been mentioned that the main focus and aims are to expose the relationship between interaction and pedagogy and how participants orient to that relationship (Seedhouse, 2005). SETT exposes that relationship more explicitly and systematically. SETT can assist analysts to have a more comprehensive look at the relationship between interactional features and pedagogical goals. If used quantitatively to account for the frequency of interactional features within a single classroom, SETT can reveal a broad view of the frequency of interactional features as an additional layer of analysis that could assist CA as the main layer of analysis. The framework has received little attention in interactional research so far as an analytical tool. There has been only one study that has used SETT along with CA to analyze classroom data (Poorebrahim et al., 2015). The data from the EFL classes were analyzed based on the pre-defined modes of the SETT framework with a special focus on teacher talk. Results indicated that confirmation checking, scaffolding, direct error correction, and content feedback constituted the constructive components whereas teacher interruptions and turn completions made up the obstructive sides of the teacher.

In addition, SETT acknowledges the dynamics of interactional features in response to different modes of classrooms. For instance, the material mode is reflected if the teacher's pedagogical goal is to provide a practice around a piece of material and the predominant use of IRF should be noted. Hence, it is easier to spot these interactional features and categorize them independently. CA acknowledges different dynamics of interactional features but rarely focuses on investigating them as an independent component or branch of the interaction. It makes sense that CA is not capable of doing that because one of its main principles is approaching data with an unmotivated eye covering a large amount of data and letting the analysis guide the researcher to examine the phenomenon being questioned in the research question (Ten Have, 2007). I think that using SETT with pre-defined interactional features and pedagogical goals will help the researcher carrying out CA not only to select relevant

extracts but also to take a closer look at how different interactional features operate in different modes.

3.4 Conclusion:

This chapter focused on viewing interaction as a social process where learning can occur through the negotiation of meaning among participants. The evidence presented in this chapter suggests that classroom interaction has been studied more in ESL than any other forms of CBI, including lectures in EMI. In view of all that has been mentioned so far, many factors can affect the quality, characteristics, and nature of interactions. Hence, a detailed account of different aspects of these factors and their effects on lecture interaction has been reviewed. In addition, this chapter has described the methods used in the previous investigation of interaction and focused more on CA. However, evidence shows that CA is rarely used to investigate a lecturer interaction. Unlike previous investigations, the argument in this thesis attempts to focus on influencing the practice of lecturers. Therefore, a variable method for collecting and analyzing data is also called for. Using SETT along with CA can be very beneficial and influential in terms of providing insights into where enhancement of interaction can be made. Before moving to the next chapter, which describes the methods used by the present study to investigate lecture interaction, the research questions that informed this study are as follows:

3.5 Research Questions:

1. What are the interactional practices of EMI business lectures interaction in Saudi Arabia?

2. What is the effect of employing reflective practice frameworks on interaction in EMI business lectures in Saudi Arabia?

3. What are the perspectives of Saudi faculty members regarding using reflective practice frameworks for their interaction?

4 Methodology

4.1 Introduction:

This chapter has two purposes: First, to describe the methodology used in this study and to provide justification for the choice, and second to allow the readers to evaluate the appropriateness of the methods which were employed to answer the research questions. I begin the chapter by reviewing the research paradigm and approach and the theoretical considerations of the methodology, followed by a description of the methods being used. Validity and reliability concerns are discussed in the following section. Finally, the details of the research design and ethical considerations are explained in the last section of the chapter.

4.2 Research Paradigm and Approach:

Setting up the research paradigm is necessary to inform the methodological tools that will be used later on. This research is exploratory in nature and its ontological stance is mainly linked to the idea of interaction as being constructed and shaped by different interlocutors in a social environment. Interactive lectures in this study are considered as the social environment, and the process of learning involving language use reflects the social nature of learning (Vygotsky, 1978). Walsh (2011) suggested that "classroom interaction is socially constructed by and for the participants" (p. 108). Likewise, other researchers have compared the process of learning to the process of joining a community, which obligates the new member to learn how to communicate in that community (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Interaction in a classroom is a phenomenon located within a social setting that is made up of a number of contexts that are created by instructors and students as they participate in interaction (Seedhouse, 2004). Hence, interaction can be observed, evaluated, and analyzed through the use of multiple methodological tools, exploring the moment-by-moment context of interaction, the interactional features displayed in classrooms, and the perception of those involved in constructing the interaction. Yet, these factors should be considered in relation to the research purpose, research questions, and research rationale (Walsh 2011). Therefore, the use of different quantitative and qualitative instruments is a well-established approach to help uncover the impact of using reflective frameworks both on the spoken interaction and the faculty members delivering business lectures in Saudi Arabia. Bryman (2008) demonstrated that the qualitative approach provides a broad understanding of the case being investigated. Interaction can be examined and analyzed through these qualitative tools which

are influenced by my epistemological stance in this study. Two qualitative methods are used in this research: interviews and applied conversation analysis. In addition, to be able to evaluate the applicability of the SETT framework to the Saudi EMI context and to specify whether interactional features coincide or deviate from the pedagogical goal, SETT is used as a tool to both collect and analyze data. In the next section, a more detailed description is given of how a mixed-methods approach could be beneficial to uncover the elements of interaction that need to be examined in this research.

4.3 Theoretical Overview of the Methodology:

4.3.1 Mixed-Methods Approach:

Using a mixed-methodology approach in research can be described as the use of multiple sources of data to investigate a phenomenon. The development of this method requires a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches of measurement, in order to create a mixed method that combines the advantages of both (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). The main rationale for mixed methods is to allow the researcher to have different perspectives with further understanding. Different methodological tools help to elicit different empirical evidence about the phenomenon being investigated (Dornyei, 2007). The combination of the two methodologies can be employed at the data collection level or the analysis level. Previous literature on mixed methodology claim that this approach helps to achieve two potentially conflicting purposes: (1) getting a deeper understanding of the topic being investigated; (2) validating the results of the research by obtaining different results from each method (Sandelowski, 2003). Two qualitative methods will be used in this research (interviews and conversation analysis) along with quantitative data gathered using the SETT framework.

A major advantage of the mixed-method approach in this study is that the data gathered from CA can help us gain a better understanding of the data gathered employing SETT. The mixed-method approach is also practically useful to increase the reliability and validity of the classroom research investigating institutional discourse (Ten Have, 2007). Previous studies that investigated classroom interaction have based their methodological choices on triangulating qualitative tools. Using quantitative and qualitative methods is often approached with caution (ibid). The main reason is that quantitative measures can affect the fundamental rule of conversation analysis: to carry out research unmotivated by prior ideas and to let the evidence emerge from the data (Ten Have, 2007). Yet, mixed methodologies have been an increasingly growing branch of research methodology to analyze classroom discourse. Many researchers have utilized CA along with quantitative methods, such as corpus linguistics, to

analyze classroom talk (Dippold, 2013; Donald, 2015; Poorebrahim et al., 2015; Walsh, 2006). In this study, I use SETT to collect data and to analyze data gathered from the audio recordings of the lectures. Combining CA with SETT is justifiable because the two methods complement each other, enabling insight into how interaction is actually being used. SETT was originally informed by CA and it should be noted with caution that the included interactional features in the framework are representative rather than comprehensive. Using SETT quantitatively can help to identify the number of key interactional features at work after lecturers are introduced to the SETT teacher key (Appendix F). SETT provides insights in terms of the frequency of the interactional features that EMI lectures employ in their talk. On the other hand, by using CA, we are able to consider the ways in which those interactional features play a part in the overall structure of talk. Seedhouse (2004, 2005) has argued that CA has the ability to expose the textual aspects of the speakers' talk. Walsh and O'Keeffe (2010) argued that this approach is highly beneficial for classroom research:

"This dual analysis enabled us to reveal patterns and relationships between tutors' and learners' language use which each methodology on its own would be unable to uncover" (p.148).

Nonetheless, mixed methodologies have both advantages and disadvantages. One of the main significance of using mixed methods is that each method will compensate for the weaknesses of the other. While qualitative data can help to give the exact nature of data, it cannot give insight into how the data is distributed. On the other hand, the most common criticism of using mixed methods revolves around the ability of many to carry out the investigation using the two methods skillfully to achieve a balanced mix of methodologies. In addition, some research that has been carried out using a mixed-methodology approach has only shown that the sum is greater than its parts (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). In the section that follows, I present a brief description of the methods that will be used and the reasons behind their selection.

4.3.1.1 Conversation Analysis:

4.3.1.1.1 Theoretical Background:

CA was developed by Harvey Sacks and his close associates Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson in early 1970 (Ten Have, 2007). As a research approach that grew out of ethnomethodology, CA has some unique methodological features to determine how social action is accomplished through interaction (Seedhouse, 2005). The 'emic' principle of analysis which refers to using criteria from the data itself to analyze it, is the common characteristic that CA shares with ethnomethodology (Pike, 1964; Waston-Gegeo, 1988). It is

a useful tool that uncovers the speakers' own interpretation of speech data by investigating evidence that appears in the data itself (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). Hence, CA is characterized as an inductive qualitative approach because it treats data as the main source to examine talk-in-interaction. In other words, CA focuses on naturally occurring data and investigating a phenomenon should be carried out after looking into a number of regularities before drawing any conclusions. Therefore, it is claimed that CA is empirically grounded because the interpretation of data is formed by the data itself.

To identify how talk is organized and structured, CA provides an approach dealing with naturally occurring data and analyzes talk-in-interaction with fine details through different levels of organizations, such as turn-taking, adjacency pairs, preference, and repair (Richard, 2007). CA is concerned with how social actions are structured through talk. Every turn in interaction has a meaning based on where they appear in a sequence of organization within talk. The sequence of the turn's position plays an essential role in how participants understand and contribute to the talk. Speakers then are achieving what is referred to as ''intersubjectivity''. Intersubjectivity is constructing shared knowledge achieved by the continual process that starts from one person's contribution in a conversation to a sequence of independent contributions by others in the interaction (Walsh, 2011). For that reason, CA can facilitate our understanding of how participants interact with each other within a particular context (Seedhouse, 2005; Wooffitt, 2005).

4.3.1.1.2 CA and Institutional Interaction:

It is impossible to discuss the notion of ''institutional interaction'' without mentioning the difference between ''pure'' CA and ''applied'' CA. While ''pure'' CA refers to the original pure science to explore and investigate talk-in-interaction, ''applied'' CA involves exploring institutional interactions within their contexts with practical orientations to enhance social life (Ten Have, 2007). Reflecting on the features of the ''institutional talk'' is a fundamental aspect in the discussion of ''applied'' CA. CA was chosen to investigate research questions presenting micro-details of interaction. It provides the researcher with necessary guidelines to reflect on how participants co-construct social activity such as learning (Ten Have, 2007). The study aims at understanding the use of language being shaped by the pedagogical goals to help the process of learning (Walsh, 2011) by identifying patterns within talk-in-interaction in EMI lectures. It is important to mention that this study adopts applied CA, rather than pure CA, because it offers more flexibility to the researcher. While pure CA encourages focusing on the features of interaction when approaching data, applied CA uncovers how the features are structured in a particular institutional environment. Almost every aspect of talk will be affected if CA is applied to the context of classrooms from turn-taking to the roles assigned to

the participants, i.e., teachers and students. The use of CA is also well-known when dealing with the concept of interaction. Young (2009) described CA as one of the valuable tools that represent how interactional competence is created within discourse.

Drew and Heritage (1992) claimed that in order to know the "fingerprint" of each type of institutional talk, it is necessary to consider the following features:

"1 - Institutional talk normally involves the participants in specific goal orientations which are tied to their institution-relevant identity: doctor and patient, teacher and pupil, and so on.

2 - Instituational interaction involves special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions to the business at hand.

3 - Interactional talk is associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts."

While the above features are the main aspects to account for the uniqueness of institutional talk, it is far more important to consider the six main sources that will lead us to understand the institutionality of the interaction. According to Heritage (2004) investigating turn-taking, structural organization, sequence organization, turn design, lexical choice, and other forms of asymmetry can provide a good idea about interaction within particular institutes.

In this study, which is carried out in the context of university lectures, interaction is structured according to the pedagogical goals set by the whole institution, the specific department, and the specific discipline being discussed. The classes chosen for the study are business academic lectures. It is important to remember that, when referring to this context, the researcher is not focused on the geographical, physical sense of the context. What is far more important in this study is to use CA to uncover how meaning is being made, what social negotiation patterns are common and, most importantly, how interactional practices and preferences affect participation and engagement in the learning process. Applied conversation analysis is able to help interpret the variations in practice inside lectures by providing rich and detailed descriptions of the overall organization of interaction.

4.3.1.2 Stimulated Recall Interviews:

Stimulated recall interviews offer means to explore the thoughts of participants about events in the past as a reflective tool used to “prompt participants to recall thoughts they had while performing a task” (Gass & Mackey, 2000, p. 17). To conduct the interviews, the researcher first needs to engage participants through a stimulus, which is very often a video or an audio recording, to elicit their reflections about the past task. To increase the reliability

of the interviews, the process of interviewing needs to take place 48 hours after the event (ibid). Studies that looked into the notion of interaction at a university level and professional development have based their findings on stimulated recall interviews (Coyle et al., 2010; Dipplod, 2013; Donald, 2015; Poorebrahim, Talebinejad & Mazlum, 2015, Lee & Ng, 2009; Walsh, 2006).

The purpose of employing this methodological tool, as opposed to CA that might fail to represent the participants' inner thoughts and intentions, is to obtain a more in-depth understanding of the teachers' perceptions of the role of interaction in their classrooms by encouraging them to reflect on their own use of language. However, there are different disadvantages of using this method as listed in the following table adopted from Borg (2006):

1. The adequacy with which teachers can accurately report information (e.g. through processes) that is no longer in their short-term memory.

2. The extent to which stimulated recall can generate a complete account of both teacher thinking (much of which may be tacit) and teacher behaviour (which will often be automatized and thus not subject to explicit description).

3. The extent to which teachers under pressure to explain their actions in stimulated recall interviews may provide post-hoc rationalizations for them – i.e. explanations made up at the time of the interview rather than accounts of the thinking underpinning the events they were asked to reflect on.

4. The possibility that the stimulus itself (e.g. video) may supplement teachers' incomplete memories, thus generating comments on what the video suggests rather than on prior thinking processes.

5. The manner in which the video presents the events under study from a different perspective for the teacher creating a new experience which does not allow teachers to recall the original one.

6. The extent to which the prompts used to assist teachers' recall may influence the way

in which they report their thinking.

(Taken from Borg, 2006, p. 211).

4.3.1.3 Semi-structured Interviews:

The semi-structured interview is part of the qualitative methodology that is used to gain an understanding of the perceptions of participants. The semi-structured interview gives the interviewer the needed flexibility to pursue information and follow up any interesting developments (Bryman, 2004). According to Richards (2003), semi-structured interviews are most suitable for studies where the researcher has a good enough view of the topic being researched. It is imperative especially if there is a need to go in-depth to limit the focus of the research and closely examine a particular phenomenon (Dornyei, 2007). The semi-structured interview allows for two sets of questions. The prepared pre-guide questions aim at producing an effective interview and drawing the attention of the interviewees to the topic being explored and questions that are of interest to the researcher to elicit further information from the interviewee (ibid).

In this study, CA and stimulated recall interviews will allow the researcher to have a good view of the topic. Nonetheless, the use of semi-structured interviews is needed in order to fulfil the purpose of the study and explore the perceptions of both teachers about the effects of interaction on the teaching and learning process. While it could be argued that stimulated recall interviews have already explored the teachers' opinions about interaction, I intended to use semi-structured interviews as the final step at the end of the academic semester to evaluate whether the reflective practice framework is improving or disturbing the teaching process. In addition, students' opinions are essential to assess the role of interaction and capture the complexities of this phenomenon in relation to learning. This study applies a socio-cultural approach that necessitates the exploration of learning as a social activity where the opinions of the members involved are valuable to identify the functions of interactional features in higher education.

4.3.2 Justification of the Method:

CA is selected instead of other methods of analysis for its ability to look into the mechanism of connected talk-in-interaction. While the focus of this study is examining institutional talk mechanisms, CA provides the tool to look at how participants in a particular

institute organize their conduct to accomplish actions through talk. It is also a useful tool for the researcher who aims to look into details of interaction.

Ten Have (2007) wrote, “what CA tries to do is to explicate the inherent theories-in-use of members’ practices as lived orders, rather than trying to order the world external by applying a set of traditionally available concepts, or invented variations thereof” (p.31). Examining transcripts, according to Ten Have, allows us to inspect the interactional features and functions. However, using CA along with interview data will bring benefits in investigations of interactional settings (Ten Have, 2007). Therefore, the use of interviews seems very useful to provide insights for the study.

Examining interaction in EMI lectures at a university is justifiable because it could work as a representation of the effects of EMI on spoken interaction in higher education in Saudi Arabia. Sacks (1992) pointed out that exploring how a single activity is handled in a consistent and systematic way could lead to unforeseen generality. I am familiar with the context chosen because I work as a lecturer at the selected university, which facilitates the process of data collection since it is easier to get the official procedures done in a reasonable amount of time. Yet, data collection will be free from any bias as I am collecting data outside the department where I teach. Besides, I did not have any social or professional relationships with any of the participants prior to the data collection.

4.4 Validity and Reliability:

Discussing the validity concerns about the methods used in any given study should include looking at both internal and external validity. For CA, an issue of internal validity is often concerned with "restricted data" (Ten Have, 2007). CA is usually criticised by many scholars as a method that often ignores other details and factors surrounding the interaction that could affect it. While there is some truth to this argument, it is important to clarify that even when CA is accompanied by other sources of information, CA should be considered the most valuable resource because it is a data-driven method. Even if the researcher provides information about the institutions and participants, the details are not used to pre-judge the method of the analysis. Seedhouse (2004) argued that CA should only demonstrate nothing more than what it should demonstrate in terms of the details of the interaction, to ensure the validity of the emic perspective CA analysis adopts.

In this study, the research instruments which will be discussed in the next chapter, such as observation notes, are not used to pre-judge the analysis itself, but rather to make the analysis process more informed with additional details that do not affect the moment-by-moment analysis of interaction.

On the other hand, external validity is more often concerned with the applicability of the methods and analysis used to a more general scene. It is important to mention that the study covered a very limited set, and further investigation might be needed in future research. However, the results which are discussed in Chapter 5 will explain how many of the results might agree with what CA has found in similar institutional contexts in previous research.

Furthermore, in order to ensure the reliability of the data collected, three essential aspects to guarantee reliability in naturally occurring interactions are the selection of recordings, technical quality and the adequacy of transcripts (Peräkylä, 2004). Most of the data in this study are naturally occurring, and therefore, are collected in such a manner as to ensure, as much as possible, that the interactional episodes are of sufficient quality to be analyzed by CA later on. Details of how issues of reliability are tackled in this study will be discussed in the next section.

4.5 Research Design:

As explained previously, the research design employs different methodological tools to collect and analyze classroom interaction. Therefore, it is important to first present the details of the data collection procedures as well as the data analysis procedure.

4.5.1 Data Collection Procedure:

The main study was conducted employing two methods: applied CA and interviews (stimulated recall interviews and semi-structured interviews as subsequent interviews). There are many ways and forms of using different methodologies. This study used a two-phase design to obtain data. However, it was decided to conduct a short pilot study to help the researcher strengthen the data collection instruments. The details are discussed in a separate section. The two-phase design was prepared according to the procedure suggested by Dornyei (2007). In the first phase, data were collected through recordings as they naturally occurred in the business lectures in Saudi Arabia. In the next phase, data included two resources: audio-recording of lectures and semi-structured interviews of faculty members who used the SETT framework after being trained to use it to reflect on their own language use. The purpose of the first phase was to describe the overall organization of the interaction in EMI in lectures. In the second phase, the data was collected to examine and evaluate the SETT framework on the interaction in lectures. Finally, semi-structured interviews were conducted in order to elicit the opinions of faculty members at the end of the semester regarding the effects of using SETT on the interaction.

I collected data over one academic semester at a female university in Saudi Arabia. A major advantage for collecting a large amount of data from business colleges at the university where interactive lectures are valued is the ability to cover a good amount of data sample. Data collection during the semester was principally concerned with collecting audio recordings of lectures as delivered by faculty members in business colleges. Transcriptions of the audio recordings were followed to allow for CA to analyze relevant parts.

Audio recording collected three lectures prior to SETT being introduced to the lecturers and three lectures after that. In total, each lecturer was observed in six lectures. The amount of data that was collected from eighteen lectures amounted to nearly fifteen hours. The duration of each lecture was almost one hour. Details of the two phases are presented after a description of the pilot study is presented.

4.5.1.1 The Pilot Study:

A pilot study was conducted to enhance the research instruments and make any necessary changes. The pilot study was conducted by recording two lectures that were neither transcribed nor used in data analysis. One of the lecturers in this study was asked to sign an ethics form that was initially used to video record the lectures. While attending the lectures, the researcher was focused on using a previous version of the observation sheets. Another aspect that was checked was the clarity and the quality of the produced recordings. Changes were applied as a result of conducting the initial pilot study.

4.5.1.2 Implications of the Pilot Study:

As a result of the outcomes of the pilot study, and to sort out all the possible problems that might have led to the failure of the research procedure, the following were the main factors that needed to be amended:

1 - Change the information on the ethical approval consent form and clarify that audio recording will be the only device used in classrooms.

2 - Increase the number of audio recordings and use the microphone audio recording on the lecturer as it was difficult to hear certain points of interaction due to bad recordings.

3 - The research instrument (observation sheets section C) was too crowded, leaving the researcher with limited space to fill in notes. I suggest the following to make it clear and less complicated:

- Delete two sections: the participation framework and material resources. These hold repetitive information that could be written in the observation section if they were valuable information

- Integrate the sections on gesture and eye gaze to maximize the space to explain by who and why are they used

4 - The researcher needs to practice more using the observation codes to save time and space on the observation sheets.

Finally, the pilot study, therefore, had a very definite contribution to the success of the main data collection period and also to the researcher's development as a user of the observation sheets. However, SETT (Self-Evaluation Teacher Talk) had not yet been tested. The current study did not inform us about the lecturer's awareness of how and why interaction is shaped in their classrooms the way it is.

4.5.1.3 The Main Study:

4.5.1.3.1 Research Setting:

The data for this thesis was collected from lectures at a university in Saudi Arabia. Using video recording was potentially difficult for cultural reasons in that particular setting because the university is an all-female institute. Therefore, an audio recording of both lecture interactions and interviews was deemed more appropriate to the context's sensitivity to female exposure. Details of the two-phase design are explained next.

The First Phase:

In the first phase, data were collected from the three lecturers in a female university in the capital of Saudi Arabia, Riyadh. Each lecture was almost forty to fifty minutes. The three participants were chosen after the researcher contacted the business school within the university. The head of the department welcomed the researcher and offered help choosing the participants whom she believed were available to help. After they were contacted by email, they responded to agree and signed all the consent forms (see Appendix C). They agreed that their lectures could be recorded and observed. After conducting the pilot study, the lecturer then attended the first nine lectures by three different participants. Details of the recordings are presented in a subsequent section. Observation sheets that were enhanced during the pilot study were used to help the lecturer observe interactional activities, and the details are presented in Appendix (H). In the absence of video recordings, the researcher needed a tool that helped remind her of the multimodality of the context as well as out of the ordinary details in terms of lecturer-student interaction. In order to help collect as many details as possible, post-facto notes were written after each lecture was recorded. All the details of observation sheets, as well as the post-facto notes, were used while transcribing some of the lectures' audio recordings. Some of the transcripts were analyzed using

conversation analysis. Interactional practices in these EMI business lecturers presented deviant cases out of the normative interactive patterns that were used by the lecturers. Hence, stimulated recall interviews were conducted by the researcher in order to gain more insights into the reasons behind those patterns. All the details of these practices are discussed in the results chapter. After conducting the interviews, the second phase of data collection was established by the researcher. However, the lecturers were introduced to the SETT framework in order to use it before recording the last nine lectures. In the next section, the details of the SETT training are presented.

SETT Training:

Before recording and collecting data for the second phase, SETT was introduced to the faculty members with all the materials provided by Walsh (2006) for language teachers to reflect on their own language use. Walsh (2006) provided these tools that acknowledge the relationship between interaction, language, and pedagogical goals, as a medium for any L2 teachers to record, observe and reflect on their own interactional practice. Through using these materials, it is hoped that language teachers will be able to enhance their interactional competence and hence the interactional competence of their language students. Walsh (2011) acknowledged the possibility of using the materials to observe content-based classrooms with amendments on the skills and systems modes to include pedagogical goals related to any certain subject-specific knowledge. Consequently, amendments to the material provided by Walsh (2006) were made to ensure the materials were suitable for lecturers to use. The materials used are provided in Appendixes D, E and F, and the amendments are highlighted. The materials in Appendix D and E explain the procedures required from the lecturers to reflect on their own practice. All the three lecturers were required to identify and match the spoken modes that are described briefly in Appendix D with transcripts of classroom interaction, before then moving on to identifying and matching interactional features with a description of that feature (Appendix E). All the requirements were explained to the lecturers collectively, and their questions regarding the procedures were discussed in one session with the researcher in the university campus inside a computer lab. Discussion included an illustration of each requirement as well as providing examples of how to match the classroom modes to the interactional features. Recording of this session was not possible because the session was conducted prior to the planned date since one of the lecturers was going to miss the planned session. The session took twenty-five minutes, and lecturers asked about the possibility of emailing the researcher if they had any further questions.

The Second Phase:

In the second phase of data collection, another nine lectures were recorded after the faculty members used the material provided to them during the SETT training session. Similar to the first phase, the recording took place inside the university campus inside the lectures halls. Observation sheets were used again while the researcher was inside the classrooms, and post-facto notes were also added after the lecture time. After recording the nine lectures, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews to gain insights into the opinions and perspectives of the three faculty members on using the materials provided in the previous training session. These interviews were conducted at the end of the data collection period on the campus of the university.

4.5.1.3.2 Participants and Sampling Procedure:

The total number of participants in the current study was three faculty members. It was decided to target classes in the Business Department where modules are interactive in nature. The aim of selecting this population was on the basis that their classes have enough interactive episodes that the researcher can analyze. The table below summarizes the sample size, procedure, and media.

Table. 4: Participants and Sampling Procedure

Sample Unit	Lecturer	Students
Sample size	Three	Lecture A (13 students) Lecture B (10 students) Lecture C (8 students) *all students are from the year two group
Sample procedure	They were contacted via email and signed their ethical approval.	Their teacher told them that a visiting teacher will join them in the next class and they will know all the detail of her work as they have read the ethical consent form.

Modules being taught	1 - Business Skills (2) • It is the second course they were given of this nature. The first one is required to be taken in year 1 2 - Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship
Materials being used in the classrooms	Board, overhead projector, textbooks, worksheets, laptops

4.5.1.3.3 Recording Lectures:

The practical arrangements for recording lectures required close attention on the part of the researcher. A week prior to recording classes for the first time, the students in these classes were provided with consent forms outlining the purpose of the research and their role as participants. The researcher introduced herself as a researcher with no intention to interfere with their learning process. Considering the sensitivity of the culture concerning exposing females, it was decided to use audio recorders instead of filming the classroom. In order to gain as much detail of the interaction occurring in the classes under analysis as possible, the three digital voice recorders were positioned in different areas of the classrooms to ensure that quality will not be affected and to gather as many interaction instances as possible by different participants. Additionally, the equipment was tested two days before each class (Markee & Kasper, 2004). The instructor was also provided with a digital voice recorder. Another voice recorder was either placed in the middle of the classroom or transported around the class by the instructor as she interacted with learners involved in discussions as part of peer or group work. Using multiple devices and different types of recording instruments are recommended when dealing when investigating specific situated social activities such as learning (Markee & Kasper, 2004; Heath, 2004).

4.5.1.3.4 Observation Sheets:

Observation sheets are used as a tool for data collection for different purposes. In this study, observation was used as a technique for data collection that helps in observing behaviours, events and physical characteristics in the context of the study environment (Bryman, 2012; Creswell, 2012). The processes by which this technique is applied can be

divided into participant and non-participant and structured and un-structured observations (Emerson et al., 2001; Lofland et al., 2006). This study adopted the non-participant, unstructured observations approach. The reason for the choice is that the study focused on the interaction between instructors and students as it naturally occurred in the context. While it is nearly impossible to say that being inside the classroom will not affect normal activities, it is hoped that being in the same classroom for a few weeks will help students and teachers to feel more comfortable. This type of observation allows researchers to observe the natural behaviour of participants. It allowed me as a researcher to have enough time to be able to derive defensible patterns and explanations from the data (Spradley, 1980). The observational sheets for this study were first developed during the pilot study but then an enhanced version was developed to ease the researcher's examination at a later stage (see Appendix H)

4.5.1.3.5 Post-facto Notes:

To avoid important details being forgotten, I produced notes subsequent to recording lectures. It is argued that these notes, which are known as post-facto notes, help the researcher to record general descriptive observations that could inform the investigation, especially if the data is not revisited for some weeks (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). These notes are regarded as analogous and allow the researcher to document and describe the events not affected by other distractions. It is important though that these notes should be taken shortly after the observed event.

4.5.1.3.6 Conducting Interviews:

Two types of interviews were used in this research. Stimulated recall interviews and semi-structured interviews. All interviews collected audio data that did not involve note-taking as the research questions do not require that. In general, interviews were aimed at the minimum time (half an hour or so) because each interview would take about 2-3 hours to transcribe which would be time-consuming knowing that there were a number of interviews during the data collection period. Questions generated for the interviews were designed to be unambiguous, non-leading, culturally sensitive, and ethically informed. However, it was most important that each question was clear and considered simple, avoiding stringing multiple questions together. That would yield more information while still enabling the researcher to easily extend other components of the same enquiry. To make sure that I avoided all the factors that might influence the participants, the questions were tested on colleagues.

As has been pointed out previously, participants in this research were contacted by email. They were asked for their permission to take part in this study. Walsh (2006) provided

materials to be used by teachers after they had recorded and coded their class discussions. I made a few changes to the format of the materials just to make them suitable for the purpose and context of the study. Teachers were sent SETT framework materials (see Appendix B). The SETT coding framework in appendix F can be utilized by teachers without difficulty. If lecturers needed extra help with the materials, they were familiarized with the SETT framework adopted from Walsh (2006), which has been explained in the literature review. Afterwards, they were asked to evaluate the class according to the pedagogical goals, language use, identification of classroom modes, and interactional features. They were required to match the spoken modes of their discourse with transcripts of lecture discourse, before then moving on to identifying and matching interactional features with a description of that feature (for further detail see Appendixes D, E, and F). This allowed the participants to take the time to reflect and analyze their use of language. After this stage, they were sent a blank interview schedule to agree on both the time and place that the suitable for them to conduct the stimulated recall methodology.

Lecturers were interviewed after three weeks of recording their lectures to investigate interactional choices, interactional difficulties, and their thoughts about their own language use in this particular context to reflect pedagogical goals. I started each stimulated recall interview with a general discussion about the lecture's discourse and then reminded the participants of the recording day to recall the events. I then shifted attention to the interactional process, examining their SETT forms along with using audios as a stimulus and questioning their language choices.

Having done that, the results informed the second phase which involved the semi-structured interview at the end of the academic semester. After the first phase, semi-structured interviews were conducted taking enough time to cover all pre-guided questions. The interviews were conducted in English. During the interview, the guided questions were used whenever appropriate but not necessarily always following exactly the order of the questions in the protocol. The researcher was able to follow any interesting developments and encourage the participants to elaborate (see the example in Appendix G).

4.5.2 Data Analysis Procedure:

The qualitative data obtained from both lecture recordings and interviews were analyzed according to the appropriate data analysis tools to address the research purposes driven by the research questions as shown in the following table.

Table 5: Data Analysis Procedures

Data Form	Lecture Discourse Data	Stimulated Recall Interviews	Semi-structured Interviews
Research Purpose	1. Identify interactional features in undergraduate lectures that hinder interaction in Saudi Arabia. 2. Evaluating the adoption of reflective practice modules to enhance interaction in undergraduate lectures that use EMI in Saudi Arabia.	1. Identify interaction features in undergraduate lectures that use EMI in Saudi Arabia. 2. Evaluating the adoption of reflective practice modules to enhance interaction in undergraduate lectures that use EMI in Saudi Arabia.	1. To explore the perceptions of teachers in the context of Saudi universities towards the impact of SETT on the learning process
Data Analysis Methods	Applied conversation analysis with a special focus on turn-taking, topic management, and sequence of organization + SETT frequencies.	Thematic coding in relation to examples of interactional phases provided by conversation analysis.	Thematic coding.

4.5.2.1 Transcription of Lecture Recordings:

The data was transcribed according to the conventions set out by Jefferson (2004). It should be noted that the multi-modality of the context was approached by describing the

paralinguistic features such as laugh and silence. Interactional episodes that included examples of interaction between lecturers and students were identified, and the selection criteria are discussed further in the next section. Transcript files were organized according to date, time, participants, and the place of the original recordings. Each interactional episode was then analyzed in-depth, looking into how turn-taking, sequence of organization, and pausing were managed by participants in the talk. Providing a detailed description of the language use of participants, a formulation of general rules could then be originated to account for the specific interactional practice. It should be noted that to arrive at the final step, the researcher aimed to look across the episodes and adjust the analytic description where necessary, focusing on evaluating the interaction.

Translated Transcription:

According to Ten Have (2007), CA hardly discusses the practical issues of translated extracts. Literature shows that different publications by different researchers have used different techniques to present translated texts. Regardless of the appropriateness of each way of presenting translated texts, it is important to make a choice that provides the reader with full and comprehensive information. In this study, the translation is presented in English immediately below the original text (line by line).

Selecting Interactive Episodes:

The analysis explores talk-in-interaction in relation to the institution's goals. In EMI business lectures, the main goal of the lecturer is to teach the content subject and develop the students' second language in terms of their semantic, syntactic and interactional competence. The nature of the lectures' topics requires discussions and debates. Topics that were covered in those lectures included the following:

- Entrepreneur vision and strategies
- Financing new business ventures
- Management and growing new business
- Marketing strategies
- Marketing for entrepreneurs
- Segmenting markets
- Market competitors
- Business resources

- Planning and operating production
- Branding

Therefore, the analysis aims to explain in further detail the relationships between language and pedagogical goals that are displayed in EMI business lectures.

As mentioned previously, the data was collected in two different phases. In the first phase, the data was collected without introducing the SETT framework to the lecturer. In the second phase, the data was collected after familiarizing the lecturers with how to use the SETT framework to examine their own interactional choices. Hence, the amount of teacher talk and student talk varies in both phases.

For the purpose of this research, a form of quantitative CA was employed by using relatively objective criteria adopted from SETT to add further elaboration to the case-by-case analysis. While the literature on CA emphasizes the employment of any quantitative measures with caution, it has been demonstrated that a tool is eligible as long as "the conversation phenomena can be sensibly collected (Ten Have, 2007, p. 158)". While this quantitative analysis is presented before a detailed CA analysis, this was a second step in the actual analytical process.

One of the main goals of the research is to provide a description of the interaction between lecturers and university students in a specific academic field in which both participants value the interaction and consider it an essential part of the teaching and learning process. Therefore, the selection criteria in CA focus on the investigation of the interactive episodes and the interactions where both lecturers and students negotiate meaning in relation to pedagogical goals. However, it has been taken into account that these episodes are also part of the overall interaction in the lecture. Extracts are discussed in-depth and examined in light of the overall talk-in-interaction of the lecture. Little attention was given to the analysis of episodes of the lecturers' extended turns while explaining the topic of the lecture for longer periods or lecturers' talk to manage their classes in terms of discussing grades, date of exams, etc. Extracts were chosen to represent episodes of lecturer-student interactions that seem to have underlying pedagogical goals that the lecturers aimed to achieve. The amount of data that was analyzed followed the concept that Glaser and Strauss (1967) referred to as "saturation". Saturation is the notion that no more cases can provide extra information or serve a purpose in providing generality. While it is not feasible to discuss every episode of interaction between the lecturers and the students, certain cases were chosen based on the pedagogical goals that required students' participation.

Studied Features in SETT framework:

After selecting interactional episodes that reflect the lecturer's pedgogical goals, the researcher identified and matched the interactional features with a description of that feature (Appendix F).Below some examples to show how these interactional features identified in participant (A) data as shown in table (6). The whole lecture is trancribed in appendix (I) and readers are visually guided by the color coded interactional features to be able track all the features.

Table 6: Interactional Features as Shown in Participant's (A) data

FEATURE OF TEACHER TALK	EXAMPLE FROM PARTICIPANT'S (A) DATA
A. Scaffolding	T: the worst mangers S2: probably very [cruel T: [very (.) because using punishments like firing to keep people under them in fear.
B. Direct repair	S2: probably they don't know that // T:// NO its not about that S3: not use to it teacher
C. Content feedback	S2: one person could be reliable but others not in the team so [more reliance] is on her when it comes to work so T: [ummm]so::one student not cooperating is way better than a whole group not cooperatin except for one students which means (.) only one good girl and the rest is sleep(.) that is a disaster when it is the opposite its ok we can work
D. Extended wait-time	T:I am still wondering why sometimes local company are afraid of this type of management(.) is it that they are afraid OR or has no time to waste to complete the project tasks (.) it can be (.) it can be(2.8) well(.) S3: afraid afraid teacher ((laughter))
E. Referential questions	T: do you girls agree with that? S1: yes and no T: goo::d but how S1: sometimes mangers need to be//

F. Seeking clarification	T: // like HOW to find that balance rig:ht?clarify S1: I am not sure =
G. Extended learner turn	S1: //Lack of (.) lack of communication umm they they didn't want to communicate they didn't want to communicate well they did not want evento make planning
H. Teacher echo	S2: may be also its hard doctor((students is referring to the lecturer)) يعني صعب صراحة تفرض احترام// *Impose* Respect T: //ummm تفرض احترامك ok *Impose respect*
I. Teacher interruptions	S1: sometimes mangers need to be // T: // tough S1: yes but it more like putting // T:// placing boundaries (.) perhaps you mean encouraging employee independent (.) may cause problems in this area
J. Extended teacher turn	T:I am still wondering why sometimes local company are afraid of this type of management(.) is it that they are afraid OR or has no time to waste to complete the project tasks (.) it can be (.) it can be (2.8) well(.)
K. Turn completion	S5: I would love to have this experience ((laughter)) but honestly [rare T: [I know that is why I appreciate that experience(.) I can think (.) wait (.) no (.) but the nice thing that usually confidant mangers are those who are not afraid to adopt this kind of style.
L. Display questions	T: //NO NO no by the persn only Okay (0.5) now we look at slide eight (0.3) managing occurs in the here and now you're looking at the short term and mid range goals (.) which goals again? S4: short goals=
M. Form-focused feedback	T: [intertwined S3: [Twin ? = T: = Inter twin hand in hand because almost all people who manage others in projects (.)

4.5.2.2 Thematic Analysis and Interviews:

Stimulated recall interviews and semi-structured interviews have two different purposes and, therefore, two methods of analysis will be applied. Even though thematic coding will be used with both types of interviews, stimulated recall interviews will be analyzed using thematic coding in the light of the results obtained from the CA of the lecture recordings. Comparing what the researcher would find according to CA and what the lecturers expressed and stated in the interviews will help to widen our understanding of interactional features in lectures and how effective reflective practice frameworks (i.e. SETT) can be used in this particular context.

On the other hand, semi-structured interviews aim to reveal issues related to the third research question, allowing for a deeper understanding of the perceptions of lecturers at the end of the semester. It is a subsequent interview that aims to elicit responses about the lecturers' perspectives on using SETT and about the development of interaction and its impact on the learning process.

Interviews were analyzed using the thematic analysis approach proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006) and informed by the practices of the grounded theory. The audio recordings were first labelled using numbers to identify the participant and the date of the interview. Once they were organized, these recordings were broadly transcribed using Jefferson's conventions (2004). The transcripts were then uploaded to the researcher's computer. The textual information was reviewed and read repeatedly in order to gain general insights about the data. The second step in the analysis was to group participants' responses together as objectively as the researcher can be. The process of grouping the three lecturers' responses led to the generation of codes. The researcher generated initial codes of special features in the interviews following a data-driven approach, and then these codes were collated into potential themes. The process of coding is essential and was done manually by counting the times that lecturers' views were presented repeatedly. Coding can be described as "a systematic way in which to condense extensive data sets into smaller analyzable units through the creation of categories and concepts derived from the data" (Lockyer, 2004, p. 137). In this study, the categories that were used to code the data were not predetermined but rather emerged as the researcher familiarized herself with textual data with multiple readings of interview transcripts. Even though the guided interview questions were used to elicit specific views about specific issues regarding EMI and SETT (Appendix G), the focus was on allowing the lecturers to express their own ideas. Extracts were then classified into different themes that represented overall tendencies and commonality. These themes were reviewed before producing the final results alongside experienced colleagues in King

Abdulaziz University to ensure that the results were reliable. The work done by the two colleagues was carried out independently. The researcher met her colleagues virtually and reviewed their themes in order to construct new themes that capture the commonalities of lecturers' views and to eliminate any potential bias as much as possible. Themes are presented and discussed in the Results chapter.

4.6 Ethical Considerations:

The current study involves the participation of both faculty members and undergraduate students in a university in Saudi Arabia. Therefore, ethical considerations were taken into account before collecting the recordings from lectures and interviewing the participants. The approval for the main data collection was requested from the Ethics Committee at The University of Reading. This approval was then sent to the university in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia to approve so that I could carry out my research using their facilities and interviewing their faculty members.

Before recording the lectures and conducting the interviews, the participants were reminded of the confidentiality of their participation. They were first asked to read the consent form and then to sign it (appendix B&C). Then, they were reminded that the recordings and interviews will be recorded on tape. Lecturers would be able to access the lectures file of the audio recordings and related parts because they would then be asked to reflect on their practice. Both students and lecturers were reminded that they would be anonymous and unidentified when some extracts were transcribed. The information sheet demonstrated the details of the methods being employed. In addition, the participants were given an explanation in case they had any enquiries regarding ensuring the confidentiality of their participation. They were clearly informed that their data would be treated confidentially and destroyed after a certain amount of time.

4.7 Chapter Summary:

To conclude this section, the methodology chapter discussed the general framework of the study as well as the rationale for the overall research paradigm. A description of the methods that were used to examine interactive lectures where English was the medium of instruction was provided. In addition, I described the details of the research design for this study in great detail by looking into the tools used in this investigation interaction and the influence of SETT on the interaction. Yet, the current study was challenged by time constraints. CA is a time-consuming process that requires detailed steps. Although this study adopted CA to reveal the interactional features functioning in lectures, the researcher was challenged by time constraints when trying to analyze the digital audio recordings within the

time limits of the PhD programme. In the next chapter, the details of the analysis are presented.

5 Results

5.1 Introduction:

This chapter will present an analysis of the lectures from an applied conversation perspective supplemented by stimulated recall interview data. The data analyzed in this section is the data collected before introducing the SETT framework to the faculty members. The description of the analysis aims to provide an overview of interactional practices within EMI business lectures. The chapter will begin by providing an overall overview of the interaction. Attention will then shift to examining the frequency of the interactional features using the SETT framework to quantitatively describe the usage of the features within each lecture. This will be followed by a conversation analysis to describe how each faculty member demonstrates interaction features differently in their teaching. The final section will describe how code-switching constitutes part of the interaction in an EMI context and how instructors utilize it in their lectures.

5.2 Review of the Overall Interactional Practices in EMI Business Lectures:

One of the main goals of the research is to provide the readers with a review of the overall interactional practice within EMI business lectures. This section describes generally the lecturers/students interactional practices in a specific academic field in which both participants value the interaction and consider it an essential part of the teaching and learning process as discussed in the methodology chapter. In this section, I intend to provide a review of the overall interaction within EMI business lectures. The analysis explores talk-in-interaction in light of the institution's goals. In EMI business lectures, the main goal of the lecturer is teaching the content subject as well as developing the students' second language in terms of semantic, syntactic and interactional competence in an interactive environment. Therefore, the analysis is informed by van Lier (2002) who argued that context plays a significant role in shaping classroom interactional patterns and the employment of interactional resources. Therefore, the interactional organization is viewed in the light of the pedagogical goals of the faculty members in this context. Teaching and learning goals at a given moment can impact interaction practices. Hence, interaction can be understood and adjusted according to pedagogical goals which imply that any lesson is made up of a number of contexts, not one (Walsh, 2003). In the analysis to follow, the relationship between pedagogical goals and the use of different interactional resources is examined when looking at the turn-taking mechanism and sequence organization.

5.2.1 The Turn-taking Organization in EMI Business Lectures:

There are two different spectrums of a turn-taking organization in EMI business classes depending on the interactional activity in the current context. Like most content-based classrooms, the design of turns could be described as mainly institutional and less conversation or the opposite depending on the purpose of the interaction (Sidnel, 2010). The turn-taking mechanism is often controlled by the lecturer as the primary speaker with some minimal responses from students when the pedagogical goal requires that, for instance, when the pedagogical goal is to transmit a piece of information to students. The extract below is one example.

Extract 1: Participant C, Personality Types in the Management of Business:

In the extract below, the lecturer is showing the students, by using the screen projector, a clip from a video on the differences between personality types and how these could be employed in the management of a business (these details are taken from the observational sheets). After playing the video the lecturer requested that students shared their observations.

1 T: ((The lecturer plays a video called why companies do the personality type test
2 on their employees, she presses the pause button and gazes her students again))
3 ok what did you notice girls (.) of course you notice (.) you notice the difference
4 (.) how they identified their personalities type ok (.) what did you notice in them
5 (.) what are these things
6 S2: more than one role more than //
7 T: //okay why did they put only two things instead of three as they have specific
8 things for each personality that could take more than one hat skill (.) ok so:: each
9 person can have more than one role they have weird names by the way (.) control
10 plan mentor shows the things we have more than one personality type more
11 than one role >which doesn't mean that they have multi standards <but it
12 means that in business they have more than one skill you are good at many
13 good things ok (.) so:: people can have more than team role umm we can? have
14 two or three at least uh so when you take the test IT will show you go online
15 and research what you will see the positive and the negatives (.) ok (.)so let me
16 now talk about your projects

In the extract above, the lecturer's dominance of turn-taking and turn allocating is parallel to practices within teacher-dominated traditional classrooms. In lines 1-5, the lecturer asks several questions that are often answered by her in the current turn. That is followed by the first part of the adjacency pairs as she requests feedback from her students about the video presented. While the lecturer leaves the conversation floor available for students to join the

talk-in-interaction at the end of line 5, S2 self-selects to join the floor and provides the second part of the adjacency pair but is shortly interrupted by the lecturer before the completion of the current turn construction unit (TCU). The lecturer does not project or anticipate the Transition Relevance Place (TRP) and this orientation from early start to self-select resulted in interruption. The lecturer's interruption in line 7 is not based on concern with the adequacy of the S2 turn but rather motivated by the lecturer's concern with the progression of her previous turn. Her preference for minimal responses – or, perhaps, no responses - resulted in a long-extended turn in lines 7-16. This interpretation is supported in line 7, as the lecturer seems keen to progress with extended turns, elaborating reasons for having multiple personalities for each role in the team. The lecturer provides the final remarks around the types of personality in the management of business without worrying about any feedback from her students, which is motivated by her wish to transit to a different topic in the next line. At the end of the extended turn in line 14, the lecturer shifts the discussion around the students' projects which indicates that topic shifts and topic management are also often controlled by the lecturers in EMI business lectures.

The lecturer does not afford learners' opportunities to engage in a discussion because the students' minimal turns function only as a tool to steer the direction of a sequence towards the lecturer's pedagogical goal. On the other hand, the turn-taking mechanism could reflect more learner-centred phases of interaction in which the interactional activity focuses on the negotiation of meaning and fitting turns together to accomplish that goal. These phases of interaction are very limited in number as will be explained in the quantitative analysis in the subsequent section. However, the turn-taking system in these phases is marked by almost equal turns. The following extract from Participant B illustrates an example of this turn-taking structure.

Extract 2: Participant B, Entrepreneurship Strategies:

In the extract below, the lecturer has just described three major strategies that affect innovative small businesses. She requests information about the applicability of these strategies from the students' perspectives:

1 T: talking about how to maximise your business AND growing your business
2 employing the strategies I mentioned earlier ((the lecturer points to the board))
3 (0.3) how do you think this can be used in reality in local small businesses in our
4 country (.) or or more important how this change your strategic perspective
5 creating a business
6 S4: Doctor ((umm)) do you mean in our culture how we can use these strategies
7 because I don't think //
8 T: //NO It is important of course the culture is part of (.) because it has an important
9 role on the attitudes of the customers >>that we target but that is a huge topic for
10 different day dear<< (.) I want you to tell me your idea (.) ((hhh)) your thinking
11 about the three strategies I just explained today based on the module in the first
12 slide dear (.) yes you ((the lecturer is pointing to one of the students who raised
13 her hand))
14 S2: I think that when you said that creating new opportunities need to be like=
15 T: =match your resources
16 S2: yes match the resources (.) I think that is good because many of new small
17 business like they become very very excited and =
18 T: =yeah yeah بالضبط
Exactly
19 S2: ((laughter)) yes they need to be like ((um)) realistic because new
20 ideas need more money to invest

In the above extract, the lecturer is focused on achieving the pedagogical goal of eliciting personal thoughts about the application of different business strategies from her students (lines 1-5). S4 self-select in line 6 to ask for clarification from her instructor, and this form of enquiry serves the pedagogical goal as it leads to a sequential structure of turn-taking as meaning is negotiated with other students. In the third position of the sequence structure of initiation, response, evaluation (IRE) the lecturer interrupts to perform an interactional action that further explains her previous request for information by using visual aids (the smart board) and visual tools are used to help students construct her next turn. In line 14, S2 is selected by the lecturer to join the floor through gesture and latched turns as the lecturer completes the turn before the end of TCU and then leaves the floor open again for S2. S2 uses the word "yes" to complete her turn in an extended learner turn. The lecturer's latched turn in line 18 seems to function as an acknowledgement of the relevance of S2's contribution to the ongoing discussion by using the word "yeah". S2 further explains her idea in another extended learner turn in line 19 to provide the information the lecturer previously sought in lines 1-5.

The negotiation of meaning between the lecturers, S4, and S2 led to the construction of multi-unit turns that delineate extended interactional work that serves the pedagogical goal of

the lecturer. Students share their perspectives about the strategies employed by small businesses in a response to the lecturer's request for information in multiple turns.

The turn-taking originations in the above extracts seem to adhere to the reflective relationship between turn-taking and the type of task requested from students as mentioned by Seedhouse (2004) and Hauser (2009). Yet this orientation seems to be problematic only when there is a gap between the pedagogical goal and the interactional choices made by the lecturer. The following extract is one example.

Extract 3: Participant A, Maximizing profits:

This extract is taken from the second lecture of Participant A's data. In this lecture, the lecturer asks her students to share their ideas to maximize the profit of Hajj businesses.

1 T: If you are targeting a business that have annual peaks around ((umm)) around
2 events like Hajj in Makkah (0.1) how can you maximize the profits during season
3 S1: maximize the marketing becuase//
4 T: //the marketing is for sure an important part but what about the fact that they may
5 forget with all your efforts since it happens once a year (.) >I believe that breaking
6 your business into more than one sector is far more important< to make more
7 profits hmm but it can take a lot of effort to handle the management pressure
8 during one week only I'm always personally would avoid such business because it
9 needs hug support and dealing with any complicated situation needs an
10 immediate hhh decisions usually better made with well-experienced companies
11 yeah
12 S1: yes
13 T: good

The pedagogical goal of the extract is to share thoughts and ideas about making a profit from a certain type of business that revolves around an event that usually occurs once a year. To do this, the lecturer requests the information from her students in line 2, leaving the floor open for participation. S1 self-selects to share her idea but is shortly interrupted by the teacher before the end of the TCU. While dominance of turn-taking is expected in phases of the lecture where the lecturer transmits information regarding content knowledge, the extract above is just an example of interactional patterns that do not necessarily help achieve the pedagogical goal. The turn in line 3 is limited by the interruption performed by the lecturer. In the following line, the lecturer withholds the turn-taking, sharing her thoughts in a long extended lecturer turn (lines 4-11). A form of confirmation checks is employed at the end of the turn, ''yeah''. When asked about this extract in stimulated recall interviews, Participant A said:

> Here, hmm, I sometimes want to discuss topics especially like this one. It's relevant to them but I thought it's interesting to share my point of view as well. I love to hear their ideas but every now and then us teachers we keep talking and don't feel it because you want to reach a specific point.

The lecturer describes how her lack of noticing could affect her interactional practice. This gap between the intended pedagogical goals and the construction of turn impedes students' involvement. S1 have a limited right to keep the turn. She is interrupted before the end of TCU. The full meaning of her idea is incomplete because she is interrupted after the word "because". The lecturer focuses more on her talk rather than co-constructing meaning with her students.

Overall, evidence in this section suggests that this context of EMI business lectures have a variety of turn-taking organizations depending on different pedagogical interests. However, the management of turns is more similar to teacher-centred interactional practices than to student-centred interactional practices. In addition, when the turn-taking system does not lead to the achievement of the pedagogical goal, such as enabling students to share personal opinions, the students seem to struggle to play a valuable part in the interaction.

5.2.2 Sequence Organization:

The sequence of organization is another essential part to be described within the interactional practices of any classroom or lecture. Adjacency pair is often concerned with the question and answer cycle within the interaction. In lectures, adjacency pairs are mainly linked to the IRE. This pattern of sequence is made up of three positions and teachers are usually concerned with the first and second while the students' turn is concerned with the second (Mehan, 1979). Recent studies have examined the third position because of its effect on the construction of interaction. There are many actions that can be performed by the third position, such as evaluating students' contributions, giving feedback to students, and following up on students' contributions (Lee, 2007). In this study, there are two types of IRE sequences. Lecturers either give elaborative feedback that does not necessarily help to expand the sequence or give students a chance to provide more adequate responses, or they give short, direct feedbacks that limit or terminate the sequence.

Extract 4: Participant C, Risks and Small Business:

In this extract, the lecturer asks her students to share their ideas on taking risks in small businesses.

1 T: The truth is that risks are greater with ummm small and medium business.
2 Sometimes the ideas behind >> the business in small business are great and
3 brilliant(0.3) but when established there should be a lo::t of care because resources
4 are limited (.) right (.) do you agree?
5 S5: but it is so:: sad like for people who love their =
6 T: = the fact the big company can take risks and also have resources that are ready
7 to be used during and crisis to protect the business from falling. Remember that
8 these big names are sometimes made of investing in different small business(.)
9 yeah girls.
10 S2: how about the what we call it (04) the the government
11 T: So:: sometimes the risks you are willing to make is or (hh)determined by your as
12 we said the size of your business

In this extract, there are two examples of adjacency pairs. The lecturer initiates two different requests of information in lines 4 and 9. The lecturer expresses her wish for other participants to join the turn-taking and express their thoughts. It can be claimed that one reason why S5 and S2 do not negotiate the meaning of their contributions is that the lecturer's elaborate feedback ignores their contributions in the ongoing discussions in lines 5-10 regarding risks for small businesses. While responses are provided once the floor is open, the sequence is interrupted by the lecturer's extended feedback. Hence, both S5 and S2 leave the floor at an early stage before the end of their TCU because their contributions are being ignored.

The lecturer commented on the reasons for her feedback in the stimulated recall interviews as follows:

> I hate to see that I completely dismiss their answers (.) I probably was so rushed to move to the next point but I am not sure that I do this a lot

The interactional practice above is not intentional but rather a decision made without knowing the effect of giving elaborate feedback that limited students' contributions. It is evidence that similar practices are found in the other lectures in the first phase. In the next section, the focus is upon providing a more detailed analysis of the first phase, using both SETT and CA.Another example of how sequence is organized within interaction is discussed in the following extract by participant B

Extract 5: Participant B, Entrepreneurship Financing:

In this extract the lecturer requests information from her students in relation to private and governmental grants.

1 T: As far as I am concern (.) I believe we do have valuable governmental grants >that
2 aim to facilitate economical growth < have you ever heard or looked into their details
3 S3: I know that there is a centre that offer free umm <u>advice</u> for those who need to support
4 developing business plan and to//
5 T: //I think what you are referring to is ah ah something completely different dear. I am
6 talking about FINANCIAL support rather than offering guidance (.)
7 فهمتي علي (.)الموضوع مو موضوع كيف انهم يساعدون اصحاب الأعمال من المبتدئين كيف يبدء الموضوع؟
(Did you understand (.) the thing is not related to:: how they guide small entrepreneur starts their business?)
8 لا (.) الموضوع أنه فيه جهات حكومية همها الوحيد تقديم الدعم المالي لهم لانه يفيد كل البلد
(NO (.) the thing is that there are governmental agency that have one concern which is to offer financial support because it is important for the country)
9 That's why I want today to further ask about how governmental grants are completely
10 different than private one while each has a purpose and limitation (.)
11 ok (.) so if we are thinking about each one we should know they are both valuable
12 free financing options ESPECIALLY for those who::: lack the resources (.) so::
13 governmental grants are usually very strict to <u>a</u> specific sector <u>or</u> specific type of
14 business (.) they defiantly differ in term of the amount of the grant and the length
15 of it umm yeah OH and lets not forget about the competition yes completion from
16 business owner. OK now lets look into the pros and cons on the screen

In the extract above there is another type of sequence organization of the IRE sequence. While the lecturer initiates a sequence in Line 2, S3 respond to the request of information regarding governmental grants with her own perceived ideas. Her response was interrupted before the completion of TCU. To provide a evaluation of the response delivered by S3 , the lecturer interrupts and rushes to explain that part of S3 contribution is irrelevant to idea of grants. Interestingly, Another request of information as part of the another adjacency pair in line 10 which is a pttren repeatedly used in participant B data. As explained in the first phase lecturer B dominate the turn- taking. However, it can also provide us with a different interactional practice. In lines (11-16) the lecturer is actually providing the second adjacency pair part that she has initiated herself in line 10. The lecturer is responding to a question that was asked by herself. Not only there was clearly almost no enough time after the request in line 10, the lecturer have provided the first and second part of the (IRE) cycle that is often performed by two different participants in classroom interaction. When asked about this extract, the lecturer responded

I think I know that almost almost none of the students have idea about governmental grants. I wanted to rush the conversation to clarify to them the information from the slides

The researcher asked further about the reason behind initiating the adjacency pair in first place to request the information.

I assume that at the moment I wanted to interested in their background knowledge but I needed to explain it myself to clarify the pros and cons of governmental and private grants.

From the lecturer point of view, the reason behind taking over the sequence of organization in extract 5 is related to her commitment to provide accurate information to explain the new material herself. The evidence above suggests that taking over the second part of adjacency pairs affects the organization of the interaction. The lecturer comments illustrate that two conflicted purposes are operating at the same time in the sequence. She is interested in students' responses but also she is dedicated to explain the material even if that results in leaping in any of (IRE) interactional sequence and limiting the student's contribution to the interaction.

5.3 The Frequency of Interactional Features Pre-introducing SETT to Faculty Members:

This section of analysis describes the frequency of interactional features based on the pre-defined interactional features of the SETT framework borrowed from Walsh (2006). The step of analyzing quantitatively the interactional features comes as a second step to CA to support the outcome results that emerged from CA. While it is challenging to present all the extracts in all the lectures being analyzed using CA in the thesis, a qualitative treatment of the data is able to track the presence and absence of interactional features in the phenomena being investigated. The table below provides the reader with an overall view of the frequency of interactional features used in EMI business lectures by the three faculty members prior to introducing SETT as a tool to reflect on their language practice.

Table 7: The Frequency of Interactional Features Pre-introducing SETT to Faculty Members

Lecturers		Lecture 1			Lecture 2			Lecture 3		
Participants		A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
Frequencies of features of teacher-talk in interactive episodes	Scaffolding	7	4	4	6	3	2	5	3	6
	Direct repair	6	5	11	8	6	4	9	3	3
	Content feedback	2	1	4	5	2	2	2	3	4
	Extended wait-time	2	1	1	1	2	3	1	0	1
	Referential questions	3	2	5	2	3	2	2	4	4
	Seeking clarification	1	0	1	2	2	2	3	1	0
	Extended learner turn	2	2	3	2	4	2	2	3	2
	Teacher echo	2	2	2	3	5	2	6	2	2
	Teacher interruptions	11	8	12	9	9	6	7	5	7
	Extended teacher turn	10	10	6	5	9	2	7	10	4

	Turn completion	4	5	2	7	8	2	5	3	3
	Display questions	4	5	7	5	7	4	4	5	5
	Form-focused feedback	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0

Looking through the frequencies in each of the three lecturers' data, I choose to focus on the dominant features to describe the interactional choices made by lecturers in EMI business lectures. Four interactional features dominate the lecturers' talk: direct repair, teacher interruption, extended teacher turns, and turn completions.

5.3.1 Direct Repair:

The table shows that giving short direct feedbacks are favoured most by faculty members in comparison to content feedback. According to the SETT framework, direct feedback is an interactional choice often made to correct errors directly and quickly to enable students to produce the correct forms of L2. Interestingly, even though EMI business lectures are not L2 classrooms, direct repair is used to achieve different pedagogical goals. Direct repair is often used in EMI classrooms to respond to errors made by students in providing information regarding content knowledge. The effect and usage are discussed in detail through the lens of CA in the next section.

5.3.2 Teacher Interruption and Turn Completion:

Both interruption and turn completion are intervention tools used by teachers that have different functions. Both can also have positive and negative effects on the interaction (Sidnel, 2010). In EMI business lectures, the table above shows the high frequency of employing these two features among all the participants. There is little we know without CA about its effect on the interaction. However, according to Walsh (2006), who established the SETT framework, the high frequency of these features in L2 and CLIL classrooms affects the continuity of the interaction negatively and discourages L2 students from joining the interaction.

5.3.3 Extended Teacher Turn:

According to the SETT framework, extended teacher turns are mainly linked to the managerial and skills and systems modes. Extended teacher turns are used to either transmit information or provide learners with feedback (Walsh, 2006). These interactional

functions of extended teacher turns within EMI mirror the functions performed by extended teacher turns in L2. However, the nature of the content being explained and illustrated using extended teacher turns in EMA and L2 classrooms is different. In addition, the number of instances varies as well. As discussed above, one of the main characterises of EMI business lectures is that the design of turns could include phases or episodes of teacher-centred approaches to explain subject knowledge. In order to follow the lecture objectives, certain concepts and ideas must be illustrated by the lecturer in long extended turns. On the other hand, there are other functions of teacher extended turns that we know little about, these will be discussed in the CA analysis in the following section.

What stands out in the table is that interaction in EMI lectures is mainly controlled by the lecturers because of the significant number of instances of direct repair, lecturer interruption, extended lecturer turns and turn completions performed by lecturer. The role of the students in the interaction is less significant with only a few instances of extended learner turns among the three lectures during the first phase of data collection. In order to explore the effect of the significant features of interaction shown in the table above, the next section will examine qualitatively the usage of these features in a number of extracts using CA.

5.4 Interactional Practices that Challenge Interaction within EMI Business Classroom Interaction:

5.4.1 Interruptive Patterns in Interaction:

Interruptions can be one of the operations that display ''other-initiated repair'' in the turn following the trouble-source turn (Sidnel, 2010). However, overuse of this strategy by lecturers within EMI lectures seems to obstruct students' contributions, especially when the pedagogical goal focuses on developing students' involvement in discussions. The following extracts are examples of this interactional practice.

Extract 6: Participant A, Failed Teamwork:

This extract is taken from Participant A's data. In this lecture, the lecturer is introducing her topic, which is about the factors that lead to good teamwork as part of business management. The lecture asks the students to share their previous experiences where they were part of teamwork that failed.

T: So:: team barriers(.)Have you ever Umm(.) participate in a group that failed (.) when I say failed I don't mean that the project failed No you could actually submit the work took a good grade But the team itself is//
S1: Lack of (.) lack of communication umm they they didn't want to communicate they didn't want to communicate well they did not want even to make planning//
T: //So:: they don't want to communicate =
S1: =no=
T: =>So what did you do<
S1: I told the teacher(.)I tried to reach them (.) by emails and then they communicate so//
T: //ok any other stories team failure (.) >the most common thing you face in university life< if you didn't work in a team work that failed now (.) you will no graduate knowing not team work but not knowing team fashion which is totally fine (.) ((students started laughing)) no no this life you have to go through this so:: you can learn (.) when you graduate your work team in your jobs (.)the future job so fail now and learn now better than going to future failing in your job you have you will work with other people you don't know so you have to maybe the problem is not yours but it could be from others
so:: no other stories
S2: one person could be reliable but others not in the team so [more reliance] is on her when it comes to work so
T: [ummmm]
so::one student not cooperating is way better than a whole group not cooperatin except for one students which means (.) only one good girl and the rest is sleep (.) that is a disaster when it is the opposite its ok we can work //
S2: // some people might have circumstances for their absence//
T: //sure sure

The initial lines of the above extract show that the lecturer's pedagogical goal is to open a discussion about the reasons behind the failure of some teamwork in business by asking her students about their past experiences with it at the level of university projects. While the discussion is aimed at eliciting students' experiences, most of the talk is dominated by the

lecturer who stresses the importance of experiencing failed teamwork for future benefits and repeats the same question that was asked in the initial lines of the extract ''other stories'' at the end of her turn. In lines 1, 2, and 3, the lecturer is using the question ''any stories'' as a linguistic cue to invite people to join the floor. S1 shares her personal experience in lines 4 and 5 by introducing the reason for her failed project in a previous course. The lecturer interrupts her to repeat the linguistic expression “they didn’t want to communicate''. In the following line, the lecturer directly asks S1 to provide more information on how she dealt with that situation. In line 9, S1 explains that lack of communication has led her to reach for her teacher. The lecturer follows that with a turn, including giving quick direct feedback with the word ''ok'', then an extended lecturer turn, and ends her turn by requesting that students join the turn-taking and talk about their experiences, ''any other stories''. In line 20, S2 joins the turn-taking and explains another factor that contributes to failed teamwork. The lecturer claims back the turn-taking with an extended lecturer turn again (lines 22-25).S2 then interrupts the lecturer to join back the turn-taking, but the teacher once again interrupts her, repeating the word ''sure''. Interruption by the lecturer occurs again in lines 6, 11, and 27. In line 6, repair is initiated to check the information the student articulated in the previous turn. The lecturer repeats the last part of the TCU of the previous turn to check understanding. S1 confirmed the lecturer's assumption that ''the students didn’t want to communicate''. This form of interruption is not problematic and another extended turn by S1 follows. The lecturer interruption in line 11 interrupts the progressivity of the interaction with S1. The lecturer discourages further elaboration by S1 and asks for other stories, indicating that another sequence of interaction is desired. Similarly, the interruption in line 27 is used to terminate S2’s contributions by using the word ''sure'' repeatedly.

The lecturer directs and controls the interaction and creates limited space for the students’ contributions. The above extract shows that the interaction might have been meant to open a discussion on how the students’ past experiences might highlight factors that had already been researched within business management. However, the interruption patterns performed by the lecturer and the tendency to latch turns limit the students' participation in the interaction and contradict the intended pedagogical goal of this part of the lecture, which is to elicit stories about past experiences so that students can relate the content knowledge they have learned to their own experiences. A similar practice is also found in the following extract by Participant C.

Extract 7: Participant C, Business Compeitiors:

In the extract below, the lecturer asks her students to share their opinions with the rest of the class regarding their business ideas and their business competitors.

1 T: hard but not impossible (.) can you think for five minutes of competitors to your
2 business and share with us(.) you will share it
3 S3: I have one example ready teacher //
4 T: //yeah what
5 S3: the car accessories (.) the competitors are a lot but the biggest is ((the student
6 mentioned a well known company in Riyadh)) company //
7 T: // yes but explain why (.) and explain the type of company
8 S3: aha//
9 T: // local or not (.) direct or indirect
10 S3: it can be=
11 T: =you need full information (.) ok
12 S3: It is local//
13 T: //where Gulf or Saudi
14 S3: I think here //
15 T: //Saudi you mean (.) Umm I think it here as well but what positive and negative
16 aspects .
17 S3: the positive is that is well known between customers here and negative//
18 T: // it is important girls that you are known (0.5) ((the lecturer is calling S2 name))

In the above extract, interruption is not affecting the turn-taking and sequence progression, yet the student's ability to reach the end of the TCU is affected. The turns at talk are controlled by the lecturer, and the mechanism for affording interactional space to the students is not employed. In lines 4, 7, 9, 13, 15, and 18 the lecturer continues to interrupt S3 to initiate repair and request further clarifications regarding the business that S3 is discussing. To resolve the repair, S3 performs self-initiated repair (insertion) to add information to fulfil the lecturer's requests. It was noted that whenever the smooth continuity of the learner's contributions was disturbed by the lecturer, S3 produces short minimal responses. In line 18, the lecturer interrupts the turn and terminates the sequence with S3, before she can use the second TCU to express her thoughts regarding the negative aspects of her competitor. The result is rigid interactional organization.

The lecturer felt alarmed about her interactional decisions and asked the interviewer to repeat the tape again, stating her opinion in the quote below:

> I really need to listen to that again and again. I guess we are all pressured with time in lectures but you know.

The instructors expressed their dislike of this interactional pattern of dominating the turn-taking aggressively in some extracts and leaving limited opportunities for their students. The retrospective interviews revealed that lecturers are often less attentive to some interactional decisions and their impacts on students' participation.

5.4.2 Lack of Wait Time:

Previous studies by Tobin (1987) and Walsh (2006) showed that a lack of extended Wait Time affects the development of the discourse between teachers and students because it facilitates the interactional process. They claim that a wait time of three to five seconds can help students process information and produce extended responses.

Extract 8: Participant A, Making a Team Chapter Agreement:

In the extract below, the lecturer moved to explain a slide that revolved around one of the steps to formulate what is called "a team chapter", which is an agreement between team members on having regular productive meetings within the same cooperation.

1. T: to solve any problems ((the lecturer is pointing to the board))
2. S1: problems?
3. T: o::r (.) Conflicts (0.3) So:: when one student submit work under quality o::r
4. Late submission or anything else it clearly shows that you agreed on this time
5. And quality and so on(.) so there will be no excuse for any students
6. especially here in the university so you can take >this signature coding to the
7. teacher< give it to the teacher so you can say she did not committed to the
8. rules ok (.) this is the only way to solve any problems (0.4) groups any groups
9. actually who have came across these problems and they do not have codes they
10. cannot tell the teacher to help them cuz from the
11. beginning of the semester we asked you to create codes to solve the problems
12. (.) You did not (.) the teacher will not be able to help in this case (.) ok (.)
13. Team chapters should be created early while forming the team? ((the lecturer
14. is reading the slides on the board and the students are listening and looking at
15. the board as well)) you cannot in the middle of the semester you say I am
16. going to make a code No you start to work together from the beginning of the
17. semester so there are many components in team chapter mainly you should
18. specify who team members and how to communicate them providing phone
19. numbers emails students ID you should specify the leader
20. put her name you should also say how and when you will meet so::: fo
21. example we will meet once a week every Monday at central library at 6
22. o'clock ok you should specify this because when you don't specify time for the
23. meeting what happens=
24. S2: =we get lost=
25. T: = o::r you will work all the time which will be annoying (.) or anyone one can
26. show up in the meeting at any time // ((teacher is walking towards S2
27. slowly and once she is close to
28. her, the student interrupted the teacher while gazing different students in
29. class))
30. S2: //so can choose a different day for each week Umm different day
31. T: yes but preferably it is the same in every week so students will not make
32. excuses and at the end there will be only one or two students you think
33. meeting this way?

In the initial line of the interaction, the lecturer introduces her slides by pointing to the board while using the word ''problems'' as her trigger to indicate that the floor is open for her students. S1 is repeating the same word with her voice rising as if she is questioning. In the next lines (3-12) the lecturer provides a synonym for the word “problem” and pauses for (0.3) before giving examples of how formulating an agreement or team chapter might help to solve conflicts among team members. She elaborates her example with multiple short pauses. As part of her extended turn, the lecturer reads her slides and passes the floor of the interaction to her students by requesting information about the consequences of not having a specific time for meetings. In line 24, S2 provides a short answer saying that if that was the case, her team would feel lost. The lecturer then scaffolds S2’s response, and S2 interrupts to request further clarification on whether the dates of the meeting could be more flexible every week. In line 25, the lecturer replies by explaining that it might not be a wise option and ends her turn asking her students to confirm the disadvantages of not having a specific time for the meetings, and the whole class replied with ''no'' when she offered the floor. In lines 28-33 the lecturer builds on S2’s previous turn and explains the importance of staying consistent and regular in terms of the times of the meetings and switching to off-line meetings if the physical meetings seemed difficult.

In analyzing the interaction above it can be seen that space was not afforded to the students to negotiate meaning together at the beginning of the extract even though part of this interactional agenda involves leaving the floor open for students to share their personal opinion about making teams. The participant expressed shock and anger when asked about these extracts:

I mean I cannot believe that I go this fast with my discussions(.) I don’t like it when other teachers do it. I am really surprised. I should give them a chance to at least complete their thoughts(.) That makes me feel bad.

5.4.3 Direct Feedback:

The organization of repair is another aspect of interaction that seemed to have a similar practice when employed by the lecturer. Whether the repair is performed by the lecturer, direct or indirect, simple or lengthy, the lecturer seems to base her feedback on the students' responses to add to the pedagogical focus of the lecture. Students' self-repair is less common in these types of lectures. Therefore, it seems that case-by-case analysis often shows that, even when there is a discussion going on around a debatable subject, repair often occupies the F position in the IRF cycle of the interaction. The following extract clarifies some of the repeated patterns of giving feedback.

Extract 9: Participant A, Decision-making Process:

In the extract below, the lecturer is introducing a new concept, “the decision-making process in business”, The students are expected to share their opinions about different ways of deciding for team members.

1. T: after that you should also specify the process decision making (.) the process so::
2. Any team umm face the conflict of having different opinions so we have a
3. decision to make (.) right (.)And you have different point of views so how can you
4. decide usually when one girl say something the other will say something else and
5. nobody make a decision
6. S2: [voting]
7. S3: [voting]
8. T: voting >other than voting< ((the faculty member is gazing the whole class to ask
9. for more ideas))S4: umm the leader should make a decision=
10. T: =leader (.) will choose (.) what else (.) that there are many techniques to decide
11. S4: راح نجمع الأفكار من الكل
(we will collect the thoughts from everyone)
12. T: ok (.) combing thoughts
13. S4: nominating
14. T: it is a good idea umm قد فكرتوا بالقرعة
(did you think of choosing by lot=)
15. S3: =yes we did that before in Dice
16. T: in Dice
17. S: Umm another course
18. T: aha ok so umm you القرعة تسوون (.) so there are many techniques when your team
(*do the lottery*)
19. Have different point of views and you cannot decide a decision making and and that should be specified in the team chapter

In the extract above the interactional work is performed mostly by the lecturer as she seeks a specific kind of response. In line 1, the faculty member introduces a new concept in the lecture by using a prompt (that teams are most likely to have disagreements). The prompt is offered in lines 2 and 3, and in line 4 the lecturer explicitly asks the students to put themselves in that situation, indicating that the floor of interaction is open. In lines 5 and 6, S2 and S3 overlap the word "voting" as a short response. In line 7, the lecturer repeats the word "voting" to emphasize that further discussion is required. She explicitly requests more information on how to decide if the team is facing disagreements to signal again that the floor is being offered. S4 joined the interaction in line 8 to complete the earlier adjacency pair initiated by the lecturer and suggests that one person should be in charge like a "leader " of the group and have the right to have the final word. In the following line, the lecturer repeats the student's utterance and requests more responses from the students. In line 10, S4 again code switches to L1 to respond to the lecturer and suggests that collecting everyone's

thoughts could be the key to solving the conflict. Repeatedly, in line 11, the lecturer reproduces the student's utterance in English, yet does not require more information this time. Interestingly, S4 jumps into the interaction without any prompt from the lecturer. The lecturer responds to S4's contribution as being a "good idea" and, once again, provides a prompt that the conversation floor is open. S3 responds in line 13, sharing that this solution was once used during teamwork in a previous course among students. The lecturer finally explains that a "lottery" could be used and that was illustrated in an extended turn.

This episode of interaction exemplifies that inadequate feedback might lead to limited short responses by students. Students are not actually encouraged to express their personal opinions. The lecturer giving direct feedback, as in line 13, or offering no feedback, as in lines 7, 9, and 11, is usually followed by short responses from the students. The lecturer in lines 13 and 17 seems focused on eliciting a specific response about the "lottery" as that was the concluding remark of that interactive episode. Interestingly, the case in this episode is not about the lecturer giving students enough time to reflect and respond because students were interested and overlapped responses, as in lines 4 and 5, and in line 12, S4 joined the interaction without an indication from the lecturer that the floor is open. In this extract, the lecturer accepts her students' contributions and does not try to loop their responses back into the interaction. Eliciting specific content information at the end of the interaction is mostly the reason that limited the discussion.

5.5 Interactional Strategies Used by Lecturers:

5.5.1 Interactional Practices in Code-switching:

One of the most repeated interactional practices in the data is the use of language alternation or, to be more specific, code-switching. In the literature review, the approach established by Peter Auer (1988) was discussed. The analysis that follows is informed by his views on the discourse related functions of code-switching. His functions at the level of sequence and turn-taking included reformation or elaboration. The extracts below are examples from Participant B's data

5.5.1.1 Code-Switching in the Pursuit of Response:

Extract 10: Participant B, Marketing for Entrepreneur

In the extract below, the lecturer illustrates the importance of explaining some principles of marketing to entrepreneurs. The lecturer elicits answers from the students to build and sustain the pedagogical topic of the lecture.

1 T: This is what we are going to talk about today (.) so: marketing بنات is بحد ذاته is a whole discipline

(girls) (itself)

2 so there are majors (.) تخصصات (.) > we have a lot of books a lot of courses < that is

majors

3 متخصصة in marketing but what are we going to cover is only one chapter in marketing

(specialised)

4 اللي هي مهمة بالنسبة لكم *as* entrepreneur أو new business owner so:: we will talk

(which is important to you) (or)

5 about only what is only important to you as entrepreneur so here are the objects of our

6 lesson ((reading the slides)) so:: we will explain the three steps segmenting the market

7 (.) selecting the target market (0.2) and establishing a unique market position ((the lecturer

8 gaze the whole class again)) (0.5) we will also talk about branding and will explain why is

9 it important to >entrepreneur firm marketing effort < on next Tuesday the four piece of

10 marketing activities اللي كلنا نعرفها

(which we all know)

11 the four piece ? اللي هي =

(which is)

12 S1: =product

13 S2: [price]

14 S3: [product]

15 T: ايش بعد

(what else)

16 S3: Place (.) I think

17 T: ok product , price, promotion, and place we will explain that ان شاء الله in the next lecture

(god willing)

18 so you can say that this chapter is a refresh of your previous ideas from the previous

19course 101 marketing ok (0.5) so what is the most important question to start to ask who

20 are our=

21 S4: =competitors segments (.) Umm competitors

22 T: yes//

23 S4:// competitors

24 T: competitors ok important questions another important questions before we get to the

25 competitors شي مهم جدا نفكر فيه

(a very important thing we think about)

26 S4: the//

27 T: // ↑قبل قبل نروح للموضوع هذا

(before before we go to that)

28 S5: customers//

29 S4: //customers

30 T: hmmm

31 S4: customers=

32 T: =<u>customers</u> ((the lecturer is clapping her hands)) who are our customers ok (.) who are they (.) who are the customers and

33 the second question is?

34 S2: ↑who are //

35 T: // how can we appeal for them (.) how can we become attractive to them so the first

36 question is <u>who</u> are our customers <u>and</u> how can we attract them

In lines 1-11, the lecturer introduces her topic and the different aspects that will be covered in the lecture while switching from L2 to L1. The lecturer ends her turns in a raised tone, switching to Arabic. The lecturer interestingly ends the turn with an incomplete sentence

(which is) assuming that students know (the four-piece activities). The adjacency pair in lines 11-14 is distinctive because the lecturer's statement is met with answers from S1, S2, and S3 who recognize the L1 cue given by the lecturer. In line 15, the lecturer again switches to L1 to ask for further information, but this time she decides to ask the students directly in the form of a question. S3 join the next turn in line 16 and shows hesitation by using the phrase (I think), and the lecturer gives feedback confirming S3's answer and completes her turn by listing all (the four-piece activities). However, the adjacency pairs in lines 20-21 are different because the lecturer directly requests that the students use L2 information about the most important question to ask in marketing. In the latched turn in line 21, S4 answers the lecturer's question, indicating that S4 can understand the lecturer's request. In the following line, the lecturer confirms that S4 offered relevant information, but she switches to L1 in line 25 to elicit a different response. Her statement that it is (something important to think about) is not only a statement but also a way to ask for specific information. S5 attempts, in the following line, to provide the information but eventually is interrupted by the lecturer who adds another clue in Arabic (line 27). The lecturer clarifies the importance of the information. At the end of the extract, the students realize (lines 28-31) that the lecturer is illustrating in Arabic the necessity of prioritizing the importance of the (customers). S4 interrupts S5 to provide the answer to the lecturer in lines 28-29). In line 32, the lecturer confirms that this is the pedagogical information that she wanted to draw attention to by repeating the word (customers) and clapping her hands. However, she also expands on her students' contributions to illustrate further aspects of the pedagogical topic in lines 35-36.

In this example, the lecturer switches from L2 to L1 while introducing and explaining the topic of the lecture. However, interestingly, the lecturer switches from L2 to L1 to coincide with the end of her turns while requesting information from the students (in lines 11, 15, 25, and 27). In addition, if the response by the students does not match what the lecturer aims to elicit (such as in lines 24-28), the lecturer switches to Arabic to elicit the desired answer to her enquiry. This might signal her attempt to avoid breaking the students' contribution to the interaction until the pedagogical goal (i.e. understanding that the first important aspect in marketing is knowing your customers and their expectations well and being able to attract them) is attained.

3.1.2 Code-switching to Negotiate Meaning:

Extract 11: Participant B, The Difference between Equity Funding and Debt

In the following extract, the lecturer explains the difference between two financing resources utilized by business owners: equity funding and debt. The lecturer and the students negotiate their preferences providing reasons.

1 T: ok (.) so: this is the difference بنات equity funding means >>exchanging patterns of

(girls)

2 ownership funds and firm usually in a form of stocks << بتعطين شخص part of your business

(you give someone)

3 ownership of stocks (.) they will give you money (.) ok (.) OR to get get loan (.) so:

4 which one is better (0.2) what is the advantages and disadvantages of each one? أيش رايكم

(what do you think)

((the lecturer closes the door))

5 S1: [I think]

6 S2: [it]

7 T: وحده وحده (.) ok (.) perfect yeah

(one by one)

8 S4: انا أحب equity funding

(I love)

9 T: ok ايوه advantages (.)اعطيني أسبابك and the disadvantages=

(yes) (give me your reasons)

10 S1: =انه يكون فيه زي نظام الشركات انه ما اقدر اسد

(I can't always pay,it's like a company system)

11 T: ok (.) so:: the equity funding you don't have to pay at the moment and the debt you will
12 have to pay later after a certain time (.) ok ((the lecturer is pointing to S2))

13 S2: I prefer the debt because I think (umm) راح يكون بشكل قليل يعني stocks انه لمى يكون عندي

(when I have) (there will be just few)

14مافي شركات تفتح كذا على طول مساهمة فيكون يكون بشكل افضل

(there are not companies that will always be opened based on that)

15 T: Umm طيب suppose that you do have stocks ما هو stocks markets

16 لا(.) انه يكون عند شركة وقسمتيها

(No (.) it is like you have a company and divide)

17 اسهم وراس مالك عشرة الآف ريال و قسمتي باقي الشركة للباقين بحيث يوفرون لك السيولة مقابل امتلاك جزء من شركتك

(your stocks and your ten thousands riyal and you let the rest of your company for other to contribute with money in exchange of ownership of part of it)

18 S2: ok

19 T: بعد فتره اذا اعطوك السيولة that's it you have the funds and most importantly the time

(after some time they give you money)

20 to grow your business as these investors راح ينتظرون فتره اطول من الدين (0.4)

(they will wait longer than debt)

21 understood now?

22 S2: yes

23 T: you still prefer loan لسى مع رايك؟

(you still have the same opinion)

24 S2: yes

25 T: why

26 S2: because I prefer to have full control over my business and loan is like you k(h)now

27 teacher متوقع بدون ياخذون ارباحي ((S2 started to cover her mouth while laughing))

(predictable not taking all my profits)

In the extract, the lecturer switches from L2 to L1 at the end of the turn in lines 4-5 to request information from students. In line 7, the lecturer instructs taking turns rather than overlapping the talk in Arabic, and in line 9 she retakes the interactional floor to request clarification. Interestingly, the lecturer's comprehensive illustration of crucial points in the interaction is frequently carried out in L2. For example, in lines 15-17, the lecturer illustrates the difference between (stocks market) and (equity funding) in response to S2's answer to possibly explicitly define and describe the concept of (equity funding) to eliminate her student's confusion. The lecturer further elaborates in lines 19-20 how business owners will pay their debt if they chose equity funding as their resource. Similarly, the students seem to use L2 as a tool to communicate extended ideas to support their arguments with the lecturer,

such as on lines 13-14 and 26. S2 employs Arabic to explain why debt is the preferred option for resourcing the business. It seems that code-switching to L2 in the lecturer's extended turns and in the students' arguments smooths the progress of negotiating the meaning of equity funding/debt and, consequently, broadens the interaction.

Extract 12: Participant C, Marketing Slogan

In the extract below, the lecturer provides examples of marketing slogans and explicitly orients the discussion with the students to their significance in marketing the business. The lecturer allocates turns to read and discuss each slogan.

1 T: I have more examples (.) (Ummm) M and Ms , Can you read the slogan حقهم بصوت عالي

(loudly)

2S1 يلا ((the lecturer called her name))

(come on)

3 SS: laughing ((students are looking at the slogan in slides))

4 T: so: what are they trying to say

5 S2: ((laughing))

6 T: what are they saying to their customers

7 S5: so:: that are offering good quality (.) not only chocolate (.) that means they are of good quality

8 T: offering good quality يعني ماراح تذوب في يدك راح تذوب في فمك (0.7) ok(.) domino's pizza (.)

(it will not melt in your hand but in your mouth)

S4 ((the lecturer called her name))

9 S4: you get <u>fresh</u> <u>hot</u> delivered to your door in thirty <u>minutes</u> or less=

10 T:= so what they mean (.) what are they saying?

11 S4: they are fast

12 T: compare to their competitors , <u>superfast</u> but they are not that fast (.) are they still fast still keep their promise

13 S4: no they are still fast

14 SS: ((laughing))

15 S5: they do teacher

16 T: so this is their position in the market and this is what they are reinforcing in their slogan

هذ اللي يأمنون فيه (.) بس أنا ما عاد أطلب ما اعرف إذا لسى هم على وعدهم

(this is what they believe in (.) but I don't know because I do not order from them so I don't know if they kept their promise)

17 SS: laughing

18 T: ok Avis شركة تأجير السيارات (.) تعرفونهم بنات car rental(.) ok (.) yes? SO their slogan is we

(car rental) (you know them)

19are number two but we try harder (0.5) so: what they mean? ايش يقصدون هنا

(what do they mean here)

20 S4: //بنحاول

(we try)

21 S6://لسنا الوحيدين لكن نحاول نعمل اللي نقدر عليه علشان نوصل

(we are not the only one but we try our best to reach)

22 T :نعم لسنا الوحيدين [ولكن]

(yes we are not the only[but])

23 S5:[we] try harder

24 T: we try harder (.) وكمان this indicate honesty we know we are number two but we try

(and)

25 harder

26: S6: it is really cool انهم يعترفوا انهم اقل من غيرهم=

(that they admit they are less than others)

27:S5:= not necessarily less بس عارفين مكانهم في الوقت الحالي=

(but they know are they at the moment)

28: T: =exactly

The above extract shows that L1 is used by students (lines 20-21) to achieve mutual engagement by repeating previous utterances that were produced in L2 by the lecturer. Despite the fact that the lecturer's first part of the adjacency pair is a request for information about the slogan, S4 and S6 provide repetition as an answer. S4 and S6 are affirming their understanding by producing the translated version of the slogan. Students are encouraged to express personal meanings in L1 by the lecturer because in line 22 she completes S6's turn by repeating her utterance again in L1. Students are then provided with the space to interact and co-construct the meaning. In lines 26 and 27, S6 and S7 take over the turn-taking to attempt to explore the different meanings of the slogan. It seems that the lecturer's focus is for the learners to understand fully the slogan's meaning first, even if L1 is used to initiate further discussions around it.

5.6 Conclusion:

The following chapter will focus on the analysis from the second phase of data collection, in which lecturers were introduced to utilizing the SETT framework to analyze their language use. Hence what follows is just a summary of the first phase analysis:

- The data shows the same tendencies when analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively
- The data analyzed shows that the interactional organization of EMI business lectures is not always adherent to the pedagogical goals when it comes to topic management and the mechanisms of turn-taking and repair
- Students' participation is often challenged with interrupted patterns by the lecturer, direct feedback, and a lack of wait time.

6 Results II

6.1 Introduction:

In this chapter, I present the results of analyzing the data from the second phase of data collection. The data analyzed in this section is that collected after introducing the SETT framework to the faculty members. Faculty members utilized the SETT framework to reflect on their own language use after each lecture, and that led to a variety of different effects on their interactions. Therefore, this section aims to examine those effects through CA supported by both an analysis of the frequencies of interactional features and a thematic analysis of the semi-structured interviews at the end of the academic semester. The findings of this section are mainly concerned with the second and third research questions:

2- What is the effect of employing reflective practice frameworks on interaction in EMI business lectures in Saudi Arabia?
3- What are the perspectives of Saudi faculty members regarding using reflective practice frameworks for their interaction?

The first part of the chapter illustrates the frequencies of interactional features post-introducing SETT to the faculty members. Next, the second section of the chapter explores an analysis of different cases using CA of the second-phase lectures. The first part describes how each faculty member interacts differently with their students and how much change has occurred in the second phase of lectures. Interactional features and interactional resources are utilized by lecturers differently in their teaching approaches. The final section presents the different themes that emerged from interviewing the faculty members at the end of the data collection phase about their own perspectives of these changes.

6.2 Features of Teacher Talk Post-introducing SETT to Faculty Members:

Table 8: Features of Teacher Talk with Increased Frequency

Phases		Phase 1			Phase 2		
Participants		A	B	C	A	B	C
Features of teacher talk	Scaffolding	15	11	14	22	19	24
	Content feedback	7	9	9	20	17	14
	Extended wait time	4	3	5	9	12	10
	Referential questions	10	7	10	15	11	17
	Seeking clarification	2	6	4	12	10	8
	Extended learner turn	7	10	7	17	22	19

Table 9: Features of Teacher Talk with Decreased Frequency

Phases		Phase 1			Phase 2		
Participants		A	B	C	A	B	C
Features of teacher talk	Direct repair	22	18	15	6	9	12
	Teacher interruption	31	24	19	11	9	4
	Turn completion	11	17	11	8	10	6

Table 10 : Features of Teacher Talk with the Least Significant Difference between Phase 1 and Phase 2

Phases		Phase 1			Phase 2		
Participants		A	B	C	A	B	C
Features of teacher talk	Teacher extended turns	22	29	12	19	23	13
	Teacher echo	11	9	6	8	10	8
	Form-focused feedback	2	1	2	1	2	0

A comparison of Participants A, B, and C's data between the first and second phases shows that the features that significantly increased are those related to giving students feedback, offering students enough time to participate, and the number of extended participations by students (see Table 7, above).

When referring to the increase of interactional features dealing with students' contributions, it is important to discuss interactional features such as scaffolding, content feedback, and requests to clarify meaning. The increased frequency of giving students content feedback, rather than direct feedback with "no" or "yes" to their responses, indicates that there is an interest by the lecturer in acknowledging students' contributions and a willingness to offer feedback. Feedback has either reformulated or extended students' contributions, the data shows that there is an increased frequency in cases of scaffolding in the second phase. Scaffolding is defined as an interactional tool essential to survive when breakdown happens. This is a skill that requires lecturers to have the ability to monitor interaction by having good listening skills and predicting a possible collapse in the flow of interaction. Scaffolding could appear in different ways, like latched modelling, alternative phrasing and prompting, as will be explained in the conversation analysis of the lecture extracts. In Table 7, we can see the increased usage of scaffolding as a result of teachers reflecting on their own practice. Participant C demonstrated the highest increase, with 24 cases in the second phase of data collection. Similarly, the table above illustrates an increase in the use of clarification requests by lecturers and students compared with the first phase. In addition, the use of extended wait time has increased significantly, which is something that lectures gave less attention to in the first phase and expressed disappointment in their stimulated recall interviews regarding their rushed talk. Extended wait time is valued in SLA as it paves the way to negotiate meaning (Sidnel, 2010), but the effect it has on lecture interaction still needs further examination with conversation analysis. An increase in the cases in which students were able to participate in extended turns, as shown in Table 7, is an indication that amendments of teacher talk have an impact on the frequency of students' participation.

On the other hand, teacher talk in the last three lectures witnessed significant decreases in the frequency with which features like direct repair, teacher interruption and turn completion were used, as shown in Table 8. These features that were analyzed in the first phase using CA which appeared to hinder students' participation were used less frequently by lecturers in phase two. It seems that the awareness gained by using SETT materials had an impact on teachers regarding unconscious interactional decisions.

However, no significant differences were found between the first and the second phase in the number of instances of extended teacher turns and teacher echo, suggesting that the authoritative role played by lecturers remained essentially the same (Table 8). In the same vein, no great difference was found between the two phases in tracing examples of form-focused feedback concerned with language mistakes. Even though EMI classrooms are also concerned with language development, the participants in this study showed no interest in focusing on that.

What stands out in the tables above is that there is strong evidence that a process of self-reflection by lecturers led to amendments in the ways that they interacted with students and to increases in the frequency of students' participation in extended turns.

6.3 Conversation Analysis of Lecturer-Student Interaction Post-Introducing SETT to Faculty Members:

Conversation analysis reveals that increasing the frequency of some of the features discussed above resulted in increases in the interactivity in lectures. These claims are supported by evidence from teacher talk in the following sections that classify the impact of employing SETT as increased space for learning and enhanced interactive choices when dealing with the students' contributions.

6.4 Increased Space for Learning

Extract 13: Participant A, Types of Stakeholders:

1. T: What is the most important stakeholders in small or large business(0.4)remember some have different role مختلفة ادوارهم (2.3) can you think of these roles (.)
   different roles
2. can you think of those stakeholders (1.2)
3. S2: The customers (.) all types of them (.)
4. T: customers ok: and (.)
5. S5: supply (.)
6. T: Supplier ↑((name deleted))=
7. S5:=supplier the one supply
8. T: great (0.7) their role is to supply how about others (1.6) yes(.) any (.)
9. S5: I don't know their name teacher but those who buy a lot of the products and give it to different [small sellers
10. T: [you mean distributors
11. S: yes yes distributors
12. T: yes great

The extract represents an example of how space is offered to the students through the use of silence or what we call “wait time”. In line 1, the lecturer sets her expected pedagogical goal for this episode, which is eliciting different types of stakeholders and discussing their roles. Interestingly, the lecturer initiates the same request for information twice about the type of stakeholders in the same turn and the requests are separated by 2.3 seconds, allowing her students to process the question. After 1.2 seconds, S2 self-selects in line 3, providing an adequate response. However, after accepting S2’s contribution using the response token ''ok'', the lecturer still seeks more information or other involved stakeholders she would like to discuss by using the word ''and'' to indicate she is still expecting additional responses, leaving the floor open for the rest of the class. The interactional formulation of incomplete utterances in line 4 has been studied by Koshik (2002) who claimed that incomplete formulation of turns usually aims to elicit further output from learners. It seems that the interactional technique is understood and recognized by S5 who joins the turn-taking and provides the verb ''supply'' as the answer. In line 6, a repair turn is initiated by the lecturer who uses the noun form ''supplier'' with a rising annotation waiting for S5’s confirmation. In line 7, S5 repeats the word ''supplier'' in a latched turn as a repair solution and confirmation that this is what was being meant originally. In the following line, the lecturer uses the response token ''great'', confirms the repair solution provided by S5 and then initiates another request, providing 1.6 seconds for the second time in the same interactional episode to allow enough time for her students to brainstorm new stakeholders. In fact, the wait time encourages S5 to rejoin the turn-taking and make a new contribution again, even though she explicitly expresses hesitation at the beginning of her turn saying ''I don’t know, teacher''. She continues to explain the role of the stakeholder while not knowing exactly the correct linguistic form to be used. An instance of unproblematic overlap occurs at the end of the turn because the lecturer recognizes the term that S5 is looking for. This type of overlap is one type of the mid-turn overlap onset called “recognition onset”. It is common when the next speaker recognize the message that the current speaker made perfectly available before the completion of the turn construction unit (Sidnell & Stivers, 2014). S3 shows affiliation with the lecturer’s response by repeating the word “yes” in line 11, indicating that the prior response is the information she was seeking earlier.

This extract shows that the lecturer's ability to afford her students wait time while scaffolding not only for students to process the question but also to be able to put together an appropriate response. This interactional process in the extract above implies the awareness of the lecturer because she is able to understand her students' responses and also incorporate them in creating an input that helped them to be engaged in interaction. This interactional comparative process is facilitated by the use of wait time, or creating ''space for

learning" as Walsh (2011) referred to it, as one of the strategies that could develop what he called classroom interactional competence (CIC). According to Walsh (ibid), this cannot be simply achieved by just using wait time with students all the time but rather making adjustments to the interactional and linguistic patterns to meet a specific goal at a specific moment in the classroom interaction. I would argue the lecturer's conscious decision to offer enough time for S5 (lines 5-11) to fulfil the interactional requirement is an example of her ability to make such adjustments that she did not consider making in phase 1 before reflecting on her own practice. If we look back at the extract from the same lecturer, we can see that repeated patterns of problematic overlaps created an unsupportive environment that hindered interactional cooperation between the lecturer and students.

Similarly, the following extract from Participant C illustrates the use of scaffolding as well as the affordance of space through wait time. However, it leads not only to elicit specific information and examples about the customers' feedback that enhanced businesses but also provides opportunities for multiple students to compete to take a turn to fulfil the pedagogical goal of the discussion.

Extract 14: Participant C, Customers' Feedback:

1. T: what reasons or خلينا نقول why is feedback from them important (.)
   (Let's say)
2. S5: improve (0.6) the improvement can be very very good for my business
3. T: okay (.) they improve the business how (3.1)
4. S5: u::h we change the necessary احنا رأينا مو بس راي حقيقي على بناء التغيرات تكون=
   The changes are based on real opinion not our opinions only
5. S1: =yes (.) I believe that they give new ideas for change//
6. S5: // they (.) but (.) need we really take them (0.3) really care about them (.)
7. T: <u>absolutely</u> (.) listening seriously to those opinion(.) then the changing process will
8. begin (.) we will be using these ideas <u>both</u> (.) موجودة (.) already as bad
   exists
9. services(.) right? (.)زبائن رغبة على بناء تغيرات شفتو امثلة اعطونا give us examples (1.8) ok
   (give us examples that you witness changes based on customers opinion)
10. S1: تغير اوقات الفتح والأغلاق (.)
    (changing the opening and closing times)
11. T: ممتاز (2.3) where we saw that =
    (great)
12. S1: =((name of the shop deleted)) in Riyadh (.)
13. T: ok . but what do they sell =
14. S1: =clothes

The exchange above is part of a lecture that looked into different stakeholders and their roles and impacts on businesses. However, the pedagogical goal of this specific extract focuses on eliciting reasons behind the importance of customers' feedback. In line 1, the lecturer directly requests information about the reasons behind the importance of feedback from customers. S5 provides a response that included a self-initiated repair solution. S5 replaces the word "improve" with "improvement" and adds "can be very good for business" as an inserted component to clarify her opinion. In line 3, the lecturer gives feedback to S5 using the token 'okay' and initiates a post-expansion sequence based on the second pair part provided by the S5. In line 4, S4 contributes again to the discussion after being given an extended wait time by the lecturer. When space is offered, another student is encouraged to join the interactional floor. S1 self-selects to express her view of the discussion and peer negotiation is apparent in lines 5-6. Although S5 interrupts S1 before the completion of the turn, the lecturer interruption is not involved. The lecturer reclaims turn taking only to provide positive extended content feedback and initiate another sequence in line 9. The increased number of sequences in this extract is an indication that students are given more opportunities to participate, especially when wait time is employed. Wait time followed the lecturer's requests at two different extended rates (3.1) and (1.8). In lines 10-14 there is another example of the lecturer's ability to extend interaction between her and S1 through multiple post-expansion sequences. Next is an extract from participant B.

Extract 15: Participant B, Managing your Staff:

1. T: lets think of this scenario (.)umm you are the CEO of newly established small
2. business(.)OK (.) now lets say some one come to you with allegation regarding some
3. of that staff are selling some of YOUR products and making some extra money that
4. goes into his pocket//
5. S2: is he stealing=
6. T:= yes (.) in simple words yes he is stealing(2.5)
7. S2: aha I will fire him immediately
8. T: thank you ((Student's name)) so:: that's my question WHAT are you going to do
9. (.)which step will you take first (.) think carefull::y and describe to me (3.4)
   ((students are chatting in low voice to one another))
10. S2:well (.)I think first I will thank this person and tell him(.) I will look into the issue
11. myself (.)
12. S3:what if he might be lying to me and trying to make someone look bad
13. S2: fair point ok and then what is next
14. S3: I will for example check (.) if this true: or not by asking others or or um the best
15. option like ah ah see: if it is on camera somewhere or something
16. T: that's good first step to: see if for a FACT this is ha'appening

In participant B data, it has been noticed that a different interactional structure to offer space for students in both line10-15. In this utterance space had a more positive impact on the interaction. While the pedagogical goal aims to elicit different solutions to a proposed problem in line 1-4, students are able to contribute to the discussion and also control the turn-taking from line 10-15. The space they are offered in line 9, gives them a chance for a constructive side chat that lead them to organize their next turns and ideas. When referring to space in the extract, we don't only refer to the (2.5) in line 6 or (3.4) in line 9 which in itself has allow for more contribution to be made to achieve the pedagogical goal, we also refer to the fact that lecturer allows S2, S3 to control the turn-taking without interfering early. In fact, a positive confirmation that this pattern of conversation is welcomed appears in line 16.

6.5 Dealing with the Learners' Contribution

Extract 16: Participant A, Challenges of Recruitment:

1. T: there is evidence all over the world there is this challenge of recruitment
2. especially here because of what (0.3) ليش

(why)

3. S2: there is no training before=
4. T: =great there is no training before (.) ok (.) for whom
5. S2: for the students
6. T: ok (.) for students (0.3) but let's suppose you looking for certain skills
7. for recruitments what else you have in mind ايش كمان فيه (0.7) في اللي حولكم

(What else can you add (0.7) in those around you)

8. S2: انهم يطلبون خبره

(They ask for experience)

9. T: ok هم راح يطلبون بس أنتي أنتي اللي راح recruit ? (0.4) < you have entrepreneurial firms

(THEY WILL ASK BUT IT IS YOU YOU THE ONE WHO)

and you would like to recruit what challenges that you might face>

10. S2: ممكن ما يكون عنده خبره يكون فعليا ماعنده خبره بهذا المجال بالرغم من انه مفترض يكون جاي وهي عنده

(He might not have the experience in reality in this field even though he comes and suppose to have it)

11. T: aha ↑ok so // لمن تقابلينه ما تلاقينها

(when you interview him you don't find it)

12. S2: ما احس انه عنده بالضبط

(I don't feel that he has exactly the same.)

13. T: ↑ ok great (.) one of the challenges كمان الفيز اللي راح تحصلين عليها فيه من الصعوبات من مكتب
14. العمل انه لازم سعوديين فهل راح توظفينهم أو لأ

(Also the visa that you will get is one of the challenges in the work office that you need to recruit Saudis so will you hire them or not)

15. are you recruiting Saudis or not Saudis?
16. S2: Saudis
17. T: Saudi One hundred percent (0.7) yeah so:: you:: have to think about
18. this(uh)challenges that will face when recruitments(.) are you going to have Saudis
19. or none Saudis(.)if you are going to have (uh uh) most of your employees مثلا none

(for example)

20. Saudis then you have to have a percentage for Saudis نسبة للسعوده صح as you have to

(hiring local Saudis percentage right)

21. reach this percentage

This fragment illustrates how the lecturer creates interactional opportunities to extend her student's participation by constructing different sequences and different forms of sequence expansions within the same interactional project that serve the same pedagogical goal. The pedagogical goal here is to elicit different recruitment challenges when starting a business.

Participant A initiates the sequence with a question about the challenges of recruitment, leaving the floor open for the students to self-select. In line 3, S2 self-selects herself and provides a short adequate answer to the base information request sequence using English, stating that lack of training is one of the recruitment challenges. In line 4, the lecturer constructs a sequence expansion with a new question that builds on the second pair part that S2 provided. The second part of post-expansion is given in line 5, S2 provides another short answer to the lecturer's question. However, it seems that the teacher is still interested in eliciting more responses built on the same subject of recruitment challenges by initiating another sequence in lines 6 and 7. S2 provides an answer that seems to be problematic as she positions herself as an employee rather than an employer. In an attempt to repair the misunderstanding, the lecturer clarifies that S2 is the one responsible for recruitment then initiates a pre-second insert sequence that is forward-looking. In line 10, the lecturer suggests to S2 to think of herself as an employer and think about the recruitment challenges, which is something explained in the next turn by the lecturer.

This extract is an example of how Participant A is expanding the interaction with her student through multiple instances of non-minimal post-expansion. In line 1, the lecturer

initiates the sequence with the question forming the first part of the adjacency pairs, leaving the floor open for the students to self-select to provide information for her question regarding recruitment challenges. S2, in line 3, self-selects herself and provides a short response using English, stating that a lack of training is one of the recruitment challenges. Interestingly, in line 4, the lecturer responds to the second pair provided by her student with the response token ("great") and carries out the post-expansion of the previous adjacency pair by pursuing additional information from her S2. After creating another sequence of adjacency pairs requesting more information about the identity of those who lack training, S2 provides another short second part of the second adjacency pair.

The same pattern is repeated in lines 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 14. The lecturer provides a different response token ("ok") which is not used to signify a sequence closure but rather an agreement before constructing another request for additional information based on the previous information in the second part of the adjacency pair provided by S2. Another example can be seen in the following extract:

Extract 17: Participant B, Best Practices around the World:

1. T: international practices of the same type of business you are looking into (umm)
2. like what we (0.5)OK >>what we talk about in food delivery mobile application<<.
3. Look into the international practice around you (0.5) it is so:: important to
4. influence some aspects of your developmental plans right? ok (0.7) now can you think
5. of the mobile applications you chose for your projects yeah. ok (.) tell me what are the
6. best international practices and how they made you think differently =
7. S3: =you mean the same as the project
8. T: yes
9. S3: I I mean our group choose the laundry apple application=
10. T: =great o:k
11. S3: the whole idea doctor ((the student refer to the lecturer as doctor))came from
12. abroad (.)
13. T:o:k great so: the international app and the local one are completely identical?
14. S3: no of course
15. T: so some aspects are similar ? (.) because they are I assume good or helpful=
16. S3: =the developer of course depend a lot I hah I mean on the original app في الدول المتطورة
    The developed countries
17. T: الغرب okay how (0.7)
    The west
18. S3: people need it Umm the service (0.5)
19. T: what about the quality of the app (.) and the different services (1.4)
20. S3: the subscription option could be:: (0.5) for the weekly services I think was hhhhh
21. ماخوذ منهم بعد

copied from them also
22. T: thats fine (.) its not like they STOLE it. subscription is everywhere now(.) yeah (.)
23. >>it's a good idea to have loyal customers to commuin=
24. S3:=yeah

The interactional episode begins with the lecturer extended turns (lines1-6) as she tries to clarify the pedagogical goal she is pursuing at the moment which elicits ideas about the best interactional practices of her students' business project topics. In line 6, the lecturer initiates the sequence with a referential question to her students about best practice internationally. Referring to no specific business, her questioning made this turn a trouble source. S3 self-selects and interrupts the sequence with a latched turn using the word "you mean", which is a common repair operation technique to signal that she might have a grasp on what was meant by the lecturer in the previous trouble-source turn. Because S3 turn is subject to checking the issue out with her lecturer, the lecturer provides a confirmation emphasizing the word "yes" to resolve the trouble-source turn and move on with interaction. S3, in lines 9 and 11, provides a second pair part to attempt to answer the question in line 6. The lecturer uses multiple and different types of post-expansion sequences to elicit more information that leads to providing a more comprehensive and adequate idea about the international practices of laundry mobile application .in line 11, a minimal expansion acceptance "ok" and "great" is used. They often propose that the sequence is closed, yet it is utilized here leaving the floor open for (1.3) seconds waiting for a different or perhaps extended version of the response in line 9. S3 then responds, implying that there is no aspect of her project that mirrors international practice because the whole idea of establishing the application was completely borrowed from abroad. The lecturer then scaffolds, based on the information provided in the previous turn, through the use of non-minimal post-expansions "the local ones are completely identical?". The process of rephrasing S3's utterances and offering a new referential question is used to signal to S3 that further discussion of her idea is expected to meet the pedagogical agenda set in line 6. S3 provides a short direct response, which the lecturer again scaffolds by initiating another question to seek further output from S3. S3 provides an extended second pair part that is accompanied by laughter to signal that the application did not add a lot to the original international practice. The lecturer repeats the reshaping of S3's response by inserting expansion in form of an adjacency pair requesting clarification from the lecturer.

The distribution of turns and cooperative organization of the sequence of interaction in the extract above demonstrates, I would argue, how sharing the turn space, along with the lecturer's ability to monitor students' contributions, can lead not only to the continuity of the

interactional episode but also create opportunities, as seen above, for students to participate in the interaction.

Extract 18: Participant C,Improving and Developing the Small Businesses

1. T: we all have wonderful ideas to develop the small (.) and start up business but the
2. most important question is (.) how operate thes::e ideas without risking the
3. Achievement we already accomplished. Um Wh:haat is your thoughts on achieving
4. this balance?(.)
5. S5: that's would be I aha think the key to: keep going
6. S2: the we do'nt
7. T: exactly but lets think of ways that can help doing so(.) the idea of doing sales for
8. Example? if you are a business that just start to make good profits (.) isn't really good
9. idea right
10. S5: I have an example teacher
11. T: yes=
12. S5: =you know that shop ((a name of local cookies shop)) (0.2)I think they started
13. really Well but I believe they o::ver doing stuff on social media tha'at draw a rea:lly
14. negative attention
15. T: YES (.) again (.)we said before your need well wrapped marketing strategies so::
16. yes Goo::d example and we: do see that a lot even outside food industry
17. S: true I remember a delivery company who used to: be great and when they become
18. so:: bad when they grow bigger.
19. T: excellent point , expanding the business should be planned right and timed right or
20. it may do more harm than good
21. S: even teacher . when you are ready with th'a resources
22. T: even if you are ready financially (.) other elements like >>establishing customers
23. trust can take time right
24. S: yes (0.4) for me personally ahhha I like things that already have good reputation.
25. T: absolutely (.) and we will talk about the importance of customers and their opinions later on

In the extract above by participant C, the lecturer scaffolds multiple turns of her students as she is keen to learn about the students' experiences taking risks as small business owners. The episode begins with a referential question by the lecturer who took her time to listen to the students' contributions. In the IRF cycle, the lecturers occupies the F position as a facilitators of the interaction as she scaffolds nearly each of S5 turns. Rephrasing S5 utterance in line 5 and adding another ideas to expand the sequences, allow for extended learner turns by S5 in lines (10,12,17,18). It has been noticed that dealing with S5 contributions often starts with stressed conformational markers such as (exactly, yes, excellent point, absolutely) which have a positive effect on the turn-taking. S5 seems to continue joining the turn-taking which might indicates that roles in this discussion is more equal to the lecturer. Contributions are welcomed and access to the on-going discussion is

open. The use of these markers could also indicate that the lecturer awareness as changing as opposite to what has been explained in extracts taken from the first phase.

6.6 Lecturers' Perspectives of the Effect of Using SETT on their Interaction:

6.6.1 Lack of Language Policy for Faculty Members:

One of the main topics covered in the interviews is the language policy regarding the use of EMI in academic lectures. It was found that faculty members have been told to teach the modules in English orally and when given the syllabus of the modules it was all in English. However, that was never clearly discussed within their academic department. There was a sense of frustration among the interviewees. One participant commented:

'I had no clue what exactly they want us to do (.) like all of us lecturers and professors to teach with English language umm all we knew that it is important to them because you know most students will need it after graduation in work and of course so the university be like recognized internationally (.) but to be honest (.)I have no idea what they expect from me or my students but I do my best (.) I found my own way that both me and my students are comfortable and if it doesn't match what they have in mind then I have no clue.'

The view in the above extract can also be spotted in the other interviews. The concerns expressed by the participant above show that a faculty member is more likely to be fully aware of the importance of employing EMI in her lectures but has different assumptions about the purpose of employing it. Furthermore, she, like others, is left without guidance on how their department requires them to carry the process of employing EMI.

6.6.2 The Impact of Raising Faculty Members' Awareness of their Interactional Practice:

6.6.2.1 Recognition of Interactional Role:

A recurrent theme in the interviews was a sense amongst interviewees that using SETT has helped them to realize the role that they, as instructors, play in the interaction. As one interviewee put it:

'It is amazing to figure out the weight of me talking a certain way in making the discussions and (.) I literally used to blame my students all the time in my head for not sharing and discussing any topic I really, really love to hear their opinion and to know that I can use my position to encourage them in indirect ways is really helpful to look at things differently because I truly love to hear them go like in

deep discussions and that's what entrepreneurship is all about it is about sharing and developing new ideas with others.'

The comment above illustrates that the participant feels that amendment of her talk, especially during discussions, allows her to recognize the significant part she can play in the interaction. That realization has led her to sympathize more with her students and be willing to help, using her role as an instructor when the discussions are kept very simple and less interactive.

Another interviewee alluded to the same notion and commented:

'I always like to develop as a teacher to make sure that I am doing my job properly (.) I like the fact that you know that is something I normally would not feel responsible to deal with (.) we have so much on our heads as teachers but it is nice to also be focused on the way I speak during the lecture to know that this is also important and that I can use to help me do my job better.'

Interestingly, the above participant felt that examining her interaction in the lecture opened her eyes to another responsibility and added to her role as an instructor. Having accepted the importance of her role in the interaction she is now willing to use it to improve her teaching approach.

6.6.2.2 Acknowledgement of Interactional Barriers

When asked about the positive aspects of using SETT while listening to their lecture recordings, the participants agreed that it was useful as they learn more about the factors that obstruct their interaction with their students. In one case, the participant thought that:

'To me, it is like a surprise, I never thought I kept turning my students down with interruptions it was like I am hearing someone else talking I barely was able to catch a breath just talking and talking.'

SETT has helped the participant to spot an interactional practice where she admits using interruptions without being aware of its effect on her students. Similarly, in another interview, Participant B said:

'The most useful part is knowing the things I do without being conscious (.) the type of replies to my students' questions was so different because you can listen to them and how it leads to confusion or misunderstanding.'

Participant B has expressed her ability to find answers from using SETT to her students' confusion.

6.6.2.3 Creating Interactional Opportunities

While reflective practice allows the lecturers to see repetitive patterns that affect the continuity of interaction, it also allows them to spot possible interactional opportunities.

'I find it useful that SETT taught me to ask the same question in different ways and listen to different points of view.'

'Being able to learn to give my students time sometimes to understand my questions without making pressure to talk immediately, I sometimes pretend to look for my pen so they can have a few seconds to think without being rushed.'

Another participant also thought that:

'It is strange to listen to yourself but it also feels good because you can keep track of your progress like what we do with our students (.) I mean, I was proud of myself because I know now that there is an appropriate point where discussions can be kept going and going without me saying something or sending the impression that I am judging the student who's talking (.) I find it more helpful to just consider letting things explain themselves'

Similarly, another participant mentioned:

'I observed that many of students are in need for attention while, for example, finding resources.'

It was pointed out by many interviewees that students' needs should be met by paying attention during discussion and sometimes episodes of interaction need some work to be developed to achieve pedagogical goals.

6.6.2.4 The Conflicting Relationship between the Lecturer's Time and Interaction

Raising awareness among the faculty members about the role of interaction in the teaching and learning process has also created a different conflict. Concerns regarding a conflict between time and creating and sustaining interactive opportunities were commonly expressed by the interviewees. One interviewee argued that:

'Sometimes I limit those discussions and debates even though I know they are very important and the students like it but when you have fifty minutes to cover a certain chapter I don't think you can always do it.'

This view was echoed by another participant who expressed her concern about the possibility of losing time:

'It actually stresses me out sometimes because I simply do not have enough time to start a discussion but I could especially in those lectures towards the end of the term.'

The above extracts are evidence of the difficulties faculty members face when trying to find the balance between creating interactional opportunities and managing the time of the lecture. The fact that they acknowledge the importance of the interactive episodes in the lectures for the participants, and yet they are hesitant to allow these interactive sessions to

be established or continued seems to reflect a tricky struggle. Their main concern is the negative impact of following up on their weekly syllabus.

7 Discussion

7.1 Introduction:

This chapter concentrates on gaining insights into interaction practices within the context of EMI in business lectures in Saudi Arabia. The findings attained from the empirical research approach of this study fill a gap in research into EMI in Saudi Arabia with regard to interaction within lectures. The work in this thesis expands our understanding of the various aspects of interactive sessions in EMI business classrooms in Saudi Arabia. In this chapter, the characteristics of interactional practice in EMI lectures are discussed first to highlight the findings of the first phase data and provide an overview of EMI interactional practice to reveal how the data analysis makes new contributions in this specific field. The impact of using SETT to investigate the research questions has led to critical theoretical and pedagogical implications in the EMI context. This discussion is concerned with those practical implications that could influence lecturers' practice in the EMI context in Saudi Arabia. In addition, methodological implications are discussed in the final part of this chapter in relation to the usefulness of SETT and CA as tools to attain helpful insights in the EMI context.

7.2 The Characteristics of Interactional Practice in EMI Business Lectures:

One of the main goals of this thesis is to provide a review of the overall pattern of interactions within EMI business lectures before discussing the implications in the following sections. Examining the interactions within EMI classrooms in the Saudi context is under-researched as clarified in the literature review in Chapter 2. Many researchers have highlighted different problematic aspects of implementing EMI considering different variables to describe the attitudes and perspectives of instructors and students without exploring the ''practice'' itself (Alabdaly, 2012; Alkahtany et al., 2016; Almengash, 2006). The findings attained from the data in this thesis explore the interactional practice within EMI and provide an overview of how lecturers and students use English to construct sequences of interaction. Therefore, it is necessary, before exploring the effect of reflective practice, to describe the interactional context within EMI lectures. It is also necessary to keep in mind that interaction is looked at in an institutional setting (Heritage, 1997; 2004). Therefore, the analysis explores talk-in-interaction in the context of the institution's goals.

In EMI business lectures, the main goals of the lecturer are teaching the content subject and developing the students' second language in terms of semantic, syntactic, and

interactional competence. The nature of the lectures' topics requires discussions and debates.

Therefore, the analysis aims to explain in further detail how the relationship between language and pedagogical goals is displayed in EMI business lectures. As mentioned in the methodology chapter, the data was collected in two different phases. In the first phase, the data was collected without introducing the SETT framework to the lecturer, while in the second phase the data was collected after familiarising the lecturers with how to use the SETT framework to examine their own interactional choices. Hence, the amount of teacher talk and student talk varies in each phase. The management of turn-taking and other features of interaction are displayed differently in each phase. It can be described generally that talk-in-interaction in the first phase was mostly dominated by lecturer-fronted interaction even though there were a few examples in which turn-taking reflected interactional practices within student-centred classrooms. The approach faculty members adopted to deliver the content knowledge was the forcefully controlled one, which influenced the pattern of interactional sequences and the organisation of turn-taking. Data shows that lecturers hold on to their right to manage the turn-taking mechanism in their classes. Even when the pedagogical goals value discussion and eliciting different points of view regarding a topic, students' contributions were relatively limited and most of the time interrupted. The interactions unfolded through the use of a tight question-answer routine that typically used lots of display questions. A gap between the use of interactional features and the achievement of pedagogical goals limited students' opportunities to participate or fully express themselves in a complete TCU. On the other hand, the majority of repair and feedback cases seemed to have been delivered in a more direct manner, which discourages the continuity of interaction between lecturers and students. The most interesting aspect concerns the role played by L1 in the lectures and its unique effect on the interactional process as an essential aspect of EMI business lecturers. While the findings of the first phase contribute to our understanding of interactions in the EMI context, the findings of the second phase identified how interactional features hinder or facilitate interaction. It is the use of SETT that influenced lecturers to be ready to make changes in the way they use language to serve their pedagogical goals. Therefore, the next section presents the interactional features that hinder and facilitate interaction.

7.3 Identifying Interactional Features that Hinder Interaction versus Interactional Features that Facilitate Interaction in EMI Business Lectures:

By the application of both CA and SETT, it is well established that there is a gap between the intended pedagogical goals and language. This gap is specifically marked in terms of the ways the lecturers try to meet their goals. After having examined and described interaction in EMI in the first phase before introducing SETT to the lecturers, interactional features such as interruption, direct repair, and turn completion appear to be obstructing interaction. The high frequency with which these features were applied when the pedagogical goal was related to the skills and systems mode in SETT affected the interactions negatively. On the other hand, features that seemed to have a positive impact on facilitating interaction were highlighted in the second phase. When lecturers gained awareness about their interactional practices, features like scaffolding, content-feedback, extended wait-time, referential questions, seeking clarification, and extended learners' turns showed significant increases. When CA is applied, claims about the relationship between the usage of these features and lecturers and students involvement in interaction are more valid. In EMI classrooms, it can be claimed that these features are facilitative of interaction and can develop the interactional competence of both faculty members and students in the same way that they have helped language teachers improve their interactional competence (Dippold, 2013; Masuda, 2009; Walsh, 2011). It is not difficult to argue that where features reached their minimal employment, interactional opportunities increased and the classroom interactions assumed a conversational dimension.

The core objective was to make the learner well equipped with language so that necessary expressions, views, and attitudes could be presented in the interactive sessions. However, this goal was not met in many cases. For instance, when Participant A was leading an interactive session on the decision-making process, the involvement of the students appeared not very strong. During interviews, the lecturer agreed that though the participations were tremendously active, the pedagogical goals of eliciting students' views and ideas were not met. The reason was clear from the SETT results, where the lecturer detected that the contributions of the students were active, yet the lecturer was not trying to loop all their responses back into the interaction. There was a need for eliciting specific content information at the end of the interaction session. This information was to be delivered by the lecturer. As the lecturer could not deliver that, the pedagogical goal was not met. The results also highlight that there is a need for post-expansion sessions which can facilitate the scope of scaffolding to create better understanding opportunities for the students and thereby generate expanded turn-taking for developing the interactive sessions. It is important that the

scope of interactive sessions becomes expanded and is not limited to some rigid criteria. However, the responsibility of the lecturer lies in looping the discussions to the respective topic at regular intervals during the interactive sessions.

The results attained refer to the fact that the inclusion of interactive modes of teaching can be effective in developing the integration of language learning and the development of subject knowledge. However, this is a practice that must be co-constructed by the lecturers and the students of EMI classrooms (Edwards & Westgate, 1987; Walsh, 2006). With the least scope for interruptions, such implementation of EMI can bring better scope for achieving the pedagogical goals of the syllabus. The lecturers have realised through SETT that they need to have enhanced interactional competence to generate appropriate ways to meet learning needs rather than just delivering lectures.

7.4 Pedagogical Implications in the EMI Context:

As the researcher used the primary research approach to understand the lectures delivered by the business faculties in the EMI context, the application of SETT appears to be very effective and has led to pedagogical implications that could influence lecturers' practice. As stated in the literature, the implementation process of EMI has been challenged around the globe. On the interactional level, identifying the challenges is important to facilitate the process of implementing and achieving what EMI hopes to achieve. SETT provides sensible support to lecturers. The present research shows that the implications in the context of EMI at the undergraduate level could support both the students and the lecturers. The lecturers can follow SETT regularly and develop better ways to manage interactive sessions in the EMI classroom. SETT is not only a useful tool for spotting areas of interaction to be improved but also helps to confirm beliefs that particular areas are problematic. Findings from the quantitative and qualitative analysis agree with this view by illustrating how lecturers were often shocked by their interactional choices. This is an effective way of improving the learning process as it is a data-driven approach (Johns, 1991). The lecturers can record their interactive sessions and scrutinize them objectively. As they detect the challenges and factors that are restricting their students from participating, they will be able to modify their teaching methods. Although the participation of the students in some level of interaction is mandatory, they were restricted by the ways in which the lecturers handled interactions, and their contributions were challenged in order to practice and negotiate in an EMI context. As the researcher used the SETT framework with non-language lecturers, it is notable that the most beneficial results concerned gaining insights into the EMI interactive practices that hinder or facilitate the participation of students. The research established that there are

elements that hinder interaction in the interactive sessions between the lecturers and the students as mentioned above. For example, the most notable restraint has been identified in cases of interruptions and the lack of wait-time offered by the lecturers to allow the students to take time to compose their thoughts and express themselves in English. From self-reflection attained through SETT, it is clear that interruptions are initiated by the lecturers and need to be employed at a much lower rate, findings that were confirmed by further analysis from phase two. SETT offers a powerful tool to explore these unconscious interactive decisions and gives the lecturers the accountability to adjust their language to meet the pedagogical goals of the lecture. There was also a lack of participation from the students as the lecturers seemed to dominate the interactive sessions. Such limitations and restrictions in the pedagogical system appeared to be the most noted hindrance in the engagement of the students in interaction in the EMI context. The findings show that the instructors changed the ways in which they interacted with their students after being able to reflect on their practice. For example, learners' turns increased after lecturers reflected on their practice. Lecturers are convinced that there is a need to develop a better teaching process based on self-reflection. The research results also show that the time limits for lectures and interactive sessions are also responsible for rushing the lecturers' delivery. As stated by Lake (2001) and Huxham (2003), having adequate time to deliver lectures and discuss topics with students greatly improves learning outcomes from the teaching process. In this case, wait-time appeared to be the most effective measure to put less pressure on the lecturer and give them room to facilitate interactional opportunities for students, leading towards more participation in the interaction space. In addition, the frequency of interactional features changed over time and the stimulated recall interviews showed the role of awareness in directing interactional choices in the EMI context. Elements that helped to raise awareness included the lecturers using SETT to identify interactional challenges and make conscious decisions to increase or decrease features of interaction that helped them to minimize the gap between the pedagogical goal and the interactional features. As such, involvement, engagement, and interactivity can be enhanced by considering SETT for the lecturers within the EMI context and conducting further research on other critical interactional aspects in Saudi Arabia and other countries.

Following the reflective practice modules under the SETT framework, it is strongly recommended that similar education EMI contexts in Saudi Arabia could advise their staff to adopt a version of the SETT framework in their lectures and take ownership of enhancing their own interactional practice. As the lecturers listen to recordings of their own lectures, they will be able to identify the points where the students are restricted in their interactions, especially when the pedagogical goals entail expanding discussion and debates. Thus, the

lecturers will come to know that they are often producing language while implementing EMI in their lectures, which hampers the learning process of the students. The use of this framework encourages the lecturers to modify their interactional choices and allow more participation space for the students.

Training programmes based on SETT can help to provide lecturers with support. One of the essential implications of the present research that agrees with much of the previous research in this field is the need to provide lecturers with clear implementation plans for EMI as well as guided training programmes. Data analysis of the lecturers' extracts shows that training sessions can be designed under the SETT framework to add great benefits to the interactive sessions in the EMI context. Raising awareness can be more helpful when focusing on context-specific interactional challenges. The core realisations of the lecturers can help them to employ better teaching techniques and interactive strategies to increase student participation. Significant modifications when implementing EMI can be made by working on enhancing the interactional competence of lecturers through training sessions guided by the SETT framework to generate better learning and understanding of the higher education environment in Saudi Arabia.

7.5 Methodological Implications:

The procedures applied in this research to critically explore interactions in EMI classrooms suggest that class interaction can benefit from combining SETT and CA to take a deeper look into interactional practices. The combined use of CA and SETT in this study appeared to be a very effective way of gaining insights into the interactional practices adopted by EMI lecturers. On a wider scale, CA led to the context of analysing the relevance of the IRF cycle. Previous research has noted that the IRF interactive cycle can become extremely complicated if it is not addressed at the micro-level of any interaction (Garton, 2012). Contexts like EMI, can benefit from employing CA to look into these complex contexts of interactions. At the university level, EMI contexts have both monologic streatch of talks as well as interactive episodes of interaction. CA can demostrate the different pattrens of talk within EMI. Findings suggests that CA is a valuable tool investigate turn-takings, repair, and sequence of orgnization. However, regarding the classroom interactive sessions, Walsh (2011) specified that as teachers need material that look into the micro-level conversations within the classroom interactions and the complicated IRF in the light of the pedgogical goals. It is in that context that this study used the research methodology of implementing CA along with the SETT framework with the EMI lecturers. Similar results were found in the research conducted by Poorebrahim and his fellow researchers (2015) when conducting a quantitative analysis of Iranian classrooms using the SETT framework. In their study, they

found that the SETT framework was a very helpful way to gain insights into the relationship between the interactional features of teacher talk and students' contributions. The outcomes of the present study agree with the previous findings from the Iranian context. There are many features that help this study to make claims about lecturer talk. The frequency applied by using SETT is an informative way to track changes in interaction. Using this alongside CA led to a deeper understanding. For example, according to Participant A, as she introduced the topic about the factors that lead to good teamwork as part of business management, there was adequate enthusiasm among the students. Before going into the details of the topic, the lecturer asked the students to brainstorm their experiences as team members. They were asked to analyse examples of teamwork where they were unable to achieve success. The reasons for the failures of these teams were subject to a lack of wait-time with almost no cases of it noticed during the interaction. Students seemed to be excited to share their experiences with the rest of the class. However, when the session was in action, the participation of students was very minimal. There seemed to be the least expressions as the students were asked to elaborate on those factors related to their teams. Expressing their experiences fully was going to take much more time than expected according to the teacher. As a result, the lecturer started to pay no attention to most of the students who were unable to compose and express their experiences. Based on CA and SETT, the lecturers could realise that they were randomly ignoring many students. Thus CA and SETT highlight that although the relationships between the lecturers and the students are very positive, these positive relationships were not helping the former to lead a 'talk and learn' pedagogical environment. To resolve this particular aspect, there is a need to observe and track the lecturers' talk in different contexts like EMI.

8 Conclusion

8.1 Introduction:

The core purpose of this chapter is to declare the research findings and explain the arguments that determine the understandings related to the interaction in EMI lectures in higher education in Saudi Arabia. This chapter concludes the entire research process, which includes the conclusive understandings attained from the literature review and the results obtained from the primary sources. This chapter offers the study summary, followed by the contributions and the implications of the research in the selected domain by understanding the ways through which the SETT framework identified the interactional challenges faced in the university lectures. These academic challenges were noted in relation to the use of EMI by the faculty members and the concerns were detected through the SETT framework and conversation analysis. Lastly, the possibilities of observing other interactional practices in EMI in Saudi Arabia and the scope for promoting interactive sessions among the lecturers and the students in academic settings are recommended as subjects for future research.

8.2 Summary of the Study:

As has been mentioned in the literature review, previous research in the context of Saudi have followed similar methodological orientations to describe the final products of teachers and students' language competencies in EMI lectures, overlooking the different phases that they go through to communicate meaning. It is hoped that providing a different methodological approach by using conversation analysis with Walsh's (2006) SETT framework can influence the practice in EMI classrooms in Saudi Arabia which, as illustrated in the literature, needs evidence-based research to be of assistance to EMI instructors.

A considerable literature has grown up around interaction in English as a second language (ESL) settings. On the other hand, content-based instruction (CBI) has received little attention in comparison to research on ESL, especially in lectures where many assume that interaction is limited due to the fact that it reflects monologic discourse. Interaction in lectures can take a variety of structures and patterns based on different aspects that include the language being used, the teaching approach being adopted, and the discipline being taught. Therefore, it is crucial to examine these elements in the context of EMI business lectures in detail to understand the role and effect of interaction in university classrooms. While different aspects of EMI classrooms have been investigated, social interaction is under-researched.

Evidence suggests that teacher talk and different interactive practices have a great role in promoting or obstructing learners' contributions to the lecture discourse.

In addition, the methodological approach adopted in this study shows that combining SETT with conversation analysis is beneficial in terms of revealing aspects of the interaction in EMI business lectures that we know little about. The SETT framework provided quantitative evidence in this study that was able to acknowledge the dynamic nature of interactional features in EMI lectures in response to different pedagogical goals. For instance, the material mode in the SETT framework is demonstrated if the teacher's pedagogical goal is to provide a practice around a piece of material and the predominant use of IRF should be noted. Hence, it is easier to spot these interactional features and categorize them independently. Conversation analysis, on the other hand, acknowledges the different dynamics of interactional features within a sequence of the interaction but rarely focuses on investigating them as an independent component of the interaction. It makes sense that conversation analysis is not capable of doing that because its main principles include approaching data with an unmotivated eye, covering a large amount of data, and letting the analysis guide the researcher’s examination of the phenomenon being questioned in the research question (Ten Have, 2007). I think that using SETT with pre-defined interactional features and pedagogical goals have helped the researcher to not only select relevant extracts to be presented but also take a closer look at how different interactional features operate in a large data corpus.

8.3 Contribution in Relation to the Study Findings:

The major contribution that this research offers is examining the interactional architecture of EMI lectures in Saudi Arabian Higher Education. In relation to the findings of this study, the major contributions of this research concern identifying the interactional difficulties and complications that lecturers in Saudi Arabia are facing in terms of implementing EMI. As this research examines the interactional architecture of EMI lectures in Saudi Arabia, it reveals that no former researcher has explored this domain. The methodological approach in this study is unique and the design was informed by previous recent literature, borrowing tools from ESL research to investigate interaction. The main reason behind adopting and developing a research methodology that is an amalgamation of CA and the SETT framework is the absence of a methodological framework that can influence interactional practices in EMI. This is an innovative way of understanding classroom interactions through the use of qualitative and quantitative tools. The exceptional inclusion of SETT in CA is also effective in generating precise categorical information about the challenges of EMI in the higher education system of Saudi Arabia.

Based on CA and the SETT framework over the recordings of eighteen lectures, this research demonstrates that the interactional practices in Saudi Arabian higher education comprise some concerning practices. The academic faculties in the business classroom are using EMI with some practices that hinder interaction. The results attained from the SETT framework with the lecturers clarified that the lecturers could have used interactional features that coincide with pedagogical goals. There is also the need to modify the way that pedagogical goals are delivered through the use of the appropriate form of interactional features. This research hereby looked into these aspects and noted that necessary training sessions for the faculty members to promote further forms of lecturer-student meaningful interaction would increase opportunities for student participation.

The research can be focused on the implications of the application of SETT. In the research, I have tested and developed a methodological approach that combines theory and practice. This study helps to test frameworks such as SETT, which were originally informed theoretically by conversation analysis, in a new context: EMI.

SETT offers a helpful tool that can be put immediately into practice, which is something that previous research in the context of Saudi Arabia needed. It empowers practitioners by giving them tools that can be used flexibly in their own time to encourage them to identify the practices in interaction that might limit students' participation. SETT confirms that it can explore different areas of interaction within university lectures and identify what elements of interaction are valuable in terms of promoting interactive discussions with students.

The SETT framework can offer relevant results as a tool given to the lecturers to reflect on their own practice. Through such reflection, the lecturers realize some of the challenging practices in the delivery of their lectures. The researcher noted that the lecturers used rapid interactional patterns in EMI when delivering their lectures. They are usually rushing into the topic and are delivering the concepts at a much faster pace. Interruptive patterns and lack of wait time have led to challenges in terms of engaging the students in the interaction. From the classroom discourse, they also noted that the students are unable to respond to their queries as they are not giving much time to the student to compose answers. It also leads to a lack of transparency in displaying their understanding of intellectual ideas. Such realizations are very effective in developing the future lecture delivering practices of the academic faculties in the business lectures. From the SETT framework, this research identifies that there are severe restrictions noted in terms of the interactional competence between the lecturers and the students. In most cases, the students are unable to make valuable contributions to negotiate meaning with their lecturers.

Eventually, the contribution of this study is of great relevance to the process of considering the effective implementation of EMI in the higher education system of Saudi Arabia as this study offers perceptions attained from the faculties in the context of Saudi universities regarding the impact of using SETT on interaction. The derivations established that in the process of classroom interaction more time and emphasis should be bestowed upon bridging the gap between the pedagogical goals of the teaching and learning and the interactional practice of the lecturers. This study finds that there is a need to encourage the students to actively participate in the developmental process of the topic. In doing so, it is the responsibility of the lecturer to maintain interactional space and create interactional opportunities through feedback. The findings of this study contribute towards identifying the need to add proper English training and teaching programmes based on the SETT framework for teachers in the higher education system in Saudi Arabia.

8.4 Limitations of the Study:

Like any other research work, this study has some inevitable limitations. The foremost limitation is its sample size of three lecturers. A larger cohort of lecturers needs to be examined to analyze the interactive sessions within classrooms through EMI in the universities of Saudi Arabia. Owing to limitations of resources and time, this study covered only a small sample of three instructors. The research has been developed within the limited context of one university in Saudi Arabia, which does not target the entire higher education system of the nation. Since the sample size is very small, it is difficult to generalize the results and to be assured that the stated implications will be effective in all kinds of lecture interactions. There is a need to assess more faculty members to gain proper information regarding the understanding of interactive challenges in EMI lectures among university students.

The second limitation of this research is its restricted mode of meeting results in relation to universities rather than higher education in general. This limitation restricts this study when it comes to generalizing the results of the research to the whole context of managing the usage of EFL programmes in the higher education of the nation.

There is the need to develop a comparative research provision whereby the higher education of Saudi Arabia could be compared with the higher education of other economically developed nations. However, due to time constraints, such comparative assessments were not made part of this research approach, hence that is one of the major limitations of this study.

The last limitation of this research is the socio-cultural restrictions of Saudi Arabia that do not permit video recording inside the classroom. Such restrictions are maintained in the university classrooms, as they comprise female students who do not wish for any video recording. This limitation restricted the researcher from keeping note of various multimodalities of classrooms that include different types of gestures like body language and the facial expressions of the lecturers while delivering their lecturers to the students.

8.5 Recommendations for Further Studies:

This research attempts to influence the practices of EMI in higher education as an effective mode of creating global appeal and scope for further research in the international arena for Saudi Arabian higher education students. The notable recommendations are:

It is highly recommended that designing and implementing training programmes based on the current methodology of amalgamating CA with the SETT framework should be highly encouraged by future researchers. As this methodology is very transparent and robust in finding the obstacles in the interactive episodes between the lecturers and the students while using EMI in the classroom, it should be applied by different academic faculty members in the universities of Saudi Arabia. In addition, many similar contexts, like content and language integrated learning (CLIL), integrating content and language in higher education (ICLHE) and English medium education in multilingual university settings (EMEMUS), can benefit from analysing classroom interaction through the use of SETT because most of them lack professional developmental frameworks.

In order to expand the framework, which was originally established to be representative rather than comprehensive in terms of identifying interactional features in language classrooms, future research can evaluate and suggest amendments based on the requirements of the new context. Aspects such as the skills and systems mode in the framework can benefit from amendments because the pedagogical goals of different disciplines and different educational approaches are different.

The second recommendation is to suggest that in future research there is the need to include the perspectives of the students from higher education in Saudi Arabia. It is important to understand the role of interaction and the effect of the reflective frameworks used by lecturers from the point of view of the students. Additionally, a comparative study between the perspectives of the students and lecturers can bring in great transparency and deeper insights into the subject, creating scoping for reformation in the way that faculty members interact in EMI in the higher education classrooms of Saudi Arabia. In addition, it would be

very interesting to look into variations between students and lecturers' perspectives and variations between lecturers from different disciplines.

The next recommendation is about future comparative research on the same EMI setting within Saudi Arabia but for a longer duration. As this study has been accomplished in one academic semester, it would be very effective if the same can be extended to a duration of a year or more. The objective will remain consistent in terms of recording the effects of using SETT with the lecturers and the possible benefits and challenges related to the same. The changes and the results for a longer duration of studying lecturer-student interaction can reveal various findings regarding the interactional activities of EMI in the higher education lectures in Saudi Arabia.

In order to extend the applicability of the results of this study, it is recommended that a larger sample should be examined. Because of the limitations of resources and time, this study covered only a small sample of lectures in the context of Saudi. In the absence of a large language corpus in Saudi, it is recommended to carry out future research that includes a large number of participants to provide a more comprehensive overview of what is happening in the context of EMI in the Middle East.

Appendix A

Transcription Conventions:

Adapted from Jefferson (2004)

SYMBOL	DESCRIPTION
(.)	A micropause - a pause of no significant length.
(0.7)	A timed pause - long enough to indicate a time.
[ ]	Square brackets show to indicate overlaps.
> <	Arrows showing that the pace of speech has quickened.
< >	Arrows showing that the pace of the speech has slowed down.
( )	Unclear section.
(( ))	An entry requiring comment but without a symbol to explain it.
Underlining	Denotes a raise in volume or emphasis.
↑	Sharp rise in intonation
↓	Drop in intonation
CAPITALS	Louder or shouted words.
(h)	Laughter in the conversation/speech.
=	Will be at the end of one sentence and the start of the next. It indicates that there was no pause between them.
: : :	Colons - indicate a stretched sound.
?	Rise in intonation, question inflection but not necessarily a question.
,	Rising continuation indicating continuation.

Appendix B

Asma Almuaawi

Phone: 07492422030

Email: A.M.D.Almuaawi@pgr.reading.ac.uk

Department of English Language and Applied Linguistics

HumSS Building

The University of Reading

Whiteknights, PO Box 218

INFORMATION SHEET

Interactional practice is an important aspect of EMI classrooms. Lecture-student interaction is an important aspect of learning and teaching. Consequently, Interactional is a necessary tool for the learning process, especially in language classrooms. While many scholars in this field have focused on the role of the learners in their discourse, little attention has been given to the role of the teacher in the construction of the interaction and the manner in which interaction is displayed and maintained in the context of English as a medium of instruction (EMI).

My objective from this study is to examine interactional practice of faculty members and students and what could influence their full engagement in the academic discourse regardless of their L2 proficiency. Data will be collected from different participants in Saudi Arabia. Data collection will include both audio-recording of lecture sessions as well as interviews of faculty members (professors and lectures) and undergraduate students from a university in Saudi Arabia. To do so I would be seeking to record lectures that is conducted through the use of English. I will first collect audio-recorded data from lectures and focus on extracts that involve interaction between students and faculty members. After the selection of some extracts, data will be transcribed and analyzed. In the next phase, I will organize audio-recorded interviews with faculty members to be asked about Interactional competence in their lectures and what challenge their practice. In addition, students will also be interviewed to be asked about using English and what challenge their involvement and participation during lectures.

All the data will be stored securely on a password protected laptop or a locked drawer for the period of three years in the School of Literature and Languages. The Data will be treated confidentially and will be destroyed after this time. Data will only be used for academic purposes by Asma Almuaawi, her supervisor Dr. Tony Capstick, Faculty members, and the

examiners. Participants will remain anonymous and no reference will be made to their identity throughout the project. Participants can withdraw from the study at any time by contacting the researcher, and are free to ask for their data to be removed if they feel the need to do so.

This project has been subject to ethical review by the School Ethics Committee, and has been allowed to proceed under the exceptions procedure as outlined in paragraph 6 of the University's *Notes for Guidance* on research ethics.

If you have any queries or wish to clarify anything about the study, please feel free to contact my supervisor at the address above or by email at [include supervisor's email address here]

Signe

School of Literature and Languages
Department of English Language and Applied Linguistics

University of Reading

Appendix C

ETHICS COMMITTEE

Consent Form

Project title: Interaction in EMI Business Interactive Lecture: An Investigation of the Effects of Reflective Practice on Interactional Competence in Saudi Arabia

I understand the purpose of this research and understand what is required of me; I have read and understood the Information Sheet relating to this project, which has been explained to me by Asma Almuaawi. I agree to the arrangements described in the Information Sheet in so far as they relate to my participation.

I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary and that I have the right to withdraw from the project at any time.

I have received a copy of this Consent Form and of the accompanying Information Sheet.

Name:

Signed:

Date:

Appendix D:

SETT: Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk

Procedure:

1. I will collect data from your lecture and then provide you with a transcription of that data. Listen to a part of the Lecture involving both you and your learners. You don't have to start at the beginning of the lecture; choose any segments you like.

2. As soon as possible after the lecture , listen to the tape. The purpose of the first listening is to analyze the extract according to classroom context or **mode**. As you listen the first time, decide which modes are in operation. Choose from the following:

(1) Skills and systems mode (main focus is on particular skills or information related to the subject of Business)
(2) Managerial mode (main focus is on setting up an activity);
(3) Classroom context mode (main focus is on eliciting feelings, attitudes and Views of learners);
(4) Materials mode (main focus is on the use of text, tape or other materials)

3. Listen to the recordings a second time, using the SETT instrument to keep a tally of the different features of your teacher talk. Write down examples of the features you identify. If you're not sure about a particular feature, use the SETT key (attached) to help you.

4. Evaluate your talk in the light of your overall pedagogical aims and modes used. To what extent do you think that your use of language and pedagogic purpose coincided? That is, how appropriate was your use of language in this extract, bearing in mind your stated aims and the modes operating?

5. The final stage is a feedback interview with me where I will also go over areas of interest from recordings of the data relating to interaction to discuss with you have selected. Please bring the completed SETT instrument with you.

Appendix E

SETT: Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk
Lesson Cover Sheet

A. Lesson Details

- Name:
- Course:
- Level (To which year in the Undergraduate this course is usually given) :
- Date:
- Overall aim:
- Age:
- Material:

B. b. Lesson modes identified

C. Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk

Evaluate your teacher talk in the light of your overall pedagogical aims and modes used. To what extent do you think that your use of language and pedagogic purpose coincided? That is, how appropriate was your use of language in this segment, bearing in mind your stated aims and the modes operating? Continue on the next page if necessary.

Appendix F

SETT : Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk key

FEATURE OF TEACHER TALK	DESCRIPTION
A. Scaffolding	1. Reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution) 2. Extension (extending a learner's contribution) 3. Modelling (providing an example for learner(s)
B. Direct repair	Correcting an error quickly and directly.
C. Content feedback	Giving feedback to the message rather than the words used.
D. Extended wait-time	Allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for students to respond or formulate a response.
E. Referential questions	Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer.
F. Seeking clarification	1. Teacher asks a student to clarify something the student has said. 2. Student asks teacher to clarify something the teacher has said.
G. Extended learner turn	Learner turn of more than one utterance.
H. Teacher echo	1. Teacher repeats teacher's previous utterance. 2. Teacher repeats a learner's contribution.
I. Teacher interruptions	Interrupting a learner's contribution.

J. Extended teacher turn	Teacher turn of more than one utterance.
K. Turn completion	Completing a learner's contribution for the learner.
L. Display questions	Asking questions to which the teacher knows the answer.
M. Form-focused feedback	Giving feedback on the words used, not the message.

Appendix F:

SETT: Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk

FEATURE OF TEACHER TALK	EXAMPLE FROM YOUR RECORDINGS
A. Scaffolding	
B. Direct repair	
C. Content feedback	
D. Extended wait-time	
E. Referential questions	
F. Seeking clarification	

G. Extended learner turn	
H. Teacher echo	
I. Teacher interruptions	
J. Extended teacher turn	
K. Turn completion	
L. Display questions	
M. Form-focused feedback	

Appendix G:

Interview Guided Questions for Semi-Structured interviews:

Opening:

My name is _____ and I am a PhD student at the University of Reading. I would like to ask you some questions about your background, your education,

And your experience as a lecturer.

The interview should take about 10 minutes. Are you available to respond to some questions at this time?

EMI:

-What is the institution's policy on using EMI by academics?

-What is your opinion towards :

-using EMI?

-your institution's policy implementing EMI?

-Were you provided with any institutional support/ training on using EMI?

-Does using EMI affect you as a teacher or your students in term of

-lecture delivery?

-students' contribution during the lecture?

-How can these issues be addressed in your opinion?

Using SETT:

What do you think of interactive mode of teaching and learning?

Does your language use change according to your pedagogical goals?

Is it important to have discussion and debate in your classroom? And why?

To what extent does being interactive with students help achieve pedagogical goals in your class?

Do you think your students face any difficulty interact in lecture? In what ways?

Do you do anything specific to assist your students participate during the lecture using EMI? In what way?

Do you think it is possible that interaction in classroom be enhanced and why?

How can you reinforce discussions and arguments in your classroom?

In your opinion to what extent does using SETT affect the way you interact with students? In what ways?

Does using SETT help you achieve your pedagogical gaols using EMI? In what way?

Does using SETT limit your ability to achieve those pedagogical goals? In what way?

What in your opinion the advantages and disadvantages of using SETT regularly by faculty members?

Closing:

I appreciate the time you took for this interview. Is there anything else you think would be helpful for me to know …I should have all the information I need. Would it be alright to email you if I have any more questions? Thanks again.

Appendix H:

Observation sheets

Classroom Field notes:

Section A:

Teacher Code:……

Observer:……

Date:……

Time:……...

Length of observation:……

Module observed:…….

Lecture Title:……..

Students' number:……..

Year Group:……. Level:……

Section B: Classroom Setting and Material artifacts:

1- Description of the classroom setting:

Aspects of Classroom Setting	Description
The size of the classroom	
Classroom arrangement (how students are being arranged and seated)	

Number of recording devices	
Place of recording devices	

2- Material artifacts:

Materials Present in the classroom	Yes	No	Notes on how it is being used:
Board			
Interactive Board			
Overhead Projector			
Textbooks			

Reading materials			
Worksheets			
Writing materials (notebooks, dictionaries…..)			
Computers or laptops			
Video or audio			

Section C: Observing classroom international activities: (using codes provided below)

Observations	Time	Interactional Activities	Learning activities	Pedagogical project	Gesture & Eye gaze	Theoretical-Analytical notes
For example: T: can you tellme about …..? S1: yes, there are				The topic and purpose of the discussion or instruction		

…… S2: but can …..						

Appendix I

Transcript of Lecture (A) Participant (A)

This transcript is provided to allow the reader track the marked interactional features in five lecturer-students interactional episodes that involves pedgogical purposes.The interactional features are color-coded to visually demonstrate the features investigated.

Interactional features	**color**
Scaffolding	
Direct Repair	
Content Feedback	
Extended wait-time	
Referential questions	
Seeking clarification	
Extended learner turn	
Teacher eco	
Teacher Interruptions	
Extended teacher turn	
Turn Completion	
Display questions	
Form focused feedback	

References

Al- Abdaly, A. (2012). *The impact of English as a Medium of Instruction on science learning:Perception of the medicine female students and academic staff at King Khalid University.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Aghajanzadeh, M. and Hemmati, F. (2014). The Importance of 'Teacher Talk' in Teaching EFL Writingy. *Porta Linguarum,* 95-108.

Al-Ghamdi, A., and Al-Saddat, I. (2002). The development of the educational system in Saudi Arabia. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Tarbiat Al Ghad

Alhawsawi, S. (2014). *Investigating student experiences of learning English as a foreign language in a preparatory programme in a Saudi university.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Sussex. UK.

Al-Hazmi, S.H. (2003). EFL teacher preparation programs in Saudi Arabia: Trends and challenges. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(2), 341-344.

Al-Hazmi, S. (2005). English and Arabization: Friends or foes? The Saudi experience. Paper presented at the Language in the Age of Globalization Conference.King Khalid University.

Al-Jarf, R. (2006). Large student enrollments in EFL programs: Challenges and consequences. *Asian EFL Journal, 8,* 8–34.

Al-Jarf, R. (2008). The impact of EIL upon Arabic in Saudi Arabia. *Asian EFL Journal*, *10*(4), 193–210.

Al -Kahtany, A., Farouk, S., & Al Zumor, A. (2016). English As The Medium Of Instruction In Saudi higher education: Necessity Or hegemony?. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(1). 49-58.

Alkhazim, M. (2003). Higher education in Saudi Arabia: Challenges, solutions, and opportunities missed. *Higher Education Policy 16*, 479–486.

Al-Makoshi, M. (2014). Discourse markers and code-switching: Academic medical lectures in Saudi Arabia using English as the Medium of Instruction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Birmingham.

Al-mengash, S. (2006). An analysis of the Saudi education policy and suggestions for its improvement. *Journal of Educational Sciences & Islamic Studies, 19*(1), 381–440.

Al-Nafisah, K. (2001). *A Study of the curriculum and methodology for the teaching of English in Saudi Arabia with particular reference to learning difficulties encountered by students*. unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wales, UK.

Alrasheed, M. (2000). *Future vision of education in Saudi Arabia*. Riyadh: King Fahad National Library Press.

Al-Sultan, A. (2009). English as medium of instruction. *Archive Arab News*. Retrieved from http://archive.arabnews.com/?page=13&section=0&article=124214&d=2&m=7&y

=2009

Astuti, I. W. and Selti, G. W. (2018). Trainees' Views on the Use of Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) in Microteaching Sessions *in Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on E-Society, E-Education and E-Technology*. ICSET 2018: Association for Computing Machinery, New York, United States.

Auer, Peter. (1988). A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In Monica Heller (Eds.), *Codeswitching : anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (p. 187 – 213). Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter.

Allwright, R. (1984) The importance of interaction in classroom language learning, *Applied Linguistics, 5*(2), 156-171.

Barnawi, O. Z. (2017). *Neoliberalism and English language education policies in the Arabian Gulf.* London: Routledge.

Barnawi, O.Z., Al-Hawsawi , S.Y. (2015). English Language Education Policy in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: Current trends, issues and challenges. In K. Robert (Ed.), *English Education Policy in the Middle East* (pp.199-222) The Netherlands: Springer.

Baumal, R. and Benbassat, J. (2008). Current trends in the educational approach for teaching interviewing skills to medical students, *Medical Education, 10*, 552–555.

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

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education research and practice*. London: Continuum.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3,*77-101.

Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research method.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Can Daşkın, N. (2015). Shaping learner contributions in an EFL classroom: Implications for L2 classroom interactional competence. *Classroom Discourse, 6*(1), 33-56.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases for communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-27.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching, 39*, 1-14.

Collins, B. A. (2010). English-Medium higher education: Dilemma and problems. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 39*, 97-110.

Costa, F. and Coleman, J. A. (2013). Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education in Italy: Ongoing Research. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1*(3), 19-29.

Costa, F. and Coleman, J. A. (2013). A survey of English-medium instruction in Italian higher education. *International Journal of Bilingual Eucation and Bilingualism, 16*(1), 3-19,

Crystal, David (2003) *English as a Global Language*, Cambridge University Press.

Dafouz, E., Smith, U. (2014). *Towards a Dynamic Conceptual Framework for English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings*. Oxford: University Press.

Dearden, J. (2015). *English As a Medium of Instruction - A Growing Phenomenon. Educational Review* . Oxford: The British Council.

Dippold, D. (2013). Interaction for learning in the Anglophone university classroom: Mastering interactional challenges through reflective practice. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, *7* (1), 14-25.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. M. (2013). Internationalisation, multilingualism and English-medium instruction. *World Englishes*, *30*(3), 345-359.

Donald, S. (2015). A study of interactional competence in the taiwanese english as a foreign language classroom context. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Newcastle.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methodologies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction. In P. Drew and J. Heritage, (Eds.). *Talk at work: Interaction in Institutional Settings.*(pp. 3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ebad, R. (2014). The role and impact of English as a language and a Medium of Instruction in Saudi higher education institutions: Students-instructors perspective. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, *2*(2), 140.

Edwards, A. D. & Westgate, D. P. G. (1987). *Investigating Classroom Talk*. Sussex: The Falmer Press.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2000). Task–based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, *49*,193-220.

Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons.

Flowerdew, J. and Miller, L. (1992) Student perceptions, problems and strategies in second language lecture comprehension. *RELC Journal, 23*(2), 60–80.

Flowerdew, J. and Miller, L. (1995) On the notion of culture in L2 lectures. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(2), 345–373.

Flowerdew, J. and Miller, L. (1996a) Lectures in a second language: Notes towards a cultural grammar. *English for Specific Purposes, 15*(2), 121–140.

Flowerdew, J. & Miller L. (1996b) Lecturer Perceptions, Problems and Strategies in Second Language Lectures. *RELC Journal, 27*(1), 23–46.

Garton, S. (2012). Speaking out of turn? Taking the initiative in teacher-fronted classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 3*(1), 29–45.

Gass, S. & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Routledge.

Gass, S. (2003). Input and interaction, In Doughty, C. and Long, M. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 224-256) Massachussets: Blackwell Publishing.

Ghafarpour, H. (2017) Classroom Conversation Analysis and Critical Reflective Practice: Self-evaluation of Teacher Talk Framework in Focus. *RELC Journal. 48*(2), 210-225.

Guthrie, L. F. (1984). Contrasts in teachers" language use in a Chinese-English bilingual classroom. In J. Hanscombe, R. Orem, & B. Taylor (Eds.), *On TESOL '83: The question of control.* Washington, DC: TESOL.

Hauser, E. (2009) Turn-taking and primary speakership during a student discussion. In G. Kasper and H. T. Nguyen (Eds.), *Talk-in-Interaction: Multilingual Perspectives* (pp. 214–244). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Hellermann, J. (2006). Classroom interactive practices for developing L2 Literacy: A microethnographic study of two beginning adult learners of English. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(3), 377–404.

Hellermann, J. (2009). Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: A case study of self-initiated self-repair by an adult learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 53*, 113–132.

Heritage, J., (2004). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In K. Fitch and R. Sanders, (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction.* (pp. 103-147*).* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Howard, A. (2010). Is there such a thing as a typical language lesson? *Classroom Discourse, 1*(1), 82-100.

Humphries, S. (2014). Codeswitching in two japanese contexts. In R Barnard, and J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives* (pp. 65-76). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Huxham, M. (2005). Learning in lectures: Do 'interactive windows' help? *Active Learning in Higher Education, 6*(17), 17–31.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse. English in a global context*. A&C Black.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D.

Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics:The Ethnography of Communication* (pp. 35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ishida, M. (2007, April). *Engaging in assessment in Japanese as a second language: Longitudinal changes are usability of developed interactional competence across situations*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics, Costa Mesa, CA.

Ishida, M. (2009). Development of interactional competence:Changes in the use of *ne* in L2 Japanese during study-abroad. In G. Kasper & H. Nguyen (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 351–357). University of Hawai'i: National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation.* (pp: 13-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kachru, Braj. B. (1992). *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Korkut, P. and Ertas, A. (2016). The Interactional Features of English Classroom Discourse In the Mugal Context. *The Online Journal of Quality in Higher Education*, 3(4), 40-51.

Klaassen, R. G. and De Graaff, E. (2001). Facing innovation: preparing lecturers for English-medium instruction in a non-native context. *European Yournal of Engineering Education, 26*(3), 281-289

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, *70*, 366–372.

Lake, D. A. (2001). Student performance and perceptions of a lecture-based course compared with the same course utilizing group discussion. *Physical Therapy 81*(3), 896–903.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *43*(4), 195–211.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press.

LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Analyzing & interpreting ethnographic data*. Rowman Altamira.

Le Ha, Phan. , Barnawi, O. Z. (2015). Where English, neoliberalism, desire and internationalization are alive and kicking: higher education in Saudi Arabia today. *Language and Education*, *29*(6), 545-565.

Lee, Y. A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of pragmatics, 39*(6), 1204-1230.

Lee, W. & Ng, S. (2010) Reducing student reticence through teacher interaction strategy. *ELT Journal64* (3), 302-313.

Lin, A. (1990). *Teaching in two tongues: Language alternation in foreign language classrooms*. Department of English, City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.

Lockyer, S. (2004). Coding qualitative data. In M.S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, and T.F. Liao (Eds.) *The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*, London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Long, M.H. and Sato, C.J. (1983). Classroom foreign talk discourse: forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H.W. Seliger and M.H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition,* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Long, M.H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie and T.K. Bhatia, (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.

Macaro, E. (2018). *English medium instruction*. Oxford University Press.

Margutti, P., & Drew, P. (2014). Positive evaluation of student answers in classroom instruction. *Language and Education, 28*(5), 436–458.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learner behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA*, Applied Linguistics*, *29*, 404-427.

Markee, N. (2015). Are replication studies possible in qualitative second/foreign language classroom research? A call for comparative re-production research. *Language Teaching*, 56, 367-383.

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

Masuda, K. (2009). Learners' use of interactional particles in students-teacher conversation. *Japanese Language and Literature*, *43*, 335–362.

Mauranen, A. (2001). Reflexive academic talk: observations from MICASE. In R. Simpson and. J. Swales (Eds.), *Corpus linguistics in North America* (pp. 165-78). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Mauranen, A. (2010). Features of English as a lingua franca in academia. *Helsinki English Studies*, *6*(1), 6-28.

Mees, I. M., Denver, L., Jensen, C., & Werther, C. (2017). Good Enough to Teach? A Study of EMI Lecturers' Language Skills and Metadiscourse. *Moderna språk*, *110*(2), 46-72.

Mehan, Hugh. 1979. *Learning Lessons*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Meunier, F. (2015). Steve Walsh, Classroom Discourse and Teacher Development. *English Text Construction, 8*(1), 153 -157.

Miller, L. (2009). Engineering lectures in a second language: What factors facilitate students' listening comprehension? *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 11*(2), 8–30.

MoHE-Ministry of Higher Education. (2010). King Abdullah scholarships program.*Ministry of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.mohe.gov.sa/en/studyaboard/King-Abdulla-hstages/Pages/default.aspx

Mori, J. (2007). Border crossings? Exploring the intersection of second language acquisition, conversation analysis, and foreign language pedagogy. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*, 849–862.

Morell, T. (2004). Interactive lecture discourse for university EFL students. *English for Specific Purposes, 23*, 325–338.

Moser, J., Harris, J., and Carle, J. (2012). Improving teacher talk through a task based approach. *ELT Journal. Volume, 66*(1), 81-88.

Murphy, R. and Sharma, N. (2010). What don't we know about interactive lectures? *Seminar.International Journal of Media*, *Technology and Lifelong Learning, 6*(1), 111–120.

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

Ohta, A. S. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*, 1493–1512.

Ohta, A. S. (2001a). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ohta, A. S. (2001b). A longitudinal study of the development of expression of alignment in Japanese as a foreign language. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 103–120). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pedrosa de Jesus, M. H. and da Silva Lopes, B. (2009) Classroom questioning and teaching approaches: A study with Biology undergraduates. In Çakmakci, G. and Taşar, M. F. (Eds.) *Contemporary Science Education Research: Scientific*. *Literacy and Social Aspects of Science* – Paper presented at ESERA 2009 Conference. *Istanbul*: Pegem Akademi, 33–39.

Petitjean, C. (2014). Social representations of turn-taking in classrooms: From compulsory to post-compulsory schooling in French-speaking Switzerland. *Classroom Discourse, 5*(2), 138–157.

Auer, Peter. (1988). A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In Monica Heller (Eds.): *Codeswitching : anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives. Berlin* (p. 187 – 213), Mouton de Gruyter.

Pica, T. (2002). Subject-matter content: How does it assist the interactional and linguistic needs of classroom language learners. *The Modern LanguageJournal 86*(1), 1–19.

Pike, K. E. (1964). *Language in relation to a unified theory of structures of human behaviour*. The Hague: Menton.

Poorebrahim, F., Talebinejad, M., & Mazlum, F. (2015). Constructive or obstructive features of teacher talk in Iranian EFL classes. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5*(4), 729.

Poos, D. & Simpson, R. (2002). Cross-disciplinary comparisons of hedging. In R. Reppen (Ed.), *Using corpora to explore linguistic variation* (pp. 3-23). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Prakash, E. (2010). Explicit constructivism: A missing link in ineffective lectures?. *Advanced Physiological Education 34*, 93–96.

Richards, K. (2007). Introduction. In K, Richards, and P, Seedhouse (Eds.) *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 1) London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rodgers, D. M. (2006). Developing content and form: Encouraging evidence from Italian content-based instruction. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(3), 373–386.

Sacks, H. 1992. Lectures on conversation, 2 Vols. (fall1964-Spring 1972). Oxford:Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language, 50(4),* 696-735.

Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System. 42,* 308-318.

Sandelowski, M. (2003) Tables of the tableaux? The challenges of writing and reading mixed methods studies. In Tashakkori, A.and Teddlie, C. (eds) *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage: 321-50.

Sawahel, W.(2010). *Building scientific and technological talent in the broader Middle East and North Africa region (BMENA). Arab capability status and present development and proposed action plan*. IDB Science Development Network. National Research Centre, Cairo, Egypt.

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

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*, 361-82.

Shamsipour, A., and Allami, H. (2012). Teacher Talk and Learner Involvement in EFL Classroom: The Case of Iranian Setting. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(11), 2262-2268.

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

Seedhouse, P. (2004). Different perspectives on language classroom interaction. *Language Learning*, *54*, 55–100.

Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language teaching, 38,* 165-187.

Seedhouse, P. (2007). Conversation analysis as a research methodology. In Richards, K. and Seedhouse, P. (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis*.(pp. 251-266) London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Seedhouse, P. (2011). Conversation Analytic Research into Language Teaching and Learning. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.), *The Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching andLearning.* (pp. 345-363). Routledge.

Sert, O. (2013). Epistemic status check' as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings. *Journal of Pragmatics, 45*, 13–28.

Sert, O. & Seedhouse, P. (2011) Introduction: Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics. *Novitas-ROYAL ,5* (1),1.

Shamim, F., Abdelhalim, A., & Hamid, N. (2016). English Medium Instruction in the transition year: Case from KSA. *Arab World English Journal Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, *1*(71), 32–47.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis- an introduction*. West Sussex: Wiley-

Blackwell.

Svahn, J., Bowden, H. (2019), Interactional and epistemic challenges in students' help-seeking in sessions of mathematical homework support: presenting the problem. *Classroom Discourse.*1-21.

Sulaimani, Amjjad. (2016). Teaching and learning in Saudi Arabia: perspectives from higher education. *Asian Englishes*, *18*(1), 85-87.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. M. and Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition.* (pp. 235-253) Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Swales, J. M. (2001). Metatalk in American academic talk: The cases of point and thing. Journal of English Linguistics, 29(1), 34-54.

Teddlie, C. & Tashakkori, A. (2009) *Foundation of Mixed Methods Research: Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches in the Social and Behavioral Science.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: a practical guide*. London: Sage.

Ten Have, P. (2007) *Doing conversation analysis*. London: Sage.

Trigwell, K., Prosser, M. and Waterhouse, F. (1999). Relations between teachers approaches to teaching and students' approaches to learning. *Higher Education, 37*, 57–70.

Tobin, K. (1987) . The role of wait-time in higher cognitive level learning. *Review of Educational Research, 57* (1), 69

Tsay, J.J., Judd, A.B., Hauk, S., and Davis, M.K. (2011) Case study of a college mathematics instructor: Patterns of classroom discourse. *Educ Stud Math, 78*, 205-229.

Unterberger, B. (2014) *English-medium Degree Programmes in Austrian Tertiary Business Studies: Policies and Programme Design*. [Upublished master's thesis], University of Vienna.

Van Dijk, L. A. and Jochems, W. M. G. (2002). Changing a traditional lecturing approach into an interactive approach: Effects of interrupting the monologue in lectures. *International Journal of Engineering Education, 18*(3), 275–284.

Van Lier, L. (2002). An ecological-semiotic perspective on language and linguistics. In Kramsch, C. (Ed.), *Language Acquisition andLanguage Socialization: Ecological Perspectives* (pp. 140-165) New York: Continuum.

Van Lier, L. (2008). Agency in the Classroom. In J. P. Lantolf, & M. E. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural Theory and the Teaching of Second Languages*(pp.111-138) London: Equinox.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or Obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*. *6*(1), 3-23.

Walsh, S. (2003). Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom. *Language Awareness*. *12*, 124-42.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse.* London: Routledge.

Walsh, S., & O'Keeffe, A. (2010). Investigating higher education seminar talk. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and language)*, *4*(2), 141–158.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising Classroom Interactional Competence. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language).6* (1), 1-14.

Walkinshaw, I., Fenton-Smith, B., & Humphreys, P. (2017). EMI issues and challenges in Asia-Pacific higher education: An introduction. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I.

Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia-Pacific: from policy to pedagogy* (pp. 1-18) Springer.

Wang, P.L. (2012). *The investigation of classroom modes and interactional features in young learners' English classrooms*. MA Thesis, Department of Applied English, School of Education and Applied Languages, Ming Chuan University, Taiwan.

Watson-Gegeo, K. (1988). Ethnography in ESL: Defining the essentials. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22/4.

Wilkinson, R. and Walsh, M. L. (Eds.) (2008). *Realizing Content and Language Integration in Higher Education.* Maastricht: Maastricht University.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction. London: Sage.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. (2008). *Very good' as a teacher response. ELT Journal, 63*(3), 195–203.

Worldlistmania.com. 2020. *List Of Universities In Saudi Arabia*. [online] Available at: <https://www.worldlistmania.com/list-of-universities-saudi-arabia/> [Accessed 15 March 2020].

Young, R. (2003). Learning to talk the talk and walk the walk: Interactional competence in academic spoken English. *North Eastern Illinois University Working Papers in Linguistics, 2*, 26–44.

Young, R. (2008). *Language and interaction: an advanced resource book*. London and New York: Routledge.

Young, R. & Miller, E. (2004). Learning as changing participation: discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 519-535.

Yushau, B. & Omar, M. (2007). Preparatory year program courses as predictors of first calculus course grade*. Mathematics and Computer Education 41*, 92–108.