

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

I certify my authorship of the PhD thesis submitted today entitled:

“Teachers’ and Students’ beliefs about classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes in Ho Chi Minh city”

for the degree of Doctor of Education, is the result of my own research, except where otherwise acknowledged, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree at any other institutions. To the best of my knowledge, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by other people except where the reference is made in the thesis itself.

Hue, October 5th, 2018

Author’s signature

Trần Thị Thanh Thương

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my academic supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Le Pham Hoai Huong, for her early suggestion of the topic, significantly important suggestions on the analysis of the data and conscientious guidance and supervision throughout the writing of this thesis.

I am indebted to the lecturers of Hue University of Foreign Languages: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Trần Văn Phước, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Phạm Thị Hồng Nhung, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Trương Viên, Dr. Tôn Nữ Như Hương, Dr. Trương Bạch Lê, Dr. Phạm Hoà Hiệp who have wholeheartedly guided me through each part of the thesis. I own a word of thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Lê Văn Canh for giving me suggestions with my early development of the thesis topic. I am thankful to Ms. Hồ Thị Phùng Duyên, MA, Dean of the Foreign Languages Department and my colleagues at HCM College of Foreign Economic Relations for supporting me and taking up my workload while I was doing my study. I also would like to express my thanks to the Administration Board of my college for granting me study leave. I am grateful to the lecturers of HCM University of Law, HCM University of Environment and HCM University of Industry and students of these universities for their participation into the study and for allowing me to record their classes. I thank the participants for filling the questionnaires and answering the interviews. I am also thankful to my former colleague and friend, Trần Thi Thu Trang for helping me with reference materials used in the thesis.

My special appreciation goes to my husband, Dũng, and my daughters, Ngọc and Thi, for their support and love. My husband has been the most patient and supportive partner who in many ways put his own ambitions aside so that I could accomplish mine.

Last but not least, I owe a special word of thanks to my parents, parents-in-law and all other members in my family, who have always given me encouraging words as well as financial and spiritual support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
ABSTRACT	x
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Rationale.....	1
1.2 Research Aims.....	3
1.3 Research Questions.....	4
1.4 Research Scope	4
1.5 Research Significance.....	5
1.6 Structure of the Thesis	6
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Definitions of Interaction	7
2.3 Teachers' and Students' beliefs.....	8
2.4 Classroom Interactions	10
2.5 Major Features of Classroom Interactions	13
2.5.1. Classroom Interactional Competence	15
2.5.2. The First Language in Classroom Interactions.....	15
2.6 Approaches to Classroom Interactions	16
2.6.1. Interactionism/Interactionist Theory	16
2.6.2. Sociocultural Theory	18
2.7 Similarities and Differences between Interactionism/interactionist theory and Sociocultural Theory in terms of Classroom Interactions	20

2.8	Teacher-learner Interaction	22
2.9	Learner-learner Interaction	24
2.10	Interactions in Large Classes	25
2.11	Operational Definitions of Classroom Interactions in the Current Study	28
2.12	Non-English Majored Students and ESP Teachers in Vietnam	28
2.12.1.	Non-English Majors.....	28
2.12.2.	ESP Teachers.....	29
2.13	Previous Studies.....	30
2.13.1.	In Vietnam	30
2.13.2.	In other countries.....	32
2.14	Summary	36
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY		37
3.1	Introduction	37
3.2	Research Design.....	37
3.3	Research Participants.....	39
3.3.1.	Teacher Participants	39
3.3.2.	Student Participants.....	40
3.4	Data Collection Methods.....	41
3.4.1.	Questionnaires	42
3.4.1.1.	Questionnaire for students.....	44
3.4.1.2.	Questionnaire for Teachers	45
3.4.2.	Interviews.....	45
3.4.3.	Observation with Audio-recording of Classroom Interactions	48
3.5	Research Procedure.....	49
3.5.1.	Pilot study.....	49
3.5.2.	Main study	50
3.6	Research Methods on Classroom Interactions	51
3.7	Data Analysis.....	52

3.8	Research Reliability and Validity	53
3.9	Ethical Considerations	56
3.10	Summary	56
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....		57
4.1	Introduction	57
4.2	Findings	57
4.2.1.	Teachers' and Students' beliefs about Class Size and Classroom Interactions.....	58
4.2.2.	Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of Teachers in Classroom Interactions in Large Classes	63
4.2.3.	Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of Students in Interactions in Large Classes.....	78
4.2.4.	Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of the Target Language in Classroom Interactions	88
4.2.5.	Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of the First Language in Classroom Interactions	102
4.3	Discussion on Data from Questionnaires and Interviews.....	108
4.3.1.	Similarities in Teachers' and Students' beliefs about Classroom Interactions in Large Non-English Majored Classes	108
4.3.2.	Differences in Teachers' and Students' beliefs about Classroom Interactions in Large Non-English Majored Classes	111
4.4	Discussion on Data from Audio Recordings of Classroom Interactions .	113
4.5	Summary	118
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY		119
5.1	Summary of the Key Findings.....	119
5.2	Implications.....	122
5.3	Limitations	124
5.4	Suggestions for further study	125

5.5 Conclusion	125
REFERENCES	129
AUTHOR'S WORKS	147
APPENDICES	148
APPENDIX H MINIMUM-MAXIMUM	220
Class Size and Classroom Interactions	220
APPENDIX I MINIMUM-MAXIMUM.....	221
Roles of Teachers in Classroom Interactions in Large Classes.....	221
APPENDIX J MINIMUM-MAXIMUM	222
Roles of Students in Interactions in Large Classes.....	222
APPENDIX K MINIMUM-MAXIMUM	224
Roles of the Target Language in Classroom Interactions.....	224
APPENDIX L MINIMUM-MAXIMUM	225
Roles of the First Language in Classroom Interactions.....	225

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EFL:	English as a Foreign Language
ESP:	English for Specific Purposes
IRE:	Information, Response, Evaluation
L1 :	First Language
L2:	Second Language
M:	Mean
SLA:	Second Language Acquisition
SCT:	Sociocultural Theory
SPSS:	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Teacher Participants

Table 3.2 Student Participants

Table 3.3 Summary of Data Collection Methods

Table 3.4 Summary of the Questionnaire Clusters

Table 3.5 Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Analysis of Clusters of Teachers' and Students' responses

Table 4.1 Mean Scores of All Questionnaire Clusters

Table 4.2 Teachers' and Students' beliefs about Class Size and Classroom Interactions

Table 4.3 Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of Teachers in Interactions in Large Non-English Majored Classes

Table 4.4 Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of Students in Interactions in Large Non-English Majored classes

Table 4.5 Teachers' and Students' beliefs of the Roles of the Target Language in Large Non-English Majored Classes

Table 4.6 Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of the Mother Tongue in Large Non-English Majored Classes

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted at some universities in Ho Chi Minh city in Vietnam. The objectives aimed at finding out the similarities and differences in teachers' and students' beliefs about classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes and how teachers' and students' beliefs about classroom interactions corresponded to their actual practice. Data were collected from questionnaires for 100 teachers teaching English to non-English majors and 100 students. Besides, semi-structured interviews were conducted with representative teachers and students from both groups. Additionally, audio-recordings of 45 lesson periods were used to verify the actual practice of classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes.

The findings reveal that both teachers and students believed that classroom interactions involved talks between teachers and students, and among students. Furthermore, teachers and students similarly considered that classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes were restricted because students did not have a lot of opportunities for speaking. The two groups also agreed that teachers should talk less to give opportunities for students to speak. As for language use, both groups tended to think that language is used to provoke thoughts and that students can use the first language when necessary to mediate the thinking process of learning English. However, teachers' responses achieved higher mean scores on the opinion that students can learn from other peers through interactions. Also, more teachers thought that peer interactions mediate students' thinking process and that peer interaction provides language input for students.

The audio recordings of classroom reflect teachers' beliefs of the dominant roles of teachers in managing classroom interactions. Their turns usually included three-part sequential IRE (Information, Response, Evaluation). Additionally, the transcripts confirm teachers' and students' belief that in large classes, pair work and group work

were employed to provide speaking opportunities for students. In excerpts of interactions where only peers participated, the interactions indicate more equal roles of peers in co-constructing knowledge. Despite the fact both teachers and students highly appreciated the opportunities for students to use English in the class, the audio recordings revealed the frequent use of Vietnamese by teachers to facilitate students in completing the given tasks.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale

Researching teachers and students' beliefs in education is without doubt essential. "It is perfectly legitimate to be interested in the ways in which 'knowledge workers' in general carry out their work, or think and talk about their work" (Havita & Goodyear, 2001, p.2). Beliefs about teaching and learning, more specifically, about classroom interactions, can bring about the opportunities for educational change. Studies on the thought processes involved in teaching and learning can give teachers and learners a more realistic view of how interactions in classroom take place.

Promoting classroom interactions has always been the target of the English language education. The reason comes from the fact that they can facilitate language communication in the classroom which may lead the development of language competence. Interactionism or Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996) has been embraced in many second/foreign language researches for it emphasizes that language development is facilitated through face-to-face interaction or communication. Besides, it is worth investigating classroom interactions because they serve several important functions including referential function of communicating curriculum content, social function of maintaining and establishing social relationships between teachers and students, and ideational function of helping teachers and students negotiate and express their ideas through discourse (Cazden, 1988). Similarly, Walsh (2011, p.158) regards classroom interaction as a central tool to facilitate, mediate and assist learning.

As classroom interactions play essential roles in language teaching and learning, studying teachers' and students' beliefs on this topic apparently may shed more light on what leads to how they interact with each other. Additionally, understanding teachers' and students' opinions will help promote effective practice in classroom interactions. Results of such investigation will also assist teachers and

students to set more realistic goals in designing activities or adopting classroom management strategies that promote classroom interactions.

Studying teachers' and students' beliefs about interactions in large classes, to some extent, dwells on some aspects that are rather different from interactions in other classes for several reasons. Firstly, large classes consist of a range of abilities as well as diverse student learning styles (Cleek, 2005). Secondly, students can feel anonymous and voiceless and teachers in large classes often feel compelled to focus on content delivery; therefore, interactions in large classes may become even more challenging (Hall, Binney & Kennedy, 2005). Lastly, discipline in a large class is another matter in large classes due to a large number of students, teachers might not be able to manage to engage all students into interactions (Vrasidas & McIsaac, 1999).

In Vietnam, English holds an important role in the foreign language policy. The Ministry of Education and Training in Vietnam issued Circular 7274/BGDĐT-GDDH dated 31/10/2012 describing the National Foreign Languages Project 2020 for educational institutions. MOET also issued the framework of six-level foreign language competence for Vietnam in Circular 01/2014/TT-10 BGDĐT dated 24/01/2014. The circular states that non-language majored university students must reach the level of 3 (B1) in foreign language competence and junior college students at level 2 (A2). These prescriptions indicate the urgent need for teachers and students to work effectively in their English teaching and learning to reach the target. Clearly, in most university and junior college students in Ho Chi Minh city, students need to achieve the level of B1 or A2 in English Proficiency to be able to graduate. For example, at the College of Foreign Economic Relations, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam, students are expected to be able to communicate in English and use English for their majors to serve their jobs (<http://www.ktdn.edu.vn/zone/311/news/2046-chuan-dau-ra-bac-cao-dang-cho-cac-nganh-dao-tao.aspx>).

In recent years, sociocultural theory stressing the interaction between people and the culture in which they live has been well used in educational research (Lantolf, 2000). Its significance in serving as a conceptual framework has proved to be appreciated for its relevance in providing interpretations. The theory applied in classroom research suggests that human learning is largely a social process through classroom interactions.

As an English lecturer at a college in Ho Chi Minh city for more than a decade, I myself have been intrigued to the question of what factors can promote classroom interactions. My experience in teaching large ESP classes has revealed to me that teachers and students have different beliefs about classroom interactions. As students of different majors learn English as a compulsory subject, their attitudes toward this subject are diverse. I have been searching for the answer to the question what teachers and students think about classroom interactions and how they actually carry out classroom interactions.

For the reasons above, the current study was set out to investigate the topic of interactions in large classes for non-English majored students.

1.2 Research Aims

The current study aims to

- Explore teachers' and students' beliefs about classroom interactions, more specifically, to understand why they interact in certain ways in the classroom, what they believe and think about classroom interactions.
- Compare the beliefs of teachers and students about classroom interactions to find out some similarities and differences to help both teachers and students set more realistic goals in maintaining classroom interactions.
- Explore whether teachers' and students' beliefs about classroom interactions correspond to their actual practice of classroom interactions.

- Suggest some solutions for promoting effective classroom interactions.
- Develop an understanding of classroom interactions and improve classroom interaction management.

1.3 Research Questions

This study tried to answer the following research questions:

What are teachers' beliefs about the roles of classroom interactions to students' learning in non-English majored large classes?

What are students' beliefs about the roles of classroom interactions to their learning in non-English majored large classes?

What are similarities and differences between teachers' and students' beliefs about the roles of classroom interactions in non-English majored large classes?

How do teachers' and students' beliefs about the roles of classroom interactions correspond to their actual practice?

1.4 Research Scope

Research on teachers and students' cognition of classroom interactions is a broad field. The current study examined their beliefs on the roles of language interactions in classroom only. More specifically, it focused on exploring the verbal interactions taking place in a structured manner of planned lessons with the aid of textbooks. Non-verbal interaction was not explored due to the scope limitation of the current study. Besides, nonverbal behaviors are considered to vary markedly in their acceptability from culture to culture (Klopf, 1998). In this study, all the participant students came from the same Vietnamese culture and their nonverbal behaviors are not expected to vary culturally. Furthermore, it is beyond the scope of the study to explore the non-linguistic features of talk by teachers and students.

The title of thesis contains the phrases “non-English majored classes” and “large classes”; however, these terms refer to the research site and contexts for participant selection and data collection. They were not set out as variables for measurement or calculation of data. Similarly, Ho Chi Minh city refers to the research site where three universities were chosen for data collection for the current study.

1.5 Research Significance

Theoretically, this study hopes to contribute to the literature on teacher cognition, classroom interactions, how interactionism and sociocultural theory can be used to explain and interpret beliefs about classroom interactions and actual patterns of classroom interactions. It is significant to investigate teacher cognition because it has become a key theme in the field of language teaching and teacher education (Borg, 2015). Besides, “Cognition not only shapes what teachers do but also is in turn shaped by the experiences teachers accumulate” (Borg, 2003, p. 95). More specifically, the study hopes to shed light how what constitutes teachers’ thinking in conducting interactions in the classroom and why they believe so. Understanding teachers’ belief is important to explore the linkages between the teaching mind and practice.

Pedagogically, the study findings can provide implications for teachers and students in managing and promoting effective classroom interactions, especially in large classes for non-English majored students. In a word, understanding beliefs is important in the ELT context. It is even more necessary to find out teachers’ and students’ beliefs about classroom interactions as they may provide some indications of how teachers and students behave in their actual classroom interactions as Nguyễn Thanh Nga (2014, p. 43) stated, “Teachers’ beliefs influence instructional behaviours and actual teaching practices”.

1.6 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis contains five chapters. Chapter one provides the rationale for the current study and states the research objectives, questions, scope and significance. Chapter two reviews the literature related to classroom interactions, and justifies the conceptual framework for the current study. It also presents previous studies and gaps in the literature. Chapter three describes the research methodology. Chapter four displays the findings and discusses the findings in the light of the literature. Finally, chapter five summarizes the key findings of the study, provides implications and discusses the contributions of the current study.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of different approaches to classroom interactions. It first synthesizes different definitions of classroom interactions, features of classroom interactions and then analyses the two main approaches to classroom interactions, namely, interactionism and sociocultural theory. Besides, it discusses interactions in large classes as well as in non-English majored classes. The chapter also documents previous studies related to the current one and points out the gaps in the literature.

2.2 Definitions of Interaction

Quite a number of definitions have been put forward for the term of interactions; however, interactions have not been clearly or operationally defined (Wagner, 1994). The exact meaning of the term has varied across studies (Battalio, 2007). With a large number of factors that contribute to interaction, it has become difficult to reach an agreement on exactly what constitutes interaction (Soo & Bonk, 1998).

Vrasidas and McIsaac (1999, p. 25) point out that interaction is “the process consisting of the reciprocal actions of two or more actors within a given context”. Wagner (1994, p. 8) defined interaction within the context of learner performance:

An instructional interaction is an event that takes place between a learner and the learner’s environment. Its purpose is to respond to the learner in a way intended to change his or her behavior toward an educational goal. Interaction is an important word for language teachers and language learning. Brown (1994) said that in the era of communicative language teaching, interaction is the heart of communication. Similarly, Rivers (1987) stated that through interaction, students can increase their language assimilation as they listen and read ‘authentic linguistic materials’, or even the output of their fellow students in discussions, joint problem-solving tasks, or

dialogue journals. In the process of interaction, students can produce what they have learned or absorbed in real life exchanges. It could be said that interaction is the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings or ideas between two or more people resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other.

2.3 Teachers' and Students' beliefs

Research on teacher's belief is part of the inquiry of teacher cognition. According to Borg (2015), teacher cognition is what teachers think, know and believe and its relationship to teachers' classroom practices. Understanding language teachers' cognition is to explore teachers' mental lives. This is important because their mental lives form and are shaped by the practice of language teaching in different contexts (Kubanyiova & Feryok, 2015).

Clearly, belief is part of cognition and there are different ways to define belief. Beliefs are central constructs in every discipline which deals with human behaviour and learning (Sakui & Gaies 1999, p. 474). Beliefs are synonymous with attitudes, representations, opinions or ideologies (Fraser & Gaskell, 1990).

According to Borg (2001, p.186):

A belief is a proposition which may be consciously or unconsciously held, is evaluative in that it is accepted as true by the individual, and is therefore imbued with emotive commitment; further, it serves as a guide to thought and behavior.

According to Schwitzgebel (2006), belief is a way of defining a mental representation of an attitude positively oriented towards the likelihood of something being true. Wikipedia defines belief as the state of mind in which a person thinks something to be the case, with or without there being empirical evidence to prove that something is the case with factual certainty (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Belief>). Similarly, Oxford dictionary defines "belief" as a firmly held opinion or conviction or an acceptance that a statement is true or

that something exists. Lê Văn Canh (2011, p. 51) considered the term “teachers’ beliefs” to be a generic term referring to the “statements teachers make about their ideas, thoughts and knowledge that are expressed as evaluations of what “should be done” “should be the case” and “is preferable”.

Comparing belief with knowledge, Pajares (1992, p. 313) pointed out, “Belief is based on evaluation and judgment; knowledge is based on objective fact”. Beliefs are more personal and subjective than knowledge and clearly a person’s beliefs affect the way his/her knowledge can be used (Nespor, 1987). Thus, different teachers may have similar knowledge about teaching or learning methods, but they will teach and learn in different ways because of personal beliefs on their decision making (Ernest, 1989).

In the educational context, teachers’ beliefs are closely connected with educational practices. More specifically, “teachers’ pedagogic beliefs or those beliefs of relevance to an individual’s teaching” (Borg, 2001, p. 187). Similarly, Nguyễn Thanh Nga (2014, p.40) stated, “All teachers hold beliefs about their profession, themselves as professionals and matters beyond their profession.” Despite the fact that teachers’ beliefs mainly focus on teaching practices, it is still a broad term which may indicate teacher efficacy, the nature of language, teachers’ or students’ performance, motivation, or other topics related to ELT. The current research focuses on teachers’ beliefs about classroom interactions.

According to Atkinson, Nishino, Churchill, and Okada (2007), it is important to understand different factors that may shape the way people think and behave, especially in the teaching contexts. These authors point out that from the sociocognitive perspective, there are complex processes through which human beings are influenced by coordinated interaction, both with other human beings and environments, situations, tools, and affordances. In other words, for investigation of beliefs, factors that affect beliefs should be taken into consideration.

“Learner beliefs are generally what learners bring into the classroom learning environment which may be based on their cultural background or even their learning experience” (Nhapulo, 2013, p. 84). In the classroom context, the beliefs that students bring with them to the learning situation have been recognized as a significant contributory factor in the learning process and ultimate success (Breen, 2001). Some beliefs held by second or foreign language students include the nature of the language learning, the process of its acquisition, the success of certain learning strategies, the existence of aptitude, etc. In this study, beliefs are opinions of teachers and students related to their thinking and attitudes towards classroom interactions.

Burns, Freeman and Edwards (2015), however, used the term of language teaching mind to refer to teacher cognition in language education research. According to these authors, research starts with teachers’ thinking and what they do will help to identify ecologies of practice because there are linkages between cognition and language teaching.

Clearly, there are different definitions of belief but they share some features in common which are the notion of personal opinion and attitude towards an issue. This is also the definition used in the current study.

2.4 Classroom Interactions

Classroom interactions occur everyday in the classroom activities between the teacher and the learners and among learners. In language classrooms, interactions play an especially significant role to serve as the medium through which learning is realized and an object of pedagogical attention. Classroom interactions can lead to learning (Barnes, 1992; Cazden, 1988; Mehan, 1979).

Another aspect of classroom interactions is student to student interaction which can determine students’ success in learning (Tinto, 1999). Students can feel a connection with their peer group. Besides, students can echo one another in the

process of interaction. Drawing on Halliday's (1975) theory of language, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) described what they found to be the basic unit of classroom interaction, a three-part sequential IRE (Information, Response, Evaluation) exchange. According to these authors, IRE involves the teacher, in the role of expert, eliciting information (I) from individual students in order to ascertain whether each knows the material. The teacher does this by asking a known-answer question to which the student is expected to provide a brief response (R). The teacher then evaluates the student's response (E) with such typical phrases as "Good," "That's right", or "No, that's not right." IRE has been seen in classroom interactions studies ranging from all ages and contexts (e.g., Barnes, 1992; Cazden, 1988; Green & Dixon, 1993; Gutierrez, 1994; Mehan, 1979; Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur, & Pendergast, 1997; Smagorinsky & Fly, 1993). There are connections between the IRE pattern of language use and language development. The study by Cazden (1988), for example, revealed that the use of the IRE often facilitated teacher control of the interaction rather than student learning of the content of the lesson. Similarly, Barnes (1992) found that the frequent use of the IRE pattern of interaction did not allow for complex ways of communicating between the teacher and students. Rather, it was the teacher who decided who would participate, when students could take a turn, and how much they could contribute.

To some researchers, classroom interactions include both verbal and nonverbal channels. Hall and Sandler (1984) suggested that nonverbal behavior, such as eye-contact, leaning forward, nodding to show attentiveness, and refraining from touching and invading the space of the students have an impact on intercultural communication. These nonverbal behaviors vary markedly in their acceptability from culture to culture (Klopf, 1998). This study, however, only focused on verbal interactions by both teachers and students due to the scope restriction. As mentioned earlier, all the participant students came from the same Vietnamese culture and their nonverbal behaviors are not expected to vary culturally.

Apparently, interactions are very important in the classroom because they provide the opportunity for sharing perspectives, receiving feedback, and bringing about knowledge (Garrison & Shale, 1990). With the appearance of the Internet, interactions now change the way teachers and students interact online. According to York, Yang, and Dark (2007, p. 41), interaction is one of the primary goals of online education because it is connected to learning and the motivation to learn. Regardless of the setting of traditional classroom or an online program, interaction is a key factor in effective learning. The study by Cao, Crews, Lin, Burgoon, and Nunamake (2008, p. 53) found that interaction with instructors and other students, either face-to-face or through an electronic medium, is a consistent and reliable predictor of positive learning outcomes even for distance education programs. Students interact with instructors to look for prompt feedback, guidance, and motivational and emotional support. Chaudron (1988, p.10) stated that interaction is viewed as significant because it is argued that only through interaction, the learner can decompose the teaching learning structures and derive meaning from classroom events. Moreover, Allwright and Bailey (1996, p. 25) said that through classroom interaction, students produce outcomes (input, practice opportunities, and receptivity).

It is undeniable that interactions in classroom are vital to the learning process. However, Hutchinson (2007, p. 364) cautions that a large number of ideas raised at one time in interaction may actually hinder motivation. Moreover, when students do not receive attention or feedback, they may lose motivation. In the process of interactions, some students may be apprehensive about how other learners may view and criticize their ideas. To maintain motivation for learners requires instructors to have a healthy support structure in place, develop a good rapport with the learners, and provide feedback to each of the learners.

2.5 Major Features of Classroom Interactions

Interactions may vary in different classrooms and cultures. However, they share some key features. Walsh (2011) reviewed them as: Control of the interaction, speech modification, elicitation techniques, and repair or Initiation, Response, Feedback (IRF) exchange structure. As the roles of teachers and learners are asymmetrical, teachers usually seem to have the control of the patterns of communication that occur by managing both the topic of conversation and turn-taking. With speech modification, teachers usually want to ensure that the class is following, that everyone understands and that learners do not “get lost” in the rapid flow of the discourse. As a result, they modify their language use by simplifying and elaborating their speech. Apart from control of the interaction and speech modification, Walsh (2011) pointed out that teachers often use eliciting techniques to prompt a response, check understanding, guide learners towards a particular response, promote involvement and check concept understanding in classroom interactions. The concept of repair refers to the ways in which teachers deal with errors. It includes direct and indirect error correction and the ways in which teachers identify errors in the discourse. Lastly, IRF exchange deals with a teacher Initiation, a student Response, and a teacher Feedback. The technique indicates that most of the time, teachers’ feedback is an evaluation of a student’s contribution. Teachers are constantly assessing the correctness of an utterance and giving feedback to learners.

The IRF structure was originally developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) from research concerning the structural description of discourse found in the classroom. It has evolved in research on classroom interactions focusing on classroom discourse. Wells (1993) however pointed out that the IRF structure can be seen to aptly characterize the teacher’s major responsibilities. Cazden (1988), however, criticized that the use of the IRF often facilitated teacher control of the interaction rather than student learning of the content of the lesson. Thus, it limits

students' opportunities to talk through their understandings and try out their ideas in relation to the task.

From the perspective of sociocultural theory, Mercer (2004) argued that classroom discourse can be analyzed based on the Vygotskian conception of language as both a cultural and a psychological tool. The analysis involves a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods and enables the study of both educational processes and learning outcomes. On the one hand, for qualitative features of interactions, students use language as a tool for collective thinking to create more shared understanding and to inter-think. This collective thinking looks at the general social climate of ideas associated with a topic rather than specific conversations. It focuses more on the function of interaction for the pursuit of joint intellectual activity. "It incorporates a concern with the lexical content and the cohesive structure of talk, especially across the contributions of individual speakers, because word choices and cohesive patterning can represent ways that knowledge is being jointly constructed" (Mercer, 2004, p. 141). On the other hand, quantitative analysis incorporates a concern with the lexical content and the cohesive structure of talk, especially across the contributions of individual speakers. More specifically, it looks at word choices and cohesive patterning that represent ways that knowledge is being jointly constructed. In general, sociocultural discourse analysis (Mercer, 2004) examines the relationship between particular interactions which occur at different times and quantitative assessing the relative incidence of key words or collocations of words in the data as a whole, or comparing their incidence in data subsets.

Lê Phạm Hoài Hương (2007) argued that features of classroom interactions should take into account the roles of peers and how peers interact to reach the common goal of the talk. Classroom interactions features include collective scaffolding in which peers scaffold each other with questions, ideas, vocabulary to complete the given tasks. More knowledgeable peers can assist other peers in managing the tasks as well as create more opportunities for them to use the target

language. The author also pointed out that classroom interactions are to some extent structured by the use of articles, more specifically, the textbook which bounded the contents of interactions.

2.5.1. Classroom Interactional Competence

The notion of classroom interaction competence was conceptualized by Walsh (2011). Walsh (2011, p.158) described classroom interaction as a central tool to facilitate learning. Consequently, classroom interactional competence is “teachers’ and learners’ ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning”. Classroom interactional competence manifests itself in language that is convergent to the pedagogic goals of the classroom that is appropriate to the learners, that facilitates interactional space and that shapes learner contributions, for example, via scaffolding and paraphrasing. In classroom interactions, “interactants display and orient to learning through interactions which are co-constructed, they also demonstrate differing abilities to jointly create discourse which is conducive to learning” (Walsh, 2012, p.5).

The features of classroom interactional competence, according to Walsh (2012), include the meaning co-construction in interaction, reaching understanding, interaction repair and breakdown, and how interactants create and sustain “space for learning”. Space for learning (Walsh, 2011) refers to the extent to which teachers and learners provide interactional space for learning. It encompasses the need to adjust linguistic and interactional patterns to the particular goal of the moment. Interactional space promotes interactions which are both appropriate to a particular micro-context and to specific pedagogic goals.

2.5.2. The First Language in Classroom Interactions

The use of the first language in English classrooms is controversial. Obviously, there are benefits of its use in the target language learning and teaching. Nation (2003), for example, pointed out that the first language has a small but important role to play in communicating meaning and content. Cook (2001, p. 402) similarly

argued, “The first language can be a useful element in creating authentic L2 users rather than something to be shunned at all costs.” Polio and Duff (1994) supported the use of L1 in classroom interactions because it helps students when they cannot engage in meaningful interaction in the foreign language. In the same way, Atkinson (1987, p. 247) stated, “To ignore the mother tongue in a monolingual classroom is almost certainly to teach with less than maximum efficiency”. In sociocultural theory, L1 can mediate learning in L2 as it serves the thinking tool. The study by Lê Phạm Hoài Hương & McDonald (2004) found that learners used L1 to negotiate task planning and procedure, to share understanding, and to help each other with unfamiliar English words.

However, if L1 is overused in L2 classes, it will deprive students of the opportunity to use L2. Turnbull (2001), for example, argued that second/foreign language teachers should maximise the use of the target language in their classes particularly when students seldom encounter it outside the classroom. Ellis (1984) warns that overuse of the L1 deprives learners of valuable target language input. In sociocultural theory, L1 is considered to be a mediating tool to assist students in learning another language. L1 is shown to be an indispensable device for students in providing each other with scaffolded help (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998). Furthermore, Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) pointed out that L1 can function as a psychological tool. It provides learners with additional cognitive support that allows them to analyse language and work at a higher level than with the sole use of L2.

2.6 Approaches to Classroom Interactions

2.6.1. Interactionism/Interactionist Theory

In the field of second language acquisition, interaction has long been considered important in language learning. It requires in the process of second language learning the presence of two or more learners who collaborate in achieving communication. Interaction is a way of learning in general and developing the language skills in particular. Long (1983) proposed the interaction

theory/hypothesis which emphasizes the importance of comprehensible input and claims that it is most effective when it is modified through the negotiation of meaning. According to Long's (1983) Interaction Hypothesis theory, the interactional collaboration among peers can lead to second language learning. The modified input created within interaction can be facilitating in explaining linguistic forms that learners found difficult to understand. Modified input can facilitate their comprehension (Ellis, 1999). According to the theory, a second language can be acquired by the learners through in-classroom interaction (Ellis, 1995, 1997; Long, 1996). Throughout the process of interaction the second language, learners have the possibility to create the input they need in order to better understand new information (Ellis, 1999; Mackey, 1999). Besides, they are likely to have more chances to receive additional input and produce new output out of it (Mackey, 1999). Interaction hypothesis maintains that the collaboration between the native and non-native interlocutors, with adjustment of the new input to their interlocutors' level of competence, increases the chances of comprehension. It is during negotiation of meaning, interlocutors modify their conversation, recruiting strategies such as comprehension and clarification checks and comprehension requests in order to facilitate communication and understanding of the new input, without being aware of their intention (incidental acquisition). Long's (1985) Interaction Hypothesis argues that negotiation of meaning in verbal interactions contributes to the generation of input favourable for second language development, and several studies have built upon the effect of negotiation of meaning on second language acquisition (Mackey, 1999; Pica, 1988, 1994).

Besides the Interaction Hypothesis, interactionism is another term used in second/foreign language learning and teaching. It refers to the central role of social interaction in the development of language. Interactionism stresses the unification of nature and culture (Toulmin, 1978), the interweaving of the biological and the social factors. The term "interactionist" includes both the Vygotskian notion of social sources of development and also the dialectical mode of analysis. It attempts

to capture the complex non-reductionist and nonlinear features of our subject (Stanovich, 1980).

It is clear that interactionist methods of investigation and analysis focus on the processes rather than the products of learning and development. Learning and development are the best examined as dynamic processes in meaningful contexts of social activity. Besides, one of the most important aspects of the interactionist theory of education concerns the ways in which teachers make sense of and respond to the behaviour of their students.

In summary, interactionism emphasizes the communication that actually takes place in the classroom between teachers and students and among students for language input and creating meaningful contexts for classroom activities.

2.6.2. Sociocultural Theory

Sociocultural Theory (SCT) has its origins in the writings of the Russian psychologist L. S. Vygotsky and his colleagues (Lantolf, 2000). According to this theory, human activities take place in cultural contexts and are mediated by language and other symbol systems. In other words, the theory focuses on the interdependence of social and individual processes in the co-construction of knowledge. Ratner (2004) pointed out that in SCT human mental functioning is fundamentally a mediated process that is organized by cultural artifacts, activities, and concepts. The mediation process depends on language use, organization, and structure for learning to take place. SCT argues that while human neurobiology is a necessary condition for higher order thinking, the most important forms of human cognitive activity develop through interaction within these social and material environments.

Sociocultural theory has made a great impact on the learning and teaching profession. According to Vygotsky (1978), the sociocultural environment presents the child with a variety of tasks and demands, and engages the child in his world through the tools. The learning process takes place in the way that in the early

stages, the child is completely dependent on other people, usually the parents, who initiate the child's actions by instructing him/her as to what and how to do. Clearly, the process of teaching of parents, as representatives of the culture is conducted primarily through language. Vygotsky (1978) child acquires knowledge through contacts and interactions with people as the first step (interpsychological plane), then later assimilates and internalises this knowledge adding his personal value to it (intrapsychological plane). This transition from social to personal property, according to Vygotsky, is not a mere copy, but a transformation of what had been learnt through interaction, into personal values. Similar learning takes place at school in the way that students do not merely copy teachers' capabilities but transform what teachers offer them through interactions.

In sociocultural view, language is not comprised of internal structures located in the individual (Lantolf, 2000). Language is also considered to be fundamentally social with linguistic resources in our everyday communicative activities and practices (Wells, 1993). Through repeated participation in interactional activities with more capable members such as teachers and peers, learners acquire the linguistic, sociocultural and other knowledge and competencies considered essential to full participation (Hall, 1995; Lantolf, 1995; Lantolf & Appel, 1994)

Furthermore, in the sociocultural perspective of learning, the communicative contexts in which we participate, along with the particular linguistic means that are needed to communicate with others in these contexts, do not simply enhance the development of universal mental structures that already exist. Rather, they fundamentally shape and transform them (Leontiev, 1981; Vygotsky, 1981). In other words, if learners have more opportunities for taking part in communicative activities, the more they will develop the linguistic, social and cognitive knowledge and skills needed for competent engagement.

In fact, classrooms are important sociocultural contexts because they are fundamental sites of learning. In classrooms, face-to-face interaction is

consequential to the creation of effectual learning environments and ultimately to the shaping of individual learners' development. In other words, it is through the discourse created in the interaction of these classrooms that teachers and students together develop particular understandings of what constitutes language and language learning (Lantolf, 2000).

According to Zimmerman (1997), meaning construction in the act of learning in L2 classroom interactions takes place in sociocultural contexts. Therefore, the author argues that enhancing students' competency in L2 should not be seen to be located in mastering skills. Too much concentration on skills could deprive students from engaging with what he refers to as aspects of literacy such as meaning construction, competency, fluency and flexibility in dealing with texts as readers and writers.

2.7 Similarities and Differences between Interactionism/interactionist theory and Sociocultural Theory in terms of Classroom Interactions

There are some similarities and differences between interactionism/interactionist theory and sociocultural theory in terms of classroom interactions. In fact, interaction is the key to second language learning. Ellis (1985) defines interaction as the discourse jointly constructed by the learner and his interlocutors and input is the result of interaction. The interactionist view of language learning is that language acquisition is the result of an interaction between the learner's mental abilities and the linguistic environment. Long (1985) and Ellis (1994) proposed that interaction is necessary for the second language acquisition. According to interactionist theory, three aspects of verbal interaction can be distinguished: input, production and feedback. Input is the language offered to the learner by native speakers or other learners, production (output) is the language spoken by the language learners themselves and feedback is the response given by the conversational partners to the production of the learner. Besides, an integral part of an interactionist approach to language use and literacy is the recognition that

context is a constitutive factor in language use, in the social construction of meaning.

In comparison, sociocultural theory emphasizes the interdependence of social and individual processes in the co-construction of knowledge. Shannon (1989) criticizes interactionism to be a strategy-oriented approach. The term interactionism expresses two essential aspects: (1) the central importance of social interaction in all forms of human communication and (2) the necessity of addressing the complex and dialectical nature of our subject (Bickhard, 1987; Rosenblatt, 1985). The use of the term interactionism fits well with the rapid development of “social interaction” in the human sciences particularly in language and cognitive development (Snow, 1983). Recent collections of works with an interactionist position include Rogoff and Lave (1984), Hickman (1987), Moll (1990), and Azmitia, Diaz and Berk (1992). Lee (1987, p.104) summarizes the point of view on social interaction:

Man lives in a world of meaning because of the systematicity of language. At the same time, culture is also the context for the evolution of language. The principles that guide the evolution of the mind are the product of socio-historical forces which regiment language in culturally specific ways; these in turn determine the development of mind in a never-ending dialectic of mind being in society.

However, interaction in sociocultural theory emphasizes more on the use of language to mediate the thinking process of learning, especially, between teachers and more capable peers. Language is used a way to provoke thought and lead learners to move to the new zones of proximal development. In other words, interaction leads to development in cognition and learning.

In general, the differences between interactionism and sociocultural theory are that interactionism puts great emphasis on the cognitive process of language learning and acquisition whereas sociocultural theory pays more attention to the social aspects. Interactionism narrowly focuses on one type of interaction -

negotiation of meaning. In comparison, sociocultural theory is concerned with interaction with different processes that mediate learners. Interactionism focuses on assisting learner according to data driven needs whereas sociocultural theory focuses on shaping and constructing learning through interaction as a social practice (Ellis, 1999).

2.8 Teacher-learner Interaction

This type of interaction has received a great deal of attention from teachers in a wide range of disciplines (Coulthard, 1977). It happens between the teacher and one learner or many other learners. In teacher-learner interaction, there is negotiation between teacher and students about the content of the course, asking for advice and justification of the tasks given. Besides, during teacher-learner interaction, students have opportunities to demonstrate their speaking and listening skills in front of their teachers. According to Harmer (2009), teachers should focus on three things when they talk with their students: the kind of the language the students are able to understand; what they will say to their students, and to identify the ways in which they will speak such as the voice, tone and intonation. Johnson (1995) points out that the patterns of communication in most classrooms are not explicitly taught, but they are implicitly enforced through teachers' use of language. Lê Văn Canh and Renandya (2017) examine the extent to which teachers' use of the target language in the classroom creates learning opportunities for L2 learners. The analysis of classroom interaction shows that teachers' general proficiency significantly affects the way they use language in the classroom to promote learning.

In teacher-student interaction, students can use all language they possess, expressing their real meaning important to them. Moreover, they are able to exploit the elasticity of language to communicate. The interaction processes help students to proceed with the give and take of message exchanges which enables them to retrieve and interrelate a great deal of what they have encountered. Students through

interaction with teachers create messages from what they hear and in creating discourse that conveys their interaction.

Discussing teacher roles, Allwright and Bailey (1996, p. 25) stated that through classroom interaction, teachers have to make sure the plan produces outcomes (input, practice opportunities, and receptivity) and they have to plan what he intends to teach (syllabus, method, and atmosphere). For interaction to take place, as stated by Brown (1994), the teacher must create a climate in which spontaneity can thrive, in which unrehearsed language can be performed, and in which the freedom of expression given over to students makes it impossible to predict everything that they will say and do. Actually, some control on a teacher's part is an important element of successfully carrying out interactive techniques. Rivers (1987) claimed that real interaction in a classroom requires the teacher to accept all kinds of opinions, and be tolerant of errors the student makes while attempting to communicate to assure students that they can talk without worrying about their mistakes.

In non-English majored large classes, teachers' questions give students the opportunity to produce comfortably language without having to risk initiating language themselves. Usually, students become afraid when they have to start the conversation in the classroom. However teachers' questions can serve to initiate a chain reaction of student interaction among themselves. However, it is argued that a lot of questions in a classroom will not by any means guarantee stimulation of interaction (Ellis, 1985). Certain types of questions may actually discourage interactive learning. For example, display questions or question for which the answer is already known to the teacher may worry students.

According to Long (1983), teachers can create an interactive language classroom with their initiation and the stimuli for continued interaction. These stimuli are important in the initial stage of a classroom lesson as well as throughout the lesson. In the classroom, Chaudron (1988) pointed out that wait time, or the

amount of time the teacher pauses after a question and before pursuing the answer with further questions or nomination of another student is necessary for classroom interaction.

2.9 Learner-learner Interaction

In SCT, knowledge is actively constructed and skills improved through interactions between learners (Johnson, 1995). According to this author, if learner-learner interaction is well structured and managed, then it can be an important factor of cognitive development, educational achievement of students and emerging social competencies. It can also develop the learners' capacities through collaboration with other peers. Interaction not only brings shared knowledge but also develop social relationship because the sense of learning community is promoted and isolation is reduced in the classroom. Naegle (2002, p.128) adds, "Students talk with their peers about the content of the course, which is a powerful way for them to reinforce what they have learned." Therefore, teachers must encourage such type of interaction between learners because it is the fastest and the best way to make learners active rather than passive participants.

SLA studies based on sociocultural theory have viewed interaction as verbal mediation which is, "the act of achieving control of tasks and activities through speaking" (Brooks, Donato & McGlone, 1997, p. 526). Peer interaction in this theoretical orientation is the social origin of language development because there was the role of the 'expert' in scaffolding or mediating development to the point where the learner is self-regulating or autonomous (Lantolf, 2000). More recently, these aspects of the learning process have also received increasing attention from other researchers including Swain (1998) and Swain and Lapkin (1998), through their investigation of the role of collaborative dialogue in language learning. Learner-learner interaction occurs in terms of the types and amount of feedback that learners provide for each other is considered to be beneficial to learners of a language.

Clearly, students' talks in second language classrooms vary in different cultural settings because students bring with them the values and attitudes of their own cultures (Johnson, 1995). For example, Kramsch (1987) found that the closeness or distance learners wish to establish with one another has to do with how well they know each other, how it will affect their self-image, for example, the socially expected behavior of males and females. Moreover, the concept of social distance is, moreover, culturally determined.

To increase classroom interactions, pair work and group work are recommended for classroom interactions (Lê Phạm Hoài Hương, 2007; Trần Thị Thanh Thương, 2016). These techniques enable teachers to get students engaged in interactive communication within a short period of time, which will increase students' interests and willingness to participate. Students in pairs or groups can take turns asking questions and giving opinions. Besides pair work and group work, encouraging students to develop their own strategies is an excellent means of stimulating the learner to develop tools of interaction. Nunan (1991) suggests that learning to speak in a foreign language will be facilitated when learners are actively engaged in attempting to communicate in groups. However, Harmer (2009) considered group work to be more dynamic than pair work because in group work, more students reacted with and against in a group, leading to more interaction.

2.10 Interactions in Large Classes

The concept "large class" has been studied and discussed by various researchers. For example, Coleman (1989) studied large classes and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning and raised a question: what is a large or problematic size? This question cannot be simplistically answered. It depends to a great extent on the context and individual experiences and cultural perceptions.

A large class in Vietnam usually has 100 or more students (Tran Thi Thanh Thuong, 2008) or one that has too many students to learn names by the end of the semester (Enerson, Johnson, Milner & Plank, 1997). According to Jin and Cortazzi

(2013), large classes are widely considered to be problematic for language learning. Thus, research the teaching methods and ways of organizing effective interaction in large classes is essential. Cleek (2005) also points out that teaching large classes is challenging as large classes consist of an extreme range in ability as well as diverse student learning styles. At tertiary level, there have been concerns with issues involved in the teaching of large classes, including teaching quality and whether there are effective learning outcomes for students (Hall, Binney, Kennedy, 2005; Trần Thị Thanh Thương, 2016). Other problems of large classes may come from the fact that students can feel anonymous and voiceless and teachers in large classes often feel compelled to focus on content delivery.

Interaction is one of the major challenges of English teachers because it is difficult to keep good discipline in a large class or teachers cannot easily give each student the individual attention they need or teachers may not have enough teaching and learning aids. Besides, Vrasidas and McIsaac (1999) identified four major factors that influenced interaction: (a) structure of course, (b) class size, (c) feedback, and (d) prior experience with computer-mediated communications.

Therefore, the communicative approach seeks to encourage learners to initiate and participate actively in meaningful interaction in large classes. For example, Trần Thị Thanh Thương's (2008) study showed that pair work and group work were frequently used by large class teachers. Pair work and group work make it easier for students to be involved in various classroom activities. The positive and pleasant atmosphere will help to realize the notion of learner-centred language teaching. What is more, group work turns the competition between individual students into a race of different groups. In a large class of EFL, the advantage of group work may be doubled. On the one hand, too many students make it impossible for the teacher to give proper directions to each of them. On the other hand, many students make it easier to share their ideas. With all these merits, group work and pair work are no doubt very reasonable choice in large class EFL teaching for interaction.

However, in non-English majored classes, there is an obstacle in teacher-learner interaction. Some students may feel anonymous in the lecture and this anonymity may make it harder for them to become motivated to keep up. According to Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2015), another obstacle is that with so many of their peers listening, many students feel too intimidated to ask questions or too overwhelmed by the material to approach instructors or others for help. Besides, the roles of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) teachers are really challenging.

Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2008) found that in large classes for non-English majors, students-teacher interaction could be seen from the students' activity like students' talk-response and students' talk-initiation. Besides, students-students interaction appeared when the students had a discussion activity with their groups or partner. As a result, it can be concluded that the teaching and learning process in non-English class was still in teacher's dominant activity. However, the students were active enough in the classroom interaction. The teacher usually asked some questions related to the material that was intended to the students' responses.

Pica and Doughty (1985) compared teacher-learner and learner-learner interaction by adult English second language learners. Data for the teacher-learner interaction were collected from a whole class discussion of a decision-making task about family planning in the future. Data for the student-student interaction came from a group discussion about who should be chosen for a heart transplant from six potential recipients. The study found that teacher-student interaction generated less input for students than student-student interaction, but that the input provided was more grammatical. The teacher produced most of the grammatical input. Students in the teacher-directed context took fewer turns and produced less language.

According to Allwright (1984), it is important to keep learners active in the classroom, for effective interaction in classrooms, teachers need to know how to reduce the amount of teachers' talking time in classroom and increasing the

learner's talk time. In this way, students will talk to each other through pairs or groups where each learner gets his time to talk.

2.11 Operational Definitions of Classroom Interactions in the Current Study

The review above shows that classroom interactions include both channels of teacher-student and student-student interactions in the classroom. Classroom interactions are the exchange of thoughts, feelings or ideas via speech between two or more people resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other. Interactions are the medium through which learning and teaching are realized face to face in the classroom, not via the web/internet. It is based on the assumption that through interactions, teachers can deliver their messages to the learner and the learner can decompose the teaching structures and derive meaning from classroom events.

Classroom interactions comprise of both verbal and non-verbal communication. In this study, classroom interactions however are limited to verbal interaction for several reasons. Firstly, it is more convenient and convincing with data recorded. Secondly, audio recordings of classroom interactions will reveal the patterns and process of classroom interactions. These data when reaffirmed with data from interviews with teachers and students will illustrate clearly how classroom interactions occur and whether there is mismatch between students and teachers' belief about classroom interactions and the how interactions are actually carried out in the classrooms.

2.12 Non-English Majored Students and ESP Teachers in Vietnam

2.12.1. Non-English Majors

Non-English majored students are students who study English for their majors such as math, science and business and finance. Learning English is a part of their degree. According to the Ministry of Education and Training of Vietnam (2012), students are required to pass the entrance exams relevant to the particular discipline and university they wish to attend. As for foreign language requirements, students

can choose to study a foreign language, and those who choose to study English will do so throughout their study (Hoang, 2008). The majority of non-English majored students show limited levels of English proficiency at the beginning of English courses and have low motivation in learning English (Ngô Thu Hương, 2015; Tran & Baldauf, 2007). Besides, most ESP students were facing problems related to vocabulary, organizing ideas, grammar and spelling in learning English. During the course, they study about 3-6 class hours of English per week over the first four to six fifteen-week semesters (Tô Thị Thu Hương, 2010). A non-English majored class usually has from 50 to 105 students (Le & Barnard, 2009). According to Ngô Thu Hương (2015), non-English majored students at some universities in Vietnam can take international English test such as the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) or the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) as the end-of-course English test.

2.12.2. ESP Teachers

English for specific purposes (ESP) teachers teach English to students who study other majors, not English. Some examples of the subjects that ESP teachers teach include Business English, Technical English, English for Tourism, etc. According to Phạm Hoài Anh and Tạ Thanh Bình (2016), there are 369 higher education institutions in Vietnam that need ESP teachers. To meet this demand, a number of ESP teacher training programs have emerged because “Most of the ESP teachers did not receive any ESP teacher training and were transformed to ESP teachers from general English teachers mainly through self training” (Phạm Hoài Anh & Tạ Thanh Bình, 2016, p. 68). As there is the lack of systematic and effective ESP teacher training programs and these authors argue that ESP teachers need field-specific linguistic competency, ESP pedagogic competence, and basic content knowledge.

ESP teachers in Vietnam have experienced challenges that are certainly barriers to effective teaching and learning (Pham & Malvetti, 2012). These challenges

include large classes, and the exam pressure on both teachers and students. Therefore, even though they are interested in communicative language teaching, ESP teachers may find it impossible to apply this approach due to such factors. The use of Vietnamese is still common in English classes because of students' low English proficiency. Furthermore, ESP teachers face some difficulties in their English teaching due to qualification difference, teaching method difference, especially lack of specialized knowledge. The challenges also come from teachers' qualification and teaching methods and lack of time (Nguyễn Thị Tố Hoa & Phạm Thị Tuyết Mai, 2016). Besides, ESP teachers meet difficulties related to course design, tasks, assignments and teaching methods. Lessons are sometimes not highly effective because of class time constraints and learning efficiency assessment is not accurate as the majority of exams are designed by teachers.

2.13 Previous Studies

2.13.1. In Vietnam

In the Vietnamese context, Lê Phạm Hoài Hương (2007) investigated students' interactions in two group settings, 'unassisted' and 'assisted,' the first consisting of five students from the same class and the second of four from the same class and a more knowledgeable student from a higher class. The findings show that the senior student assisted the other students to start their discussions, explained new English words, and increased the use of English in this group setting. The results indicate that the teaching manner of the senior student contributed substantially to the group work.

Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2008) explored the issue of teaching English in large classes for non-English majored students at a university and found that to facilitate interactions in crowded classes, teachers reported to resort to group and pair techniques.

Luu Trong Tuan (2010) investigated student diversities as regards participation, interaction and achievement through cooperative learning activities with 77 first-

year EFL students in Vietnam. The findings substantiated that Vietnamese learners were open to change and the author concluded that Vietnamese EFL teachers should create effective activities for learners to immerse themselves in talking cooperatively instead of talking individualistically in the classrooms.

In another study, Trần Thị Thanh Thương and Lê Phạm Hoài Hương (2013) examined the strategies the English teachers used in managing interactions in large classes. The results indicated that the majority of the teachers reported to adopt team work, group work and pair work as strategies to provide students with more opportunities to interact. The authors pointed out large English classes in Vietnam could adopt the principles of sociocultural theory to promote interactions between teachers and students and among students.

The study by Hoàng Phương Trang Nhung (2013) recorded peer interactions in EFL university classes. The findings show that peers followed a rather repeated pattern of interaction with questions and answers with more advanced peer offering help with linguistic forms and structures to other peers.

The study by Pham, Thalathoti & Dakich (2014) examines the frequency and pattern of interpersonal interactions between the 252 learners in ten groups and five instructors of an online English language learning course offered at a Vietnamese university. The results suggest that the majority of the online messages in the communication forums of this online course centred on stages two and three of Salmon's model which mean online socialisation and information exchange. Even though the communication forums was online, Vietnamese learners had a useful platform to enhance their communication skills (in English) with peers and instructors. Another finding of the study was that the instructors' engagement in the interaction process was varied. They paid a great deal of attention to guiding and motivating the learners to interact with one another and with content, but they did not intervene in the learners' interaction with peers.

Đào Thị Thanh Hà (2017) investigated the factors that influenced non-English majored students' speaking skills. Data collection tools included questionnaire and classroom observation. Among many other findings, the author pointed out that in non-English majored classes, teachers let students use much Vietnamese to express the ideas. Besides, insufficient time for speaking practice and large size classes impeded the efficacy of students' speaking performance.

With regards to studies on teachers' beliefs in the Vietnamese context, Lê Văn Canh (2011) explored the beliefs about form-focused instruction held by a group of eight EFL teachers in Vietnam and the relationship between their beliefs and practices as well as factors shaping their beliefs. The findings show that teachers' beliefs were affected by multiple contextual factors, experiences which were accumulated through the process of socialisation in their professional community. Such beliefs constituted their personal theories for practice, which shaped what they did in the classroom and how they did it.

Another study on Vietnamese teachers' beliefs was carried out by Nguyễn Thanh Nga (2014) on the topic of learner autonomy. More specifically, it examined the extent to which Vietnamese teachers understood the concept of learner autonomy and how their beliefs about this concept were applied in their teaching practices. The study concluded that teachers generally lacked understanding about learner autonomy and there was an alignment between teachers' beliefs and their actual teaching practices regarding learner autonomy, resulting in little evidence of learner autonomy found in any of the case study classrooms.

2.13.2. In other countries

Regarding research on beliefs, Christison and Krahnke (1986) found that learner beliefs contribute valuable sources of insight into language learning. This is even more beneficial when their beliefs are compared with analysis of teacher behavior and classroom activity.

Wenden (1987) formally investigated students' beliefs about second language learning by questioning learners about their own learning behaviors in response to specific contexts. Wenden found that learners hold certain beliefs and that those beliefs are reflected in the learners' approaches to language learning. The findings of Gorham's study (1988) on a set of verbal teacher immediacy behaviors between small and larger classes indicate that the impact of teacher immediacy behaviors in both verbal and nonverbal channels such as consistent eye contact, movement, vocal variety, gestures, humor, and personalized examples during class on learning is coincidentally enhanced as class size increases.

Wells (1993) examined the IRE pattern of interaction from a number of science classrooms. The researcher found that while the teachers often asked questions of students, they did not typically close down the sequence with a narrow evaluation of the student responses. The teachers in the study, usually asked students to elaborate or clarify, and in other ways treated student responses as valuable contributions to the ongoing discussion.

Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur and Pendergast (1997) studied interactions among 112 eighth and ninth grade language arts and English classrooms in the United States and found that the use of the IRE pattern of interaction was negatively correlated with learning. The IRE pattern made students less able to recall and understand the topical content than were the students who were involved in more complex patterns of interaction. Another study was that the use of the IRE sequence of interaction was more prevalent in lower-track classes.

In another study, Nassaji and Wells (2000) provide a more comprehensive discussion of various options for the follow-up move in the three-part exchange in classroom interaction. Their data come from a six-year research project involving nine elementary and middle school teachers and three university researchers. The findings indicate that the teacher shaped the direction of subsequent interactions in classrooms.

In Tognini's (2007) study, the researcher investigated the interaction of teachers and learners in ten primary and secondary school languages other than English classes in Western Australia. The study aimed at providing a detailed picture of the nature and patterns of interactions and found that teacher-learner interaction featured various types of negative feedback, positive evidence and considerable reliance on interactional routines such as elicitation, non-corrective repetition, drilling and reinforcement.

In another study, Muramatsu (2008) explored the general characteristics and influence of both teachers' and students' nonnative speaker status on teacher-student interaction during writing conferences within the context of university-level composition courses. The study adopted the interactional sociolinguistics approach to explore such factors of sociocultural factors as politeness, face, and power relationship around which the characteristics of the communicative event are constructed.

The study by Harrison and Peacock (2009) compared science students' perceptions of their teacher-student interactions with those of their teachers from 164 secondary school science classes in Australia. The findings indicate that the teachers thought they demonstrated more leadership and helping/friendly behavior than their students did. Besides, teachers perceived the ideal teacher as being more positive than they currently were.

Ralston (2010) explored interactions that occur and are facilitated in mainstream classrooms where a majority of the students are English language learners, specifically in Southern Nevada. The aims of the study were to explore how interactions are elicited by teachers, within instructional contexts. The research also considered if and how differentiated instruction and scaffolding impact the learning of English language learners in mainstream classrooms. The findings show that pervasive strategies during the course of the study were interaction in the classroom with different kinds of differentiated instruction, and scaffolding.

Nhapulo (2013) studied teacher and learner beliefs and expectations about English language teaching and learning at a Mozambican university. The author used questionnaires and a focus group report to collect data. The results indicate that learners and teachers point out that there is need for creating an environment in which teachers' and learners' cultural background, beliefs and needs are considered. They thought that when their beliefs are taken into consideration, teachers will be able to teach effectively, and learners are able to achieve positive learning outcomes.

With regards to class size and interactions, Kumar (1992) explored classroom interactions in large and small classes. Data were collected from traditional and activity-based English classes of different sizes. The study compared the opportunities for learners to interact meaningfully the two class settings. The findings show that the nature of the activities in the classroom and the teacher's role and attitude influence the nature of learner participation and the patterns of interaction rather than class size per se.

Koenig, Gray, Lewis and Martin (2015) conducted a survey with 162 students asking about their preference for enrolling in a large class of about 75 students or small class of about 35 students. The study found that students preferred smaller classes for major-related courses than for general education and non-interesting required courses. The findings also showed that students liked small classes because of the professor-student interaction. However, they reported to enjoy large classes as having more students means decreased responsibility. The implication from this study is that in large size classes, teacher - students interaction tends to be restricted.

From the review of previous studies above, it is clear that various aspects of classroom interactions have been explored; however, the issue of interactions in large non-English majored classes has not been investigated in depth. Especially, comparison of teachers and students' belief of classroom interactions in non-English majored classes has not been touched on. Besides, previous studies

generally focus on either classroom interactions or teachers' beliefs, there is none shown in the literature that explored both teachers' and students' beliefs and classroom interactions in one study. There remains a question on how teachers and students perceive classroom interactions and how their beliefs correspond to their actual practice of interactions in the classroom.

2.14 Summary

In summary, this chapter has reviewed classroom interactions and their features. Interaction is at the heart of language learning and teaching; it involves learners in face-to-face or teacher-learners encounters in the classroom. It presents definitions of the key terms used in the current study focusing on interactions, interaction hypothesis/Interactionism, sociocultural theory, large classes, and non-English majored students. The chapter also compiles previous studies on teachers' beliefs and classroom interactions related to the current one to analyze them and to identify the gaps in the literature. The review shows that so far almost no studies have been carried out to investigate teachers' and students' beliefs about classroom interactions in large classes for non-English majors. It is therefore worth doing a study on the topic. The next chapter will describe research methodology.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology. First, it justifies the research approaches used in the current study. Then it describes the research design with information regarding research participants, data collection tools and data analysis. Research reliability, validity, as well as ethical considerations are also discussed in this chapter.

3.2 Research Design

Both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used in the current study. Quantitative approach involves the use and analyses of numerical data using statistical techniques to produce statistically reliable data that tells us how many people do or think something. The result is usually numerical and hence considered more “objective” (Creswell, 1994). Due to the nature of the research in a naturalistic classroom environment, qualitative approach was employed. Qualitative research is “An inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting” (Creswell, 1994, p. 2). This combination is appropriate to the current to study because the use of questionnaire was to investigate teachers’ perceptions whereas interview could elaborate on what they thought and did in classroom interactions. Besides questionnaires and interviews, in this study, observation by audio recording of classroom interactions was carried out as classroom practices cannot be understood without knowing the process of teaching and learning actually happening in the classroom.

Trochim (2005) however noted that the distinction between the two approaches is not as well-defined as expected; qualitative research can include quantitative coding of data, and quantitative research can make use of qualitative interpretation. Creswell (2003) added that qualitative research provides a good means for follow-up to quantitative research. Although the implementation of different methods may

yield data that are conflicting, alternatively, that can be viewed as an advantage because the quality of the research will be enhanced through multiple perspectives (Kanuka, 2001).

This study used different techniques of both the qualitative and quantitative approaches to improve the degree of validity and reliability through three kinds of research instruments: questionnaire, interviews and observation via audio recording. Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, and Hanson (2003, p. 212) said:

The collection or analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are given a priority, and involve the integration of the data at one or more stages in the process of research.

Besides, Creswell (2007) noted that interactions between individuals cannot be represented by statistical means alone because numbers cannot depict the uniqueness that narratives can portray. Using a mixed-methods approach will take advantage of the strengths and will reduce the limitations of qualitative and quantitative research (Trochim, 2005).

Besides, McMillan and Schumacher (2006, p.401) stated, “As researchers have realized that often the best approach to answering questions is to use both quantitative and qualitative data”. In this study, data were gathered and analysed both quantitatively (from questionnaire surveys) and qualitatively (from interviews and audio recordings). The combination of different approaches enables the researchers to draw on all possibilities (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998) and provides a broader perspective to the study as the qualitative data helps describe aspects the quantitative data cannot address (Creswell, 2003). Using both forms of data allows researchers to simultaneously generalize results from a sample to a population and to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of interest.

In short, both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used in this study because they complemented each other to enhance the robustness of the study. Beside the combination of both qualitative and quantitative approaches to enhance the reliability of the study, in this research, several strategies were used to enhance research robustness (see the section on research reliability and validity of this chapter).

3.3 Research Participants

3.3.1. Teacher Participants

In this study, 100 teachers coming from HCM College of Foreign Economic Relations, HCM University of Environment, HCM Law University, and Ho Chi Minh University of Industry were invited to participate into the study. They consisted of 76 female and 24 male, aged from 27 to 55 years who were teaching non-English majored large classes. They all shared the common experience of the years of English teaching at large classes at university in Ho Chi Minh city. Among these 100 teacher participants, there are 20 ESP teachers who have about 20 years of teaching experience, 50 ESP teachers with about from 10 to 15 teaching experience years. The rest have about from 5 to 10 teaching experience years. Then 20 teachers of these were randomly chosen to take part in the interview to get insight into teachers' beliefs about interactions. Besides, 45 periods of teaching and learning in non-English majored large classes were recorded. Each period lasted for 45 minutes.

Information of the teacher participants is presented in the following table:

Table 3.1 Teacher Participants

Gender	Quantity
Female	76
Male	24
Year of Teaching Experience	
From 5 to 10 years	30
From 10 to 15 years	50
Above 20 years	20
Age Range	
From 27 to 55 years old	100

3.3.2. Student Participants

In this study, 100 students coming from HCM College of Foreign Economic Relations, HCM University of Environment and HCM Law University, Ho Chi Minh University of Industry were invited to participate. They consisted of 65 female and 35 male, aged from 20 to 21. The students were in their third year at university. The data collection was carried out at the beginning of the second semester of the academic year 2014-2015 at four universities in Ho Chi Minh city. Most of them have studied English for about ten years. Among these 100 students, 20 students of these were chosen to take part in the interview. Information of the student participants is presented in the following table:

Table 3.2 Student Participants

Number of students	Gender	Year at University	Year of studying
65	Female	Third-year student	10 years
35	Male		

In general, the sample size of this study was 200 participants. According to Israel (1992), the minimum sample size should be 100 to reach 95% of precision level (5% of risk level). Similarly, Gorsuch (1983), Kline (1979), MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang and Hong (2001) recommended at least 100 for population size in a survey study. Clearly, the larger the sample, the more reliable the data are.

3.4 Data Collection Methods

The researcher exploited three different methods namely questionnaires, interviews and observation using audio recordings to collect data. All the collected data from these methods were analysed carefully to investigate the teachers' and students' beliefs of interactions as well as to explore some similarities and differences between teachers' and students' beliefs about interactions in non-English majored large classes. Table 3.3 summarizes the information about data collection tools:

Table 3.3 Summary of Data Collection Methods

Instrument	Function	Elicitation format	Response format	Quantitative or Qualitative
Questionnaire	To investigate teachers' and students' beliefs about interactions in non-English majored large classes	45 questions with five-point scale	Written	Quantitative
Interview	To obtain deeper understanding about teachers' and students' beliefs about	Open-ended questions	Verbal	Qualitative

	classroom interactions			
Observation: Audio recording	To identify features of classroom interactions in non-English majored large classes and examine how the actual classroom interactions correspond to teachers and students' beliefs about classroom interactions.	Natural recording	Verbal	Qualitative

3.4.1. Questionnaires

There are several reasons to believe that the use of various types of questionnaires is a very popular data collection technique. Wallace (1998) pointed out that survey and questionnaires are useful ways of gathering information about teaching and learning such as beliefs, attitudes, motivation, and preferences. Besides, they enable a researcher to collect a large amount of information relatively quickly. According to Wallace (1998, p. 124) the questions in questionnaires are usually systematically set out and very often answered by reading the questions and then ticking responses, or writing in short answers.

The questionnaire is used as the main instrument for collecting data because it is easy to administer and can be administered to a large group of subjects at the

same time. Moreover, the respondents are free to answer the questions in their own time and at their own pace. Fear and embarrassment resulting from direct contact may also be avoided. The data collected from the questionnaire tends to be uniform and standard. The disadvantages of using questionnaires such as low response rate, low return rate, and poor responses resulting from misunderstanding, vagueness and ambiguity can be overcome by directly delivering and explaining the instruction of every item to the participants.

The questionnaire in this study was developed by the researcher using the key points of classroom interactions from the perspectives of sociocultural theory and interactionism which are summarized in Table 3.4 on the clusters of the questionnaires. The designed questionnaire consists of 45 questions. Each question (observed variable) is measured based on the 5-point Likert scales, from completely disagree (strongly disagree) to completely agree (strongly agree). For example, some statements were put this way: “It is difficult for the teacher to interact with students and vice versa in non-English majored large classes” or “In a large class, teachers are usually unable to manage classroom interactions.” The advantage of this type of questioning is that the predetermined close-ended responses can obtain useful information to support theories and concepts in the literature.

The items of the questionnaire were categorized into five clusters or groups of themes which are class size and classroom interactions, roles of teachers in classroom interactions in large classes, roles of students in interactions in large classes, roles of the target language, and roles of the mother language. Table 3.4.1 below presents the items of each cluster in the questionnaire:

Table 3.4. Summary of the Questionnaire Clusters

Cluster	Items
Class size and classroom interactions	2,4,6,7,14,15,29,44,45
Roles of teachers in classroom interactions in non-English majored	1,5,8,9,10,13,31,33,36

large classes	
Roles of students in classroom interactions in non-English majored large classes	11,17,18,20,22,25,26,28,30,32,34,35,37,43
Roles of the target language	3,12,16,23,27,38,40,41
Roles of the mother language	19,21,24,39,42

More specifically, each teacher and each student were given a copy of the questionnaire and expected to write his or her responses. The questionnaire was written in both English and Vietnamese to ensure that the teachers as well as the students understood it well. Careful attention was paid to the wording of the questionnaire in order to increase the reliability and validity of the data. The expected responses to the items in the questionnaire were supposed to focus on the issues of the importance, and to help answer the research questions. The questionnaires for teachers and students are included in Appendix A and Appendix B.

3.4.1.1. Questionnaire for students

A written questionnaire was used in order to gain a general understanding of students' beliefs towards interactions in large non-English majored classes. Classroom interactions can be seen through the relation of class size and classroom interaction, the role of teachers in classroom interactions, the role of students in classroom interactions, the role of the target language and the role of the mother tongue.

In the pilot research, 40 copies of questionnaires were delivered to the students during September 2015. The time for the students to complete the questionnaires was within 30 minutes. Students could return the questionnaire to the data collector after four hours so that they could have time to think about the surveyed issues. The data gained from questionnaires were analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for quantitative analysis.

3.4.1.2. Questionnaire for Teachers

The content of teacher questionnaire is similar to that of the student questionnaire. As well as the student questionnaire, the designed questionnaire for teachers also consists of 45 questions. Each question is also measured based on the 5-point Likert scales, from completely disagree (strongly disagree) to completely agree (strongly agree).

There are five clusters in the teacher questionnaire. The first cluster asked for class size information. The second cluster aimed to explore the roles of teachers in classroom interactions in large classes. In the third cluster, the roles of students in large classes are put forward. The fourth and fifth clusters focused on the roles of the target language and the mother language. The statement items in the teacher questionnaire were basically the same as those in the student questionnaire, except that teachers were asked about what and how they motivated students in classroom interactions. For example, a statement item in a cluster states, “The teacher should encourage shy students in non-English majored large classes to talk more”.

In the pilot research, 30 copies of questionnaires were delivered to the teachers during October 2015. The time for the teachers to complete the questionnaires was within 20 minutes but they had 4 hours to return the questionnaire to the data collector so that they could have time to think about the mentioned issues. The data gained from questionnaires were analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for quantitative analysis.

3.4.2. Interviews

Wallace (1998, p.124) states, “Interviews are by definition oral conversation”, and recommends three categories of interviews which may be summarized such as structured interviews, unstructured interviews and semi-structured interviews. Firstly, structured interviews mean interviews in which the question will probably be ready from a carefully prepare interview schedule, similar to a questionnaire but used orally. Secondly, unstructured interviews are simply interviews with a relaxed

atmosphere, but without losing sight of the research purpose. Lastly, semi-structured interviews are those in which the questions will probably be open questions. Comments, examples or follow-up questions may be included in the interview of this kind in order encourage the interview to give more detailed responses.

The number of the interviewees in this study was 20 for two reasons. Firstly, according to Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006), the number of interviewees follows the principle of saturation. Data reach saturation when additional participants may not provide any additional insights. Saturation usually occurs around 12 participants in homogeneous groups. Secondly, Crouch and McKenzie (2006) propose that fewer than 20 participants for interviews in a qualitative study helps a researcher build and maintain a close relationship and thus improve the “open” and “frank” exchange of information. This can help mitigate some of the bias and validity threats inherent in qualitative research. For all these reasons, 20 participants were invited for interviews in the current study.

For gathering in-depth information and extensive data on a small number of topics, semi-structured interviews were employed in this study. This kind of interview consists of specific and defined questions determined beforehand but at the same time it allows some elaboration in the questions and answers with limits. Nunan (1992, p.150) pointed out, “The advantages of the semi-structured interview are that it gives the interview a degree of power and control over the course of the interview and gives interviewer a great deal of flexibility.” Besides, Berg (1989, p.17) notes that this type of interview is conducted in “systematic and consistent order, but it allows the interviewers sufficient freedom; that is, the interviewers are permitted (in fact expected) to probe far beyond the answers to their prepared and standardized questions”.

The contents of the interview with teachers and students consist of 9 questions (See Appendix C and Appendix D). They focused on the teachers’ and students’

beliefs about classroom interactions and how classroom interactions are used in the process teaching and learning.

For data collection, individual interviews with each of the participating students and teachers were conducted to explore and confirm similarities and differences in their belief about interactions in teaching large non-English majored classes. The primary purpose of these teacher and student interviews was to complement data collected from the questionnaire responses that seemed relevant and salient for later phases of the study and data analysis.

Interviews were conducted with 20 teachers and 20 students among 100 teachers and 100 students chosen randomly at Ho Chi Minh College of Foreign Economic Relations, Ho Chi Minh University of Environment, Ho Chi Minh University of Industry and Ho Chi Minh University of Law. The researcher called for voluntary teachers' participation in the study via Facebook, personal contacts and university websites. Those who responded to the call for participation were invited to fill a questionnaire and take part in an interview. Each interview lasted from twenty to twenty-five minutes. Interview appointments extended over several weeks with different groups of teachers and several days with groups of students.

In order to obtain the optimal result, a list of issues and necessary questions were prepared before the actual interview. Regardless of the issues, the researcher had to decide on the type of questions to be used and in what form the responses are to be collected and analyzed. In the interview, the researcher asked open-ended questions so that the participants could best voice their beliefs about interactions in the process of learning. The questions were used to reaffirm the teachers' and students' beliefs about interactions in non-English majored large classes. All answers were audiorecorded for later analysis. An open-ended response to a question allows the participant to create the options for responding. For example, in the interview, the researcher asked, "What are classroom interactions in your opinion?" The student or the teacher then created a response to this question openly.

The audio recordings of the interviews were kept and then transcribed for data analysis.

However, there are some advantages and disadvantages of interviews in qualitative research. Some advantages are that they provide useful information when the researcher cannot directly observe participants, and they permit participants to describe detailed information. Besides, the interviewer had better control over the types of information received, because the interviewer could ask specific questions to elicit this information. Some disadvantages are that interviews provide only information “filtered” through the views of the interviewers. Also, interview data may be deceptive and provide the perspective the interviewee wants the researcher to hear. Another disadvantage is that the presence of the researcher may affect how the interviewee responds. Interviewee responses may not be articulate, perceptive, or clear. In addition, equipment issues may be a problem, and the researcher prepared recording and transcribing equipment in advance of the interview. During the interview, the researcher gave some attention to the conversation with the participants. This attention required saying little and add facilitating questions to encourage individuals to talk.

In general, in this study the researcher used one-on-one interviews to ask questions and record answers from only one participant in the study at a time because one-on-one interviews are ideal for interviewing participants who are not hesitant to speak, and who can share ideas comfortably.

3.4.3. Observation with Audio-recording of Classroom Interactions

The final type of data collection tool was audio recording. To get audio recordings in classrooms, the researcher used a Sony digital recorder. Before carrying out lesson recording, the researcher asked the classroom teachers in advance for permission of recording their lesson periods. The researcher also confirmed that she would like to record the natural classroom interactions and that no interference with the classroom teaching and learning would be made.

The researcher recorded 45 lesson periods to capture classroom interactions happening in the process of teaching and learning in non-English majored large classes. In total, the researcher recorded 45 periods (45 minutes each period in 10 classes) from non-English large classes of the third-year students at different universities mentioned earlier for data analysis. All of the audio recordings were transcribed carefully to explore interaction patterns of the teachers and students in their process of teaching (see Appendix E for a sample).

3.5 Research Procedure

To achieve the research objectives, the study was carried out with the process consisting of two steps: pilot study, and main study.

3.5.1. Pilot study

Quantitative pilot study was conducted with 40 students to complete questionnaires for the survey process and the same step was done with 30 teachers from some universities in Ho Chi Minh city.

For student questionnaire, after the piloting and calculating, items 3,13,16,20,37 and 41 were found to have rather low reliability efficiency as compared with the standard of Cronbach's Alpha (SPSS sytem, ≤ 0.3) (see Appendix F), so they were then revised by using simplified words and phrases and shortened to ensure students could understand them easily.

After items 3, 13,16,20,37 and 41 were revised by using simplified words and phrase, they were used again. The pilot results of teacher questionnaire achieved a reliable score, only item 39 had the Cronbach's Anphal standard smaller than 0.3 compared with Cronbach's Anphal standard (SPSS) (see Appendix G). Then item 39 was reworted and simplified.

The pilot of the questionnaire also revealed that the contents of the items "There is not enough time for students to interact with one another in a large class" and "Classroom interactions in non-English large classes are not effective because

students do not have a lot of opportunities to talk to other students” in the questionnaire were very similar. As the result, one of them was removed. Besides, the item “Interaction among students in a large class leads to development in cognition and language learning” shows the content was rather difficult to understand for both teachers and students. Therefore, it was also deleted.

Qualitative pilot study was conducted through discussions with some teachers and students. First, discussions conducted through in-depth interviews with five English teachers. Second, the interview was conducted with group discussions with 10 students. The main purpose of this pilot interview step was to explore, adjust and edit the preliminary questions that were put forward. Besides, observation via audio-recording was tested with 3 classes to make sure that the equipment obtained clear sounds of interactions in the classroom and that the interactions were clear enough for transcription. When all the tools were able to collect answers from the respondents and revised as mentioned above, the main study was carried out.

3.5.2. Main study

The main data collection was carried out at the beginning of the second semester of the academic year 2015 in three HCM universities. First, data collection with the questionnaire was conducted. The researcher contacted the teachers at the universities and delivered the questionnaire for completion. Direct guidance from the researcher helped the teachers produce accurate responses to the questionnaire which was collected after the informants had finished their answers.

When all the questionnaires were collected, the researcher invited 20 participants for interviews which took place at the time of convenience for the respondents and the places for interview were chosen by the respondents. The interview was to obtain insights of teachers’ beliefs about interactions. Besides, 45 periods of teaching and learning in large non-English majored classes were recorded. As mentioned earlier, teachers’ and students’ agreement for being observed were sought before the actual observation was conducted. The observation

was carried out with the assistance of a Sony audio recorder which recorded the classroom interactions at the research sites clearly.

In addition, 100 third-year non-English majors at four Ho Chi Minh city universities were invited to fill the questionnaire and 20 of them were interviewed to get insights into students' beliefs about interactions. The procedure for data collection with students was similar to that with teachers but conducted after the collection of data from teachers.

3.6 Research Methods on Classroom Interactions

It can be seen from the literature that most classroom interaction studies used audio or video recordings for data collection. Usually, the audio transcripts serve the purpose of linguistic and content analysis whereas video recordings reveal gestures and non-linguistic factors. The research by Wells (1999), for example, transcribed classroom talks and analysed the moves of the teachers and students to see how IRF exchange led to science learning among students. Smith and Higgins (2006) similarly adopted the transcription method to figure out how feedback turns of teachers assisted students in learning their subjects. Mercer (2004) proposed sociocultural analysis because the author pointed out that the purpose of classroom talk was to co-construct knowledge or collective knowledge sharing. Mercer (2004, p. 141) stated:

It [sociocultural discourse analysis] differs from linguistic discourse analysis in being less focused on language itself and more on its functions for the analysis, reports of the analysis are usually illustrated by selected extracts of transcribed talk, to which the analyst provides a commentary.

With a rather different focus, Flewitt (2006) argued that for studies to explore interactions by young children, it would be more insightful to use video recording because it can reveal a range of resources to mediate through words, noises, gaze, facial expression and body movement during their first year of

education. Hall and Verplaetse (2000) reported discourse analytic methods by analyzing recorded classroom interactions to examine the ability of teachers to generate student talk, the development of interpersonal relationships and identities in the classroom, and the creation of interaction opportunities for linguistic minority children. In general, classroom interaction studies are mainly connected with analysis of transcript. The focus of the analysis varies according to the purpose of a certain study.

In this study, sociocultural discourse analysis (Mercer, 2004) was adopted. The interaction is treated as a form of intellectual activity and as a social mode of thinking. It incorporates a concern with the lexical content and the cohesive structure of talk, especially across the contributions of teachers and students.

3.7 Data Analysis

Data analysis was done both quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative data from questionnaire was processed with the SPSS software. Qualitative data from interview and classroom observation through audio-recording was coded with emerging themes related to the research topic of classroom interactions including beliefs about the roles of the teachers and peers in interactions, the mediating roles of the target language and the first language and actual practice of classroom interactions. More specifically, the coding, filing and categorizing of the data were carried out at the end of the second semester of the academic year of 2015-2016. The process of data analysis from questionnaires started first, then the interviews and finally the audio recordings. Data from questionnaire was calculated for reliability efficient, mean, max, and percentages. The questionnaire items were arranged into clusters with each cluster representing a subtheme of classroom interactions such as the roles of teachers, the roles of students, the roles the first language of, and so on.

The coding for interview data was conducted when the transcript was completed and themes emerged from the transcript to answer the research questions

were chosen and arranged to complement data from questionnaires and audio recording. The data from interviews were collected in English or Vietnamese. The Vietnamese data were translated into English by the researcher. To make sure that the English translation correctly reflected what the respondents wanted to say, the translation of the interview transcript was sent back to the respondents for feedback and checking. However, none of the respondents gave any feedback regarding the exactness of their responses translated into English. The transcript of the interview was then classified and coded. The coding was classified into five themes including class size (CS), the roles of teachers (RT), the roles of students (RS), the roles of the target language (RTL), and the roles of the first language (RFL). In addition, before being used in analysis, the transcriptions of the participants' interview answers were sent back to them for checking.

Data from audio-recording was transcribed by the researcher. Where Vietnamese was used, it was translated into English. The extraction of the audio recordings was chosen if it is of a coherent group of text which is most prominent for extracting information (Rahangdale & Agrawal, 2014). The analysis adopted sociocultural discourse analysis which focuses on the use of language as a social mode of thinking and a tool for teaching-and-learning, constructing knowledge, creating joint understanding and tackling problems collaboratively (Mercer, 2004).

3.8 Research Reliability and Validity

As for reliability, all the items of the questionnaire were calculated and compared with the standard of Cronbach's Alpha (SPSS system) which must be ≤ 0.3 to be reliable. As mentioned earlier, most items in the current study reached the standard. The very few ones which did not meet the Cronbach's Alpha standard were revised.

Before the findings are analysed in details, the reliability of the questionnaire for teachers and students was measured using Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) for internal consistency. It is expressed as a number between 0 and 1. Internal

consistency describes the extent to which all the items in a scale measures the same concept or construct and hence it is connected to the inter-relatedness of the items within the scale. The following table presents the figures.

Table 3.5 Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Analysis of Clusters of Teachers' and Students' responses

Cluster	Cronbach's Alpha		Minimum Corrected Item-Total Correlation	
	Teachers (T)	Students (S)	Teachers (T)	Students (S)
1. Class size and classroom interactions	0.906	0.937	0.335	0.454
2. Roles of teachers in classroom interactions in large classes	0.908	0.944	0.447	0.520
3. Roles of students in interactions in large classes	0.903	0.926	0.490	0.468
4. Roles of the target language	0.879	0.951	0.535	0.797
5. Roles of the first language	0.837	0.803	0.585	0.546

The results in Table 3.5 show that Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of all scales of both teachers and students' responses are larger than 0.7 and the total correlation coefficient of corrected items is greater than 0.3. According to Nunnally and Burnstein (1994), if the selection criteria of Cronbach's Alpha is higher than 0.6 and

the total correlation coefficient is higher than 0.3, it can be concluded that all scales achieved reliability.

As for the qualitative techniques, the research validity was strengthened in a number of ways. First, the current research employed methodological triangulation (Denzin, 1970) to collect a chain of evidence in data collection from various tools.

In this study, questionnaire, interviews, and audio recording were used. Each of them obtained different sources of inter-personal and intra-personal information pertaining to the research questions. Second, the data gathered through these triangulated means were then cross-analysed in order to obtain an in-depth understanding of teachers and students' beliefs of interactions in non-English majored large classes. In other words, triangulation refers to data source and methodology triangulation by collecting evidence from different types. It also indicates theory triangulation or using more than one theoretical approach (theory) to interpret and support data. In this study, data from the three sources related to each research question was pulled together and interpreted. For example, teachers' beliefs about the role of classroom interactions were collected from questionnaire and interview. These data were extracted and discussed. Then, data from classroom recordings were analyzed to see how their beliefs about the role of classroom interactions were actually realized. Differences and similarities in the findings from the three tools of data collection were discussed to deepen the understanding of the matter under investigation in the light of sociocultural theory and interactionism.

Lastly, the research validity was also strengthened in the category of data "trustworthiness" (Mishler, 2000). The researcher was aware that she must not "distort" participants' meanings and the interpretation and conclusions or claims must be supported with different quoted and illustrated sources of data.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

To ensure the participants' identities were not revealed in this current study and that their ideas were not jeopardized, the researcher at the very beginning of the study informed the participants carefully of the purposes of the study and confirmed with them that no names or any information about them would be disclosed. The participants' names used in the thesis are pseudo names. Besides, all of their participation in completing the questionnaire, answering the interview or audio-recorded was based on a voluntary basis. The questionnaire as well as the interview did not ask for the participants' identity information. When collecting the data, the researcher assured that the research purpose would not harm students' marks or grades. During the data collection process, the researcher kept in mind that she was not a classroom teacher and she could not force students to do any tasks beside the mere data collection for the study purpose. The researcher was aware that the student participants were helping with the research and they were treated with respect and dignity at all times.

3.10 Summary

This chapter presented the design of the study. It justified why a combination of both quantitative and qualitative approaches was used in the current study. The chapter also described in details the research participants. Three instruments of collecting data which were questionnaire, interviews and observation with audio recordings were reported. Measures taken to enhance research reliability and validity were described. The next chapter will discuss the findings.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings and discussion for the study entitled, “Teachers’ and students’ beliefs about classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes in Ho Chi Minh city”. The data collected from questionnaire for teachers, questionnaire for students, interviews with both teachers and students as well as audio recordings of classroom interactions were analyzed in these key themes: teachers’ and students’ beliefs of classroom interactions in non-English majored large classes, similarities and differences between teachers’ and students’ beliefs about classroom interactions, and how their beliefs correspond to their actual practice of classroom interactions.

4.2 Findings

Before data to answer each research question from different instruments are pulled out to be presented together in this section, it is necessary to compare the mean scores of all the clusters in the questionnaire. Table 4.1 below presents the data.

Table 4.1: Mean Scores of All Questionnaire Clusters

Factor (Cluster)	Mean	
	T (N=100)	S (N=100)
1. Class Size and Classroom Interactions	4.25	4.11
2. Roles of Teachers in Classroom Interactions in Large Classes	4.22	4.04
3. Roles of Students in Interactions in Large	4.23	4.06

Classes		
4. Roles of the Target Language in Classroom Interactions	4.13	4.10
5. Roles of the First Language in Classroom Interactions	4.14	4.13

As can be seen in Table 4.1, the mean scores for all the clusters in the responses of teachers are higher than those of students. It could be inferred that teachers had higher agreement with all the statements. Among the clusters, both teachers and students agreed most with the factor of class size and its influence on classroom interactions (M=4.25 and M=4.11 for teachers and students respectively). The lowest value of mean score for teachers' responses is from the cluster of the roles of the target language in classroom interactions whereas that of students' is from the cluster of the roles of teachers in classroom interactions.

4.2.1. Teachers' and Students' beliefs about Class Size and Classroom Interactions

Clearly, interactions in the classroom are an essential part of teaching learning process. Long (1983) said that interactions in the classroom can lead to second language learning. In sociocultural theory, Vygotsky (1978) claimed that through social interactions that learners could develop their thinking and move beyond their current level of ability. According to Lantolf (2000), the dynamic nature of the interplay between teachers, learners and tasks and provides a view of learning as arising from interactions with others.

With regards to class size and interactions, Jin and Cortazzi (2013) pointed out that large class size can cause a lot of problems for classroom management and effective interactions. Vrasidas and McIssac (1999) also identified class size as one major affecting classroom interactions. To find out teachers and students' beliefs

about this factor, a questionnaire was given to 100 teachers and another to 100 students. Their responses are presented in the following table:

Table 4.2: Teachers' and Students' beliefs about Class Size and Classroom Interactions

Statements	(N of Teachers = 100; N of Students = 100)											
	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Neutral (3)		Agree (4)		Strongly Agree (5)		Mean	
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S
1. A language class with from 40 students or more reduces the speaking opportunities for students to interact to each other.	0	0	0	6	45	38	33	33	22	23	3.77	3.73
2. It is difficult for the teacher to interact with students and vice versa in non-English majored large classes.	0	0	7	8	49	46	26	42	18	4	3.55	3.42
3. There is not enough time for students to interact with one another in	0	0	0	0	14	38	45	24	41	38	4.27	4

a large class.												
4. In a large class, teachers are usually unable to manage classroom interactions.	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	47	55	53	4.55	4.53
5. The atmosphere in a large class encourages students to interact.	0	0	7	6	49	39	16	53	28	2	3.65	3.51
6. In a large class, students can learn from other peers through interactions	0	0	0	2	3	30	55	34	42	34	4.39	4
7. Teacher-students interactions are necessary in teaching non-English large classes	0	0	0	0	0	6	37	38	63	56	4.63	4.5
8. Classroom interactions include talking between teacher and students	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	15	80	84	4.83	4.80
9. Classroom interactions include	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	46	59	54	4.59	4.54

talking between students and students													
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

The figures in Table 4.2 relating to teachers' and students' responses of class size and classroom interactions indicate that both of the teachers and students had almost the same evaluations with most of the statements. Yet, teachers, overall, provided their evaluations at a higher level than students in their responses. More specifically, the statement of *"Classroom interactions include talking between teacher and students"* has a mean score of 4.83 from teachers' responses with 80% of "strongly agree" and 20% of "agree". However, the mean score is 4.80 for students' evaluation with 84% of "strongly agree" and 15% of "agree".

Regarding the statement of *"Teacher-students interactions are necessary in teaching non-English large classes"*, data show that students' evaluation is 4.5 with 56% of "strongly agree" level, 38% of "agree" level. In comparison, the figures for teachers' responses are higher in mean score, at 4.63 with 63% of "strongly agree" and 27% of "agree".

Furthermore, for the statement of *"In a large class, teachers are usually unable to manage classroom interactions"*, the mean score is from 4.55 for teachers' and 4.53 for students' answers. The level of evaluation between the two group was nearly the same. Similarly, the statement *"Classroom interactions include talking between students and students"* achieved 4.83 and 4.80 for each group respectively.

Besides, both teachers and students had high agreement for the statement: *"There is not enough time for students to interact with one another in a large class"* (M=4.27 for teachers and M=4.0 for students) with higher percentages of "agree" and "strongly agree" responses from teachers.

Also concerning the topic of class size and classroom interactions, 10 teachers and 10 students were invited to participate in the interviews with pre-prepared questions (see Appendices C & D). In the interviews, all the teachers mentioned the difficulties of large class size which hinder the interactions in the class and some teachers gave details of the problems which come from large classes. None of the interviewed teachers consider large classes brought advantages for classroom interactions. For example, teacher Thuý said, *“Although students work in groups or pairs, teachers can’t come to each group to check their work with limited time causing inefficient interactions”*. More problems of class size and interactions are reflected in details in the answer by teacher Châu, *“Because of many students in class and fixed desk and chair arrangement, it was hard for teachers to control the whole class. In particular, while teachers come to one group to interact, the others start to neglect studying or chat.”* Teachers Diễm mentioned another problem, *“It’s hard to respond and meet all students’ needs because of large class size. As for students, it is hard for them to ask the teacher for help directly.”* Besides, teacher Bích considered that in large classes, students tended to use the first language more often in interactions and teacher Linh commented that opportunities for students to talk in large classes are limited. Teachers Nga and Minh said that large classes mean there are different levels of proficiency of students, which makes it more difficult for teachers to teach and manage the class. Noise is another problem of large classes (Teacher Nga).

Interviews with students show that students also perceived the difficulties from the large class sizes. All students pointed out that interactions between teachers and students as well as among students in large classes are limited. Besides, they mentioned other problems. For example, student Nghiêm said, *“In non-English large majored classes, teachers couldn’t control the whole class with limited time and too many contents in a lesson”*. Students Phương and Phát added that in large classes, students may be neglected and they cannot ask teachers directly. Student Khánh said when the class is crowded, some students may not collaborate with

classmates in completing tasks. Similar to interviewed teachers' answers, student Uyên pointed out that students in large classes have different levels of English proficiency, so it is rather difficult for interactions among them to work well. She also mentioned insufficient feedback in large classes. Likewise, student Vinh said, "In large classes, some of students may be neglected and shy, they are afraid of giving opinions and asking for help. Besides, it is difficult for students to approach teachers to ask question."

In summary, both groups of participants tended to agree that classroom interactions in large classes are reduced due to the size and opportunities to speak for students. However, teachers agreed more with learning from peer interactions and limited time for students to talk in large classes. Besides, both groups responded in the interviews that large class size limited the interaction between teachers and students as well as between students and students.

4.2.2. Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of Teachers in Classroom Interactions in Large Classes

Clearly, teachers play important roles in promoting classroom interactions. Brown (1994) pointed that for interactions to take place in classroom, teachers have to adopt different techniques to promote students' talking time and to engage them in class communication. The roles of teachers in classroom interactions can range from controlling interaction patterns (Walsh, 2012) to providing modified input (Ellis, 1999) and providing comprehensible input (Long, 1983). To find out teachers' and students' evaluation of teachers' roles in classroom interactions, a questionnaire was given to 100 teachers and 100 students. Data are presented in Table 4.3. below.

Table 4.3: Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of Teachers in Interactions in Large Classes

Statements	(N of Teachers = 100; N of Students = 100)											
	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Neutral (3)		Agree (4)		Strongly Agree (5)		Mean	
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S
10. The atmosphere in non-English majored large classes is teacher-centered.	0	0	0	0	17	18	51	62	29	20	4.18	4.02
11. In non-English major large classes teachers should talk less to give opportunities for students to interact more.	0	0	20	3	45	42	32	54	3	1	3.18	3.53
12. Teachers should use audio-visual aids in non-English majored large classes to promote classroom interactions	0	0	0	3	17	15	42	58	38	24	4.27	4.03
13. Teachers should use classroom	0	0	0	3	22	43	59	53	19	1	3.97	3.52

interactions are to promote learners' processing capacity.													
14. In large non-English majored classes, students should be scaffolded by teachers.	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	22	84	78	4.84	4.78	
15. The teacher should provide language input in non-English majored large classes	0	0	0	0	0	3	32	42	68	55	4.68	4.52	
16. The teacher should encourage shy students in large non-English majored classes to talk more.	0	0	3	0	19	14	56	52	22	34	3.97	4.2	
17. Teachers should use guiding questions to help students with their language learning in large non-English majored classes.	0	0	0	3	3	43	45	52	52	2	4.49	3.53	
18. Teachers should	0	0	0	0	4	11	56	57	40	32	4.36	4.21	

use interactions in large non-English majored classes create language input and meaningful contexts for language learning.													
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

According to Rivers (1987, pp. 6-9), the teacher in the teaching learning process should not focus on the best method. Instead, he/she should be flexible, while keeping interaction central to happen between teacher and learners, learners and teacher, learner and learner, and learner and authors of texts. In sociocultural theory, interaction is the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings or ideas between two or more people resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other. Theories of communicative competence emphasize the importance of interactions. As Jones (2006, p. 269) puts it, “Through interaction, students can increase their language capacity as they listen to or read authentic linguistic material, or even the output of their fellow students in discussions, students can use all they possess of the language - all they have learned or casually absorbed in real-life exchange.”

According to interactionism, “Interaction and interactive language constitute a major role in EFL teaching, because a teacher’ interactive language can keep an interaction going on smoothly in EFL classroom” (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005, 165-227). The result of teachers' and students' survey of "Roles of teachers in classroom interactions" in Tables 4.3 indicate that both the teachers and students have very high evaluations, in which most of the teachers provide their evaluations in a higher level than students. For example, the statement of "*In large non-English majored classes, students should be scaffolded by teachers*" obtains a mean score by 4.84 for teachers' evaluation with 84% “strongly agree” level and 16% of “agree” level. The

mean score for students' answer was 4.78 with 78% of "strongly agree" and 22% of "agree".

Besides, the statement of *"The teacher should provide language input in large non-English majored classes"* achieved a mean score of 4.68 for teachers' evaluation with 68% of "strongly agree" and 32% of "agree". The mean score of 4.52 was from students' evaluation with 55% of "strongly agree", 42% of "agree" and just 3,0% of "neutral".

Furthermore, the statement of *"Interactions in large non-English majored classes create language input and meaningful contexts for language learning"* achieved a mean score of 4.36 for teachers' evaluation with 40% of "strongly agree", 56% of "agree" and just 4% of "neutral", In comparison, students' answers achieved 4.21 for mean with 32% of "strongly agree", 57% of "agree" and just 11,0% of "neutral".

Table 4.3 also shows that the statement of *"Teachers should use audio-visual aids in large non-English majored classes to promote classroom interactions"* obtained a mean score by 4.27 for teachers' evaluation with 38% of "strongly agree", 42% of "agree" and just 17% of "neutral". As for students, the mean score for this statement is 4.03 with 24% of "strongly agree", 58% of "agree" and just 15,0% of "neutral". Furthermore, the statement of *"The atmosphere in large non-English majored classes is teacher-centered"* got a mean score by 4.18 for teachers' evaluation and a rather similar score of 4.02 for students' evaluation.

One of the rest statements with a high mean score is *"Classroom interactions are to promote learners' processing capacity"*, at 3.97 for teachers' responses and 3.52 for students'. The statement of *"In large non-English majored classes, teachers should talk less to give opportunities for students to interact more"* obtained 3.18 for teachers' evaluation and 3.53 for students'.

Remarkably, the statement of *"Teachers should use guiding questions to help students with their language learning in large non-English majored classes"* received a rather large gap in mean scores with 4.49 for teachers' evaluation and just 3.53 for students'. This result is reversed for the statement of *"The teacher should encourage shy students in non-English large majored classes to talk more"* with mean scores by 4.2 for students' evaluation and just 3.97 for teachers'.

Also concerning the topic of the roles of teachers and classroom interactions, 10 teachers and 10 students were invited to participate in the interviews with prepared questions (see Appendices C & D). The results indicate that teachers believe they should guide students to interact in groups and pairs. If time is allowed, teachers should come to each group to interact with them.

In the interviews, some teachers shared their points of view on the roles of teachers in managing classroom interactions. For example, teacher Hai said: Teachers have to develop classroom interactions, particularly creating conditions or finding out solutions to set up the interchange and communication between teachers and teachers, students and students, teachers and students. I think one of the benefits of large classes is the opportunity to create interactions for students to talk to each other.

According to teachers Hạnh, Thuý, Diễm, Duy, Tiến, Bích, Nga and Trang, teachers could do several things to promote classroom interactions emphasizing pair work and group work due to large class size. Teacher Hạnh said, *"Depending on teaching purpose and student density in class, teachers should set up pairs or groups. Working groups should be set on higher priority in order to help students get more supporting than pairs."* However, teachers Diễm and Bích added that individual talk in classrooms is also necessary. Teacher Duy emphasized that the talks should be based on the purposes of the tasks.

In another interview, teacher Châu pointed out how she managed classroom interaction, *"As my experience, I often make students interact with each other first*

by pairs. Then I will check their activities or mix pairs to interact, for example, student A of pair A would communicate with student B of pair B before checking their progress.”

As for teacher Vân, the teacher is more than a manager, he/she is a facilitator, controller knowing practical techniques to provoke students' talk in classrooms. She said, *“Teachers should create questions or suggest a topic of lesson making students think about the problem. Maybe they don't have any specific answers but at least they use their mind to think and then talk”*. Teacher Minh shared his strategies how to create interactions, *“I focus on student interactions. Because of large class, teachers have not much chance to come to each student, good students have to support their friends in need. Interacting by pairs is very essential, especially in mini-games and language activities.”*

In summary, most of the interviewed teachers agreed that in large classes, teachers should apply the grouping technique of pair work, group work for classroom interactions. Teachers need some practical techniques to make students talk. In fact, learning involves selecting relevant information and interpreting it through one's existing knowledge. Accordingly, the teacher becomes a participant with the learner in a shared process of cognition (i.e. constructing meaning in a given situation) (Vygotsky, 1978). Thus, instruction is geared toward helping the student to develop learning and thinking strategies that are appropriate for working within various subject domains. When asked about the role of teachers in teaching large classes, Teacher Van answered,

As a facilitator of learning, I engaged in various activities including creating a supportive, caring atmosphere for learning, promoting discussion in the classroom, finding out what the students are thinking, helping students clarify and reflect upon their own ideas, encouraging students to find answers for themselves and 'getting them to think and giving feedback.

Teacher Thu said that sometimes she was as a manager. She explained that when the teacher captured this role, the teacher planned lessons, courses and allowed each individual student to be creative within those parameters. She claimed that a language class should be markedly different. In this capacity, teachers can play many roles in the course of teaching. Teachers should play not only one role which transfers knowledge to students but also be skillful with how to transfer this knowledge successfully and effectively as Hedge (1988:68) commented teachers will need “to advise, assist, monitor, and keep up motivation” in classroom interactions. The interviews with students show similar results. In comparison with the answers from the interview with teachers, students gave quite similar perspectives on the roles of teachers regarding classroom interactions in large classes. For example, students Nghiêm, Phương, Huệ and Vũ suggested group work and pair work with instructions from teachers. Nghiêm said, *“If teachers want to students to interact with each other well, they should divide large class into groups or pairs”*. Student Ngân further explained, *“When teachers divide class into groups, each of which has a leader. These groups would follow teacher’s instructions as well as group’s leader for interaction.”* The role of the teacher is even more important because “Teachers have to be creative in encouraging students to get their learning target and create exciting atmosphere in class for communication” said student Phát. Moreover, teachers are expected to give hints to prompt students’ speech as answered by student Khánh in an interview. Student Uyen also pointed out, *“Teachers should carry out activities by using pictures, sounds or videos to have better interactions”*. As for student Vinh, he believed that teachers should be flexible in managing classroom interactions. He said, *“With advanced lesson, teachers should apply multimedia such as Power Point, videos, practical situations to make students feel excited when speaking English Moreover, teachers have to listen, respect their opinions”*.

Besides data from questionnaire for both teachers and students regarding their beliefs about interactions in large non-English majored classes and interviews with

both groups, to validate whether their beliefs correspond to their actual practice of classroom interactions, audio recordings were carried out. Data presented in this section comes from the audio recordings of 10 classes of other majors than English at 04 colleges (College of Foreign Economic Relations, University of Environment, University of Industry and University of Law) in Ho Chi Minh city. The transcript was coded with themes related to classroom interactions. Representative excerpts from all the recordings are presented below to discuss the patterns of classroom interaction and how classroom interactions in large classes for non-English majors took place actually.

As mentioned in the literature review, classroom interactions include teacher-student and student-student communication in the classroom and comprise of both verbal and non-verbal communication. Classroom interactions in this study include both channels teacher-student and student-student interactions and limited to face-to-face verbal channel in the classroom. They are the exchange of thoughts, feelings or ideas via speech between two or more people resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other. Interactions are the medium through which learning and teaching are realized. As mentioned in the data analysis section, the extraction of the audio recordings was chosen if it is of a coherent group of text which is most prominent for extracting information (Rahangdale & Agrawal, 2014). The analysis adopted sociocultural discourse analysis which focuses on the use of language as a social mode of thinking and a tool for teaching-and-learning, constructing knowledge, creating joint understanding and tackling problems collaboratively (Mercer, 2004). Transcription of classroom interactions were selected as excerpts/extracts of transcribed talk to which the analysts provides a commentary.

Excerpts presented below were extracted from full recordings of classroom interactions based on their emerged features which show patterns of talk between teachers and students or among students. These excerpts embrace the operational definition of classroom interactions presented early in chapter two. Besides, it is formal representation of the linguistic context as well as of a domain-specific

ontology showing conceptual relations and establishing discourse coherence (Cimiano, Reyle & Šarić, 2005). Where Vietnamese is used, translation is provided in square brackets.

Excerpt 1: The Role of Teacher in Monitoring Class Discussion

The students in the following excerpt were doing a task provided in the textbook. They were discussing the qualities of a good manager. The teacher was monitoring the discussion.

Teacher: Now, which one do you think is the most important? You, please!

Student 1: Uhm, I think itability.

Teacher: Why?

Student 1: I think when you believe someone, you give chancefor someone who can develop himself/herself.

Teacher: Ok, now the other. You, please!

Student 2: I think listening to other suggestions of staff is the best because when you listen to others, you can find the best choice to solve the problems.

Teacher: Ok, good. Another idea? You, please!

Student 3: I think, I'm going to.....

Teacher: Ok. Good, good. Another idea? You, please! **Student 4:** Uhm...

Teacher: Which one do you choose?

Student 4: I think communicating with colleague clearly... **Teacher:** Why?

Student 4: When you have good communication, you can share ideas to someone

Teacher: You share your ideas to others, and then they will understand what you mean, and then they will follow well. Ok. Now, the other. You, please!

Student 5: I think listen to other suggestions is the best because it makes that easy to comment in our work.

Teacher: Ok. How about you?

As the teacher called students individually, the interaction went in the direction of teacher-students. As a result, the utterance produced by teacher doubled that of students. However, the teacher lines prompted students to produce more English and to contribute to the discussion. The pattern of classroom interaction in this excerpt is that of IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) (Walsh, 2011). The teacher controlled the interaction by calling each student to talk and put questions for students to answer. The teacher had the control of the pattern of communication by managing both the topic of conversation and turn-taking to ensure that the class was following and that everyone understood and had a turn in the flow of the discourse. Feedback of the teacher in this excerpt included praises, comments and elaborating question words such as “ why” to facilitate students’ talk. As all the questions put by the teacher were in English, they prompted the answers in English by students. The management of the teacher to the interaction is also illustrated in the use of the expression “You, please” which appeared five times in the excerpt above.

Excerpt 2: The Role of Teacher in Managing Classroom Interaction

The students were discussing some statements from the textbook.

Teacher: Discuss these statements everybody. The first statement, “making a list of things to do is a waste of time”. Do you agree or disagree? Why?

Students: Disagree

Students: Agree

Teacher: Agree? It’s OK to disagree. But tell me the reasons?

Student 1: I don’t agree with this idea because I think when we plan to making list of things, we will work more effectively and we don’t have tothe work, and we can work step by step as much as we have made the list of things.

Teacher: Yes, thanks.

Student 2: I don’t think so because making list of things to do makes working fluency.

Teacher: No, not fluency, effectively. Fluency là lừ loát [Explain the meaning of “fluency” in Vietnamese].

Student 2: Ý em muốn nói là nó trôi chảy. [I meant things will go smoothly]

Teacher: Smooth.

Student 2: and, uhm, that’s all.

Teacher: Thanks! How about you?

Student 3: Uhm, a list of things you help you do all the work you planned before more smoothly and you can avoid all the miserable things of the unlucky situations, and you won’t be....Uhm, in conclusion, you will feel very happy when you have a list of things to do before . Because all of the things you will prepare your mind....

Teacher: Yes, thank you. How about you? Student 4:

Teacher: Who else? Yeah, Tu?

Student 5: Because I think, in my opinion, if you know the time and you need the time, you have to make plans.

Teacher: Again please. I can’t get what you mean.

Student 5: If you know the time...Muốn biết thời gian hãy xem đồng hồ, muốn có thời gian hãy lập kế hoạch. [Student 5 translated the statement “If you want to know the time, look at your watch. If you want to have time, make plans” into Vietnamese].

Teacher: You mean that is a very famous proverb, right?! Student 5: Proverb?

Teacher: Yes, proverb. If you want to know the time, you can look at your watch, if you want to have the time, you have to make a plan.

Student 5: Yes.

Teacher: Maybe in the future, her saying will be listed on the calendar ...

Students: *laughing*

[The teacher then directed the class to discuss another statement.]

The pattern of interaction in this excerpt was quite similar to other excerpts with the pattern of IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) (Walsh, 2011). The teacher put a

question, students answered and the teacher gave evaluation of the response. The students took turns to contribute to the discussion. Student 2 mistook the word “fluency” with “smoothly” but thanks to the teacher’s explanation, he/she could understand the use of word clearly. With more interaction, students were able to give their opinions on the topic under discussion. The excerpt indicates the collective interaction between the teacher and students and among the students. The teacher was less dominant in this transcript, still she used questions to keep students on track and focused on the task. In general, it can be seen that the role of teacher in this excerpt is similar to the interaction controller as described by Walsh (2011).

Excerpt 3: The Role of Teacher in Mediating Students’ understanding of a Concept

This excerpt illustrates how the teacher used both English and Vietnamese to mediate students to understand the concept of “joining a department” in a business.

Teacher: Các bạn xem cô Stephany cô nói nè [Listen to Ms. Stephany], “I’m joining”, rồi sau cái từ joining là gì ạ [What is the phrases used after “joining”?] Marketing department - là cái bộ phận hay là nghề nghiệp? [Is this a department or a job?] Là một cái vị trí công việc hay là 1 cái bộ phận nào? [A job or a department?]

Students: A position.

Teacher: Nói mãi mà chúng ta vẫn chưa nhớ là sau “joining” thì phải dùng cái gì ạ? [I have reminded you for many times but you don’t remember what words should be used after joining]

Students: Human resources.

Teacher: Human resources là cái gì? [What is it?] **Students:** Bộ phận. [A department]

Teacher: Bộ phận [A department]. Good. Như vậy muốn dùng joining thì phải nói là gì ạ? [So,if you want to use “joining”, how should you say?]

Students: Human resources department

The teacher was trying to elicit the correct answers for “joining a department” or “human resource department” from students. The interaction went on for several responses until the students could make the correct answer from their understanding. In this excerpt, students answered in chorus. It could happen for the reason that the class was crowded and the collective response was a norm or the interaction could be influenced by cultural characteristic of a Vietnamese collective culture. Besides, the teachers asked the question openly to all the students. The teacher’s speech mediated students and assisted them to correctly understand a business concept and a language expression.

Excerpt 4: The Role of Teacher in Checking Students’ understanding

The students were discussing the skills needed to improve a company. They had a CD to listen and to check whether their answers were mentioned in the CD.

Teacher: If you together make the company grow, make the company improve, so what skills do you need?

Student 1:Enthusiasm.

Teacher: Enthusiasm. Uhm, more clearly? What is the skill to be enthusiastic?

Student 2: I think another skill is teamwork.

Teacher: Team working skill. OK. Let’s listen to the next part and check
Playing the tape.

Teacher: Team. That’s right! Team-working skill. It will encourage the consultants to work as a team. OK, so any more questions that you have about...? So it’s very related to what you have studied about management. I hope it will be related to managing that subject you study. So let’s now go on with unit 11. This unit is about conflict. It is a situation you have. A situation where two people are not happy with each other. For example, in this game, it is a game but what is happening between them, one person is trying to win so let’s think about their wish, their objective? Do they have the same objective? Do they have the same wish?

Students: Yes.

Teacher: Yes, but what is the difference in their objective? In other words, what is the conflict they are having?

Students: *discussing*

In the excerpt above, the teacher took a very long turn to explain to students a quality that people need to develop a company/business. Despite the fact that the teacher dominated the talk, she was able to help students understand the task required. It can be inferred from the transcript that the audio recording was also an important artifact mediating the process of students' learning about the concept of teamwork skill. However, the transcript shows the more dominant role of teacher which tried to check students' listening comprehension as well as concept understanding.

Excerpt 5: The Role of Teacher in Teaching English Vocabulary and Phrases

Teacher: Now, any volunteers?

Student 1: Em đọc 1 câu, bạn đọc 1 câu được không cô? [Can I read one sentence and my friend reads the other?]

Teacher: uhm.

Student 1: Let's look back the moment at how the dollar has performed against the Euro over the last 6 months.

Teacher: Very good. The first one is over the last 6 months. "Over" means you use before the time but the period of time. Next!

Student 2: It stayed steady for the first month of the year at around 1 point , uhm, of 0.93 Euro to 1 dollar in February however, its value fell by 2 points from 0.93 to 0.91 Euro.

Teacher: Very good. Now we have "fell by". Và vì nó giảm cho nên nó có cái movement [As it fell, there was a movement]. Các bạn thấy ở đây movement là

nó từ 0.93 ha, nó có sự chuyển đổi từ \$0.93 lên tới 1 Euro. [You see, the movement here is from 0.93 because there was a change from \$0.93 to 1 Euro].

Student 1: In the second half of February, the dollar rose to almost 96 Euro ... remained stable for the first half of March.

Teacher: OK. Bạn nói là “In the first” đúng không? Hay là “during”? [Did you say “ In the first” or “during”?]

Student 1: In

Teacher: À, ngoài ra chữ “In” chúng ta còn sử dụng được chữ “during” nữa. Tại vì “the second half” là nó cũng vừa có thể tính là 1 điểm thời gian ha các bạn [Beside the word “in” we use “during” because “the second half” can be a point of time].

In this excerpt, students were learning the concept of movement in prices, they also had an opportunity to review synonyms, for example, go up and rise, fall and decrease, etc. They reviewed the prepositions in phrases to use with time expressions. Clearly, such classroom interactions provide students with language input and opportunity to produce output related to the content of the lesson. It cannot be denied that the explanations from the teacher consolidated English vocabulary and phrases among the students.

4.2.3. Teachers’ and Students’ beliefs about the Roles of Students in Interactions in Large Classes

Table 4.4 displays the findings from questionnaire and interviews regarding students’ roles in classroom interactions.

Table 4.4: Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of Students in Classroom Interactions

Statements	(N of Teachers = 100; N of Students = 100)					
	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree	Mean

	Disagree (1)		(2)						(5)			
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S
19. It is difficult for students in large non-English majored classes to interact with the teacher because students are often too passive	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	20	81	80	4.81	4.8
20. Students feel shy to speak in large non-English majored classes.	0	0	0	0	6	4	56	82	38	14	4.32	4.1
21. In large non-English majored classes, students would not like to interact because the input level of students is different.	0	0	6	8	87	62	7	30	0	0	3.01	3.22
22. In large non-English majored classes, students can exchange ideas with the teacher.	0	0	0	0	20	19	70	70	10	11	3.9	3.92
23. Student to student	0	0	0	7	23	86	73	7	4	0	3.81	3

interaction takes place in large non-English majored classes when teachers set language items and group students into pairs or groups.												
24. Peer interaction in large non-English majored classes is necessary because students may not have opportunities to talk to classroom teachers.	0	0	0	0	9	40	81	56	10	4	4.01	3.64
25. Peer interactions in large non-English majored classes helps students understand the lesson better.	0	0	0	0	9	8	81	74	10	18	4.01	4.1
26. Peer interaction in large non-English majored classes mediates students thinking process	0	0	0	0	3	1	17	65	80	34	4.77	4.33
27. The interactional collaboration among peers can lead to	0	0	0	0	0	1	39	56	61	43	4.61	4.42

second language learning.												
28. Peer interaction provides language input for students in large non-English majored classes	0	0	0	0	0	19	87	71	13	10	4.13	3.91
29. Peer interaction creates an active learning environment.	0	0	0	0	6	8	27	50	67	42	4.61	4.34
30. The modified input created within classroom interactions can be facilitating in explaining linguistic forms that learners found difficult to understand.	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	40	70	60	4.7	4.6
31. In large non-English majored classes, the environment is safer because students do not have to answer every question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	69	49	31	4.49	4.31
32. Students play the role of negotiators in	0	0	0	0	7	0	85	89	8	11	4.01	4.11

peer interactions.												
--------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 4.4 shows that both teachers and students provide very high levels of their evaluation for the statement: *"It is difficult for students in large non-English majored classes to interact with the teacher because students are often too passive"* with the mean scores of 4.81 for teachers' responses and 4.8 for students. It can be also seen from Table 4.4 that teachers gave a higher appreciation to peer interactions. The statement: *"Peer interaction in large non-English majored classes is necessary because students may not have opportunities to talk to classroom teachers"* received a much higher mean score from teachers, 4.01 as compared with 3.64 from students. Besides, both groups reached a very high mean score for their evaluation of peer interaction that mediates students' thinking process, 4.77 and 4.33 respectively.

The statement: *"The modified input created within classroom interactions can be facilitating in explaining linguistic forms that learners found difficult to understand"* obtained a mean score by 4.7 for teachers' responses and by 4.6 for students'. The statistics of the responses for the statement of *"Peer interaction in large non-English majored classes helps students understand the lesson better"* by students received 18% of "strongly agree", 74% of "agree" and just 8% left for "neutral". In comparison, the mean score of 4.01 for teachers' responses shows 10% of "strongly agree", 81% of "agree" and just 9% left for "neutral". Besides, both groups of teachers and students gave their evaluation with the mean scores of under 4.0 for the statement of *"In large non-English majored classes, students can exchange ideas with the teacher"* and just over 3.0 for the statement of *"In large non-English majored classes, students would not like to interact because the input level of students is different"*.

Table 4.4 also illustrates that there is a considerable difference between teachers' and students' evaluation for the rest statements, in which teachers'

evaluation achieved quite higher mean scores than students'. For example, the statement of "*Student to student interaction takes place in large non-English majored classes when teachers set language items and group students into pairs or groups*" has a mean score of 3.81 from teachers with 4% of "strongly agree", 73% of "agree" and 23% of "neutral". In comparison, the mean score is 3.0 from students with 86% of "neutral". Another considerable difference was seen in the mean scores for the statement: "*Peer interaction provides language input for students in large non-English majored classes*" with 4.13 for teachers' responses and 3.91 for students'.

In the interviews with teachers, teachers Thuý, Châu, Duy, Tiến, Linh and Minh answered that students should work in pairs or groups under the guidance or instructions of teachers for promoting classroom interactions. However, teacher Vân pointed out that Vietnamese EFL learners are usually passive, so teachers should call on them sometimes to make them talk. Teachers Diễm and Bích also asserted that students should be responsible for their initiatives to talk and should sometimes speak individually. Teacher Nga said that students could find partners for themselves to interact.

In the interviews, students also expressed their opinions of what roles students should play in classroom interactions. Like teachers, interviewed students agreed that students should work in pairs or groups and be guided by teachers (Students Ngân, Vũ, and Phát). Student Nghiêm said, "*I would be active to contact with friends if I don't understand a point of a lesson. I could ask friends before finding teachers to help me with my problems*". Interaction can be carried out by students' asking teachers questions if they feel unsure as revealed by student Phương. Students Uyên and Huệ emphasized the initiative of students in classroom interactions. Huệ said, "*To create good interactions, students need positive learning attitudes and be more active and willing to exchange by questioning and commenting*". Similarly, student Vinh suggested students ask teachers when they were unclear about the lessons.

Besides data from the questionnaire and interview, recordings of classroom interaction were examined to see the patterns of peer interaction. The excerpt below is an example.

Excerpt 6: Peer Interaction in Role Playing

Students were role-playing business partners in a social meeting. The activity was part of the lesson.

Student 1: Hello, long time no see.

Student 2: I'm good. Thank you. Glad to see you here. How about your business?

Student 1: Not too bad. You know, I still work as manager of Adidas company. Would you like me to help you?

Student 2: Oh yes, my pleasure!

Student 1: That is very kind of you. Could you tell me how do you spend your weekend?

Student 2: Weekends is the time to relax, I spend the period of time to play tennis with my friends in the tennis club.

Student 1: Oh, you like sport?! Where do you go for your holiday?

Student 2: I often go travel with my family, I drive into the entertainment center and sometimes I climb the mountain with my colleague.

Student 1: Wow! What an interesting holiday! Could you tell me what you do in the evening?

Student 2: Oh I usually watch the sport program on TV and chat with my family.

Student 1: Oh I think you're very energetic in sports, so what kind of hobbies and sports do you like?

Student 2: Yes, I love sports so much. Maybe tennis is the sport I like best.

Student 1: Oh I see. Just one more thing. At the moment, our company is going to expand the consumption market into your country. So I would like to find an agent for my firm products. Our products are sporting goods such as shoes, tennis rackets, sport clothing. Can you help me?

Student 2: It's so interesting. Ok, I'll speak to a few of my contacts and I'll get back to you.

Student 1: Thank you for your help so much. I'm looking forward to you.

Student 2: You're welcome! Talk to you later.

Student 1: See you later.

The students were talking using a social situation to speak English. They were trying to perform the roles of business partners. Student 1 introduced the company, expanded the networking and promoted the company products and asked student 2 to help. In terms of language use, the language input was from both students and for both of them. As the teacher did not appear in this excerpt, the students seemed to take equal turns to talk on the given situation from the course book. The students were able to complete the task given. Student 1 put forward more questions than student 2. However, their roles seem to be symmetrical.

Excerpt 7: Peer Interaction for Co-constructing Knowledge

Similar to the previous excerpt, this excerpt shows interaction of two students making a conversation based on a given task from the course book.

Student 1: Hi Trang! How are you? Welcome to America.

Student 2: Hi Diêu! I'm ok, thanks! How about you?

Student 1: Not too bad. When did you come here?

Student 2: I came here a few days ago but your country is quite strange to me. I would like to know more about the daily life here.

Student 1: Ok, I can give you some information which can help you have a better understanding.

Student 2: That would be great! So, how do people spend their weekend here?

Student 1: Well, we like going out to restaurants, and meet friends in coffee houses. What about you?

Student 2: We usually gather together to have a party at home. And do you spend your holiday to go to somewhere?

Student 1: Actually, the majority of people tend to go to the beach. You know, Hawaii is the most popular destination in America or we can go camping for a few days.

Student 2: Oh so you like the same thing as Vietnamese people. How about evenings? What do people do?

Student 1: We generally stay at home, watch TV and enjoy a relaxing night with our family. So, what do you do in the evenings?

Student 2: We often go out for a cup of coffee or a glass of beer, you know, that's our habit.

Student 1: It sounds interesting!

Student 2: What about the hobbies or sport?

Despite the fact that here and there the students used English incorrectly, the communicative message was understood thanks to the context of the talk. The students took equal turns in their talk and they used only English to complete the task. The patterns mostly lacked the element of feedback of the IRF patterns in interactions which usually exists in teacher-students interaction. Students in the excerpt above received reciprocal knowledge by exchanging information of hobbies. Even though the students were just acting out as the task required, they were prompting each other to use English. To some extent they were co-constructing knowledge (Mercer, 2004) of hobbies from their understanding.

Excerpt 8: Peer Interaction for Information Exchange

The students were role playing friends meeting and having a social talk.

Student 1: Hi, nice to meet you!

Student 2: Nice to meet you too. How are you? **Student 1:** I'm fine. Thanks!

Student 2: Uhm, when did you come here?

Student 1: I come to New York for 5 months.

Student 2: I just come to New York, I don't know too much about New York. What do people like doing here in their spare time?

Student 1: Well, they come to... They'd like to meet their friends in café and chat about... especially, they like watching football in the evening on TV. Women enjoy talking to their friends about shopping.

Student 2: Uhm, how do you spend your weekends?

Student 1: Uhm, I stay at home and sleep. I sometimes go shopping with my friends. How About you?

Student 2: At weekends, I go coffee with my friends and talk to my family. What do you do in the evenings?

Student 1: Uhm, I generally watch TV with my family. I often eat out at restaurants. We enjoy that and you?

Student 2: Not special, I do exercise and sleep. What kind of hobbies and sports do you like?

Student 1: Uhm, I very like football, I took part in a football club, and I usually relax after a working day.

Student 2: Uhm, where do you go for your holiday?

Student 1: It starts very interesting but I won't visit to Disneyland because I don't have enough time. Uhm, what was your main purpose in coming to New York? Uhm, I'm looking for a company to supply ... they're very popular in our country. Can you recommend any one?

Student 2: Could make some inquire for you if you like. **Student 1:** It's wonderful. That's very kind of you.

Student 2: Actually, I do know someone who might help you. This is a family in the north of New York. He's from a business here. I believe the price is reasonable. I have got his business card, here you are!

Student 1: Oh thanks! I will give him a card tomorrow. Can you mention your name?

Student 2: Oh please do. I have known him for 4 years. Would you like me to give him a phone call?

Student 1: Oh he will be looking for me.

Student 2: Ok, I will do that. And now, we will go to a restaurant, enjoy our meal and discuss about this problem.

Student 1: Ok, let's go.

The two students were building up on each other's responses and the conversation went on until they ran out of ideas. In terms of English use, the students were able to do so rather fluently. Peers took equal turns and their use of English helped each other in producing more English and in completing the task. Interaction helped them to exchange information as required by the task.

4.2.4. Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of the Target Language in Classroom Interactions

Clearly, English use is the goal of any EFL classes. To find out the beliefs of teachers and students about the roles of the target language in classroom interactions, a questionnaire was given to both teachers and students. Data are presented in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5: Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of the Target Language in Classroom Interactions

Statements	(N of Teachers = 100; N of Students = 100)											
	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Neutral (3)		Agree (4)		Strongly Agree (5)		Mean	
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S
33. Classroom interactions should be mainly in English in the process of teaching in large classes for non-English majors.	0	0	0	0	29	18	68	62	3	20	3.74	4.02

34. The target language is used as a social tool for communication in classrooms.	0	0	0	3	25	42	70	54	5	1	3.8	3.53
35. Throughout the process of interaction in the target language, learners have the possibility to create the input the need in order to better understand new information.	0	0	0	3	31	15	69	58	0	24	3.69	4.03
36. Teachers should use only English in large non-English majored classes so that students can have a rich language environment.	0	0	0	3	0	43	48	53	52	1	4.52	3.52
37. Language learning is the result of interactions	0	0	0	0	29	0	71	22	0	78	3.71	4.78

between the learner's mental abilities and the linguistic environment													
38. Interactions mediate the thinking process of learning, especially, between students and between peers with more capable peers.	0	0	0	0	1	3	46	42	53	55	4.52	4.52	
39. Language is used a way to provoke thought and lead learners to move the new zones of proximal development	0	0	0	0	0	14	48	52	52	34	4.52	4.2	
40. Language classrooms can be seen as sociolinguistic environments and discourse communities in which interaction	0	0	0	0	0	11	45	57	55	32	4.55	4.21	

aspects such as communicative competence, pronunciation and situation reactions in the target language.” Teacher Minh pointed out, *“When teachers communicate with students, the target language must be used to help students adapt to English communications and review English vocabulary”*.

Like the teachers who participated in the interviews, all the students in the current study confirmed the important role of the target language. It helps both teachers and students improve English skills and communication abilities (Student Vân), gain better knowledge of English and practice basic English skills (student Phát). Student Khánh even pointed out with in non-English major classes, English as the target language should be practiced to prepare students for future jobs. More roles of the target language are revealed in Uyen’s answer, *“The target language has an orienting role. When English is the main language in classrooms, the class must be controlled by rules. It will unify and create good conditions for students to practise English”*.

The audio recordings of classroom interactions also disclose the roles of English use in classroom interactions.

Excerpt 9: The Role of English in Knowledge Co-construction

The following excerpt was from the transcript of a class discussing the qualities and skills of a manager.

Teacher: First, tell me what qualities the manager should have to manage well the company? What qualities and skills outside the list are important for the managers? Now who volunteers? First, you please.

Student 1: The personal quality a manager needs to have is creativeness and active, responsibility and good at communication and have wide knowledge.

Teacher: OK.

Student 1: Have a good appearance.

Teacher: Why is knowledge very important?

Student 1: A good manager's not only good at the... Lĩnh vực.

Teacher: Field or area.

Student 1: Not only good at the field they have study but they also good at another field such as...uhm.

Teacher: OK, thank you. Another person, another one? Which quality or skill are very important for the manager? You please!

Student 2: I think he's good at communicate, share to staff, listen to other people, create ... That's all.

Teacher: Tell me some more details about your choice. Tell me the reason why.

Student 2: Share to staff, it makes staff and manager become friendly and easy at work.

Teacher: OK, thank you. Another person? You please!

Student 3: I think a manager needs quality: responsibility, decisive, confident and hard-working and control feeling well.

Teacher: Very good. Thank you. But tell me something more about the decision skills. Why do you think the decision skill is very important to a manager?

Student 3: The manager must keep calm in urgent cases, and think the best way to solve the problem, and share the problem with all the staff. And choose the best choice.

Teacher: The best choice.

The excerpt illustrates that most of students were involved in the learning process. Despite the fact that only some students' opinions were presented, it could be inferred that the teachers' questions and responses of previous students mediated more thoughts and the use of English of other students. The frequent use of "What else" and "Why" by the teacher facilitated the classroom interactions. The knowledge was shared when students contributed to the discussion on the qualities of a good manager. They all came up with ten qualities of a good manager. The students were co-constructing the knowledge (Mercer, 2004) in their major of business.

Excerpt 10: The Role of English in Sharing Knowledge

The students in this excerpt were asked to do a task by putting the sentences into a correct order. The topic is about selling and buying flowers.

Teacher: Yes. OK, now, speaking, page 22, item 1. Mời 1 bạn đọc cho cô hướng dẫn nào, in a flower shop. [Can one of you read the task instruction please?].

Teacher: Ồ khác thì mỗi người đọc theo quy trình của mình [If different, then read your own process]. Now listen please.

Student 2: First, the growers harvest the flowers. They use a sharp knife to cut them. Next, the growers tie the flowers in bunch.

Teacher: Yes.

Student 2: And next, the growers ship the flowers all over the world in box.

Teacher: Next.

Student 2: And the flowers shops receive the flowers, the shopkeeper removes the bunch of the flowers from the shipping box, then the shopkeeper put the flowers in the water and finally, the shopkeeper adds the solution to some water so that the flowers live longer.

Teacher: OK, thanks. OK, do you think it's right? Students: yes, right.

Teacher: Right!

Student 3: The growers harvest the flowers, they use a sharp knife to cut them. The shop keeper puts the flowers in the water.

Class: [making noise]

Teacher: Now, listen, listen. Next, the shopkeeper puts the flowers in the water. Yes, next!

Student 3: The shopkeeper adds a solution to some water so that the flowers live longer. The flowers in bunch, the flower shop receives the flowers. The shop keeper removes the bunch of flower from the shipping box. The growers ship the flowers all over the world in box.

Teacher: That's it? Thank you.

The students were doing a problem solving. They came up with different ideas. Both English and Vietnamese were used to complete the tasks. Despite the fact that the teacher used Vietnamese in her turns for instructions, students used English to complete the task. The interactions were from the teacher to students and among students. The students finally agreed with the answers. English was used to perform the task and as a medium to share knowledge.

Excerpt 11: The Role of English for Concept Building

In this excerpt, the teacher asked students to talk about their ideal manager, a topic in their lesson.

Teacher: Now, in five minutes you who have to imagine who is your ideal manager. The question is, what is your ideal manager like? Are they male or female? What qualities do you think he/she should have? Now, 5 minutes to prepare. Now, who volunteers to tell me what is your ideal manager like? Who volunteers? Oh, you please!

Student 1: My ideal manager is male. First, He's an ambitious person and he has the ability to manage the staff, control his feeling well and solve problems. He's also a careful person. He must treat his staff fairly and have good thinking, always prepares for each change of the company. He must be decisive and confident in everything. He should have a good communication skill and responsibility to what he does....

Teacher: Good. Very good. Thank you. Another person? Volunteer? Now, you please!

Student 2: I think a male is the manager because he deals with problems quickly and he has a good mind, creative, so it makes the staff impressive...

Teacher: OK. Thank you. Another person. In your opinion, what is your ideal manager? You please!

Student 3: First, an ideal manager in my mind is very handsome, he's about 25 - 35 and he's very funny. I think he's smart, strong knowledge and strong relationship.

He must have ambitions, he can listen to all suggestions from staff, and believe in his employees' ability. He's active and enthusiastic in his work to motivate his staff.

Teacher: Very good. Your idea is very good. Another person? You please!

The students in this extract collectively built up their interaction responding to the topic of an ideal manager. They were able to use English to develop their ideas and each student tried to have a different opinion. The qualities and image of an ideal manager at the end of the excerpt seems to be very critical. Apparently, the questions from the teacher in this excerpt such as "What else?", "How old...?", "Yes or no?" or "How about you?" "In your opinion...?" as well as opinions given by different students led to various responses of the whole group. English is used as a social mode of thinking and interaction between the teacher and students constructs knowledge of the lesson among students as similarly shown in excerpt 9.

Excerpt 12: The Role of English in Problem Solving

The students were discussing what they need to prepare for their career.

Teacher: OK, career, everybody.

Student 1: When I plan for career, I have to determine to choose the job, after that, I search on the internet, ask friends, prepare soft skills and qualifications.

Teacher: Uhm, to search on the internet and to find out what is necessary for your career, right!?

Student 1: Yes, and try to write a good CV and practice for interviews.

Teacher: Practise interviewing.

Student 1: Yes, and open my relationships.

Teacher: Uh, open your relationship. OK, career, I want to hear from another group. This group talked about career, right!? Yes.

Student 2: About career, I will consider my ability, is that good enough for that position? Am I suitable for that position? If I were chosen, I will prepare myself before I go to work, I'll open my relationship. And if I was not, I will find another job.

Teacher: [Laughing] Yeah, so do you think that..., uhm, what are you studying now?

Student 2: I'm studying....

Teacher: want to ask you something about your faculty or your major. Student 2: My major is about English.

Teacher: ?

Student 2: English.

Teacher: English?! So, do you think that you're going in the right direction or the right way?

Student 2: I think I'm going to the right way.

Teacher: Oh yeah, OK. That's very good. And what are you doing now to prepare for something in the future?

Student 3: I'm studying English more and more, and I think in the future I will have another language like Japanese or French.

Teacher: Yes, That's OK.

Student 3: Yeah, I think I will try my best.

Apparently, the students were discussing how to prepare for (the) future jobs and career. The students brought in their class their background knowledge of the topic of the lesson that day, job application. The students were using their social knowledge and applied it into the lesson. It could have been impossible for students to talk in this case if they did not know about the process of job application. The teachers' question mediated the interaction process, assisting students to recall their knowledge. Although only three students took part in this conversation, the excerpt indicates a rather traditional classroom in Vietnam with the teacher asking and students responding.

Excerpt 13: The Use of English for Task Completion

The teacher was asking students to choose a brand name and explain why they choose it.

Teacher: Finished? Who volunteers?

Student 1: The computer brand I usually buy is Apple because it is famous and looks expensive. It is good quality. That's all.

Teacher: Thank you. Next, what about mobile phones? You please!

Student 2: The mobile phone brand I usually buy is Nokia because it's good quality and very beautiful.

Teacher: OK. Another product. Sunglasses.

Student 3: The brand I usually buy (sunglasses) is BEBE because it's very beautiful, good quality and not expensive.

Teacher: Isn't overpriced. Now, last one, jeans. You please!

Student 4: The jeans brand I usually buy is CK because it's value for money.

Teacher: That's all?

Student 4: Yes.

Teacher: Thank you. Good. Now, we move to another part - Vocabulary. Please do exercise number 1.

Clearly, the speech by the teacher was the longest and served as instruction giving. The students understood and proceeded with the task explaining the reasons for their choice. The task was completed in the sense that the students did what they were asked. The speech of students was rather short. Again the use of English was prevalent and thanks to its use, students were able to complete the task.

Excerpt 14: The Role of English in Learning Grammar

In this excerpt, the teacher asked students to make questions with verbs and prepositions. Students took turns to give answers.

Teacher: And now, you have to make 3 questions using some of the verbs with prepositions from Exercises A and C. Now 5 minutes for you to make 3 questions. After that, I will ask you to say your questions loudly.

Students: [discussing]

Teacher: Now, tell me 3 questions you use with verbs and preposition. Now, you please!

Student 1: How often do you talk to your boss?

Teacher: Good.

Student 2: What did he apologize for?

Teacher: Good.

Student 2: And, what do they impress in?

Teacher: Very good. Now, another student. You please!

Student 3: What are you talking about?

Teacher: Good, talking about.

Student 4: Are you feel confident when you communicate with foreigners?

Teacher: Good. Communicate with. What else?

Student 5: Are you going to invest in technology field?

Teacher: Invest in. Good. Now, another one? You, please!

Student 6: Do you believe in your client?

Teacher: uh huh.

Student 7: Do you agree on ideas?

Teacher: Agree on idea. OK.

Student 8: Who are you talking to?

Teacher: OK, talking to. Good. Now, another one, another. You, please!

Student 9: Do you usually argue with your parents?

Teacher: Good, argue with.

Student 10: Have you reported to your manager?

Teacher: Good, report to.

Student 11: What would you do if someone don't believe in you?

Teacher: OK, believe in you. Good. Very good. Another one? Uhm, you please!

Student 12: Why do you have to listen to all suggestions?

Teacher: Good, listen to.

Student 13: Have you apologized to your colleague yet?

Teacher: Good.

Student 14: Do you agree with me?

Teacher: Good. Agree with. Very good. Another one. You please!

Student 15: What do you talk about when you discuss with your manager?

Teacher: OK, talk about.

Student 16: Did you report to your manager at the beginning of the....

Teacher: Report to. Good.

Student 17: Do you agree with your colleague's strategy?

Teacher: Agree with. Good. Now, one more. You please!

Student 18: What did you talk to our manager?

Teacher: Talk to. OK.

Student 19: Why don't you invest in my subsidiary?

Teacher: OK, invest in.

Student 20: When do you report to director?

Teacher: Report to. Good. And now, in your opinion, in 5 minutes, you have to imagine who is the ideal manager in your mind. [Students were preparing for another task].

The answers from 20 students to the teacher's question illustrate the use of the target language. Thanks to the task requirement, teachers' encouragement and prompts, the students could recall from their receptive language and make it productive interactions. The students were able to use the English verbs and prepositions to go with these verbs and also the specialized words related business management.

Excerpt 15: The Role of English in Mediating Students' understanding

The class was talking about their holidays. The teacher was prompting students how prepare for a holiday.

Teacher: Oh, OK. Thanks! And about holidays, everybody. Any other groups want to say something about holidays? Your group talk about holiday, right?! OK, now please!

Student 1: Thừa cô là: schedule plan. Choose place, time, transport, money and friends.

Teacher: And what?

Student 2: Uhm, who do you want to go with.

Teacher: Oh, friends. OK. That means the person who accompany with you.

Student 3: Yeah.

Teacher: Yes.

Student 4: Prepare for clothes, games, drinks and food.

Teacher: and food. Oh! Why do you have to think of the food or the drinks? Whenever you get to the destination, you can enjoy the food there, you can enjoy the drinks there. Tại sao phải chuẩn bị thức ăn và thức uống? [Why do you need to prepare food and drink?]

Students: *discussing*

Teacher: Tới cái xứ đó thì mình sẽ ăn đặc sản của xứ đó chứ chuẩn bị thức ăn chi á... [When we visit that place, we will eat the specialties of that place, so we don't need to prepare food.]

Students: *discussing*

Student 5: About the holiday, I think prepare the food and the drinks when we choose the journey in the country....

Teacher: Mountainous areas, for example, where they don't sell anything for you to eat, right?!

Student 6: And you have to climb mountain, it has no food, no drinks.

Teacher: So, that's why you have to prepare food and drinks, right?!

Student 7: Uhm, yes.

Teacher: And do you think that preparing food and drinks and bring them with you to save money?

Student 8: Yes. And, food and drinks, I think it's expensive ...

Teacher: expensive than your place, right!

Student 9: Yes.

The responses of the students were short and typically just replied what the teacher asked. However, they formed a community of interaction with each one building up on each other in responses. Altogether, they made a plan for a holiday. It could be thanks to the use of Vietnamese by the teacher that the students understood the task requirement and continued to discuss what to bring on a holiday. English served as a mode of thinking and learning English prepositions in the above excerpt.

4.2.5. Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of the First Language in Classroom Interactions

Despite the fact that the classes have to use English, the role of Vietnamese cannot be ignored. Data from the questionnaires regarding teachers and students' beliefs about Vietnamese in classroom interactions are presented in the following table.

Table 4.6: Teachers' and Students' beliefs about the Roles of the First Language in Classroom Interactions

Statements	(N of Teachers = 100; N of Students = 100)											
	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Neutral (3)		Agree (4)		Strongly Agree (5)		Mean	
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S
41. The first language helps students to think in learning English.	0	0	0	0	4	3	65	73	31	24	4.27	4.21
42. Ther first language should be used sometimes by	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	30	72	70	4.72	4.7

the teacher in large non-English majored classes to help students understand clearly abstract concepts.												
43. Students should not be allowed to use the language in large non-English majored classes.	0	0	4	0	65	76	31	18	0	6	3.27	3.3
44. Students can use the first language to mediate the thinking process of learning when interacting with teachers and more capable peers.	0	0	0	0	30	29	68	70	2	1	3.72	3.72
45. Teachers can use a mixture of the two languages in the process of teaching in large classes for non English majors.	0	0	0	0	3	3	24	24	73	73	4.7	4.7

A significant characteristic of large non-majored classes in Vietnam is that teachers and students share the same mother tongue, the language of instruction and communication. Therefore, it is undeniable that the role of Vietnamese language in

learning English cannot be ignored. The data in Table 4.6 above indicate that there are minimal differences between teachers' and students' evaluation relating to the roles of Vietnamese. For example, the statement *“The first language helps students to think in learning English”* had a mean score of 4.27 for teachers and 4.21 for students. The use of the mother was appreciated by both groups of teachers and students to understand clearly abstract concepts (M=4.72 and M=4.7 respectively). The last two statements in Table 4.6 about the mediating role of Vietnamese and code switching between Vietnamese and the target language received the same mean scores from the responses of teachers and evaluation (M=3.72 for the former and M=4.7 for the latter).

Also concerning the topic of the roles of Vietnamese and classroom interactions, 10 teachers and 10 students were invited to participate in the interviews with pre-prepared questions. The results show that most teachers interviewed confirmed the important roles of the first language in learning English (Teachers Thuý, Vân, and Diễm) because it helps teachers to check if students understand the lesson or not. However, teachers Châu seemed to reject the use of the first language in the class, pointing out that *“The mother tongue plays a minor role and we should not use it much in English classes.”* Besides, *“The first language has complementary role helping students understand clearly the target language”*, pointed out by teachers Duy, Linh, Nga and Tiến. Teacher Bích further explained, *“Due to different levels of proficiency of students in large classes, the first language helps teachers and students understand each other”*. Teacher Minh also asserted the necessity of the first language, *“The first language is used to explain and support English interactions by students”*.

Besides, all the 10 interviewed students answered that the first language is important and should be used complementarily with the target language. The first language helps students to understand the lesson more clearly. However, student Uyên added, *“I think the first language should not be used too much in English classes. However, in large non-English majored classes, the level of English*

proficiency level of students is not equal, so the first language should be used at some difficult points of learning when some problems should be made clear and analyzed in advance”.

The audio recordings reveal the use of the first language in classroom interactions. In the following excerpt, the teacher and students were discussing the use of prefixes.

Excerpt 16: The Role of the First Language in Learning English Prefix

Teacher: It’s “impatient”. Yes, impatient, impolite, immature...*writing on board*
Nhu vậy chúng ta có nhận xét gì về những phụ âm bắt đầu bằng -im? [What do you think about the use of “im”?]

Students: *discussing*

Teacher: Nếu như phụ âm “r” thì không phải là -m được, nếu như các phụ âm khác thì không phải là âm -m.... như vậy thì quy luật ở đây là gì?

Students: *discussing*

Student 6: Dạ thưa thầy là đi với -m là phụ âm môi.[Teacher, -m goes with labial consonants]

Teacher: Đúng rồi, đó là do quy tắc phát âm. Để dễ phát âm thì các phụ âm môi - the labial consonants will be added to the same prefix. Đây cũng là một cái prefix kết thúc bằng phụ âm môi [This is also labial consonant]. So, usually we have -im with “m” and “p”. Calm and Nervous, that is the adjectives. Do we have “uncalm”?

Students: No

Teacher: No, we don’t have “uncalm”. What else?

The teacher dominated the talk in this excerpt. He/She was explaining in detail the concepts and how to form opposite words by using -im, - un. In such an environment with the enthusiastic explanation, students could be exposed to language input. Their use of the target language was still limited but this does not mean they did not understand the language items.

Excerpt 17: The Role of The First Language in Mediating Concept Understanding

The teacher in this excerpt was asking students how they should prepare for a business plan.

Student 2: I think the business plan should be 6 months, because it's not a long time, so if anything happens, you don't have to change too much plan.

Teacher: OK, others, everybody. So everybody, do you think that maybe 3 years is too long?

Students: Yes.

Teacher: For example, you want to set up, you want to open a coffee shop. And you think that maybe there are few coffee shops around this college, so you intent to set up a coffee shop over there. And if you think of opening a coffee shop over there, you have to go there and to deposit for hiring a building or the house. Now I think you just mention something about applying for a license, you know the word "license"?

Students: Bằng lái. [Driving license]

Teacher: Giấy phép kinh doanh chứ không phải bằng lái, kinh doanh mà xin bằng lái chi?! [A business permit, not a driving license]

Students: *laughing*discussing*

Teacher: Đúng không các bạn? Thời gian các bạn xin giấy phép nè, thời gian các bạn lắp cái facility mình muốn làm nè, những cái đó các bạn phải đầu tư, đầu tư vốn liếng, đầu tư kinh nghiệm. [Is that correct? You need time to ask for a business permit, installing facilities for your business, time to invest capital and experience]

Students: [Continue discussing] [The teacher then played the CD for students to listen]

Clearly, the students did not satisfactorily solve the problem as they did not reach the conclusion. During the course of interaction, they had an opportunity to listen to ideas from other students as well as give their opinions. Again, in this

excerpt, the teacher helped students to differentiate the word “driving license” and “business permit”. Knowledge of the concept and language use was built through the talk between the teacher and students.

Excerpt 18: The Role of the First Language in Concept Building

The teacher was asking the students to match the words in an email with definitions which come from a task in the course book

Teacher: Bây giờ các bạn có những chữ in nghiêng ở trong này nè, các bạn thấy không? Các bạn thấy những chữ in nghiêng người ta bảo là match the words in italic in the email to the definition from 1-5. [Can you see the italic words in the book? You are asked to match the words in italic in the email with the definitions from 1-5]. What are the definitions called?

Students: Items.

Teacher: Items. Very good. Rồi thứ 2 là [Second is example of things to show customers]. Hàng mẫu, hoặc là các cái thứ mẫu để các bạn đưa cho khách hàng xem, thì gọi là gì? [What do you call the samples to show customers?]

Students: Sample

Teacher: Sample. Rồi cái thứ 3 là shop with the same name and sell the same things, là gì? [Third, what do you call the shops with the same name and sells the same things?] những cái cửa hàng mà cùng tên ha các bạn, ví dụ như các bạn có là lotteria, các bạn thấy Lotteria quận 1, Lotteria quận 10, Lotteria quận Tân Bình thì cái đó gọi là gì? [The shops such as Lotteria in district 1, 10 and Tan Binh District]

Students: Chain.

Teacher: Yes, a chain of shops. How about people that work in these shops?

Students: Staff

Teacher: Staff, very good. Choice of items, a lot of them. What do you call them?

Students: Range.

Teacher: Yes, range. Ok, number 3, use “would” and “could” to make your requests more polite. For example, say “I want to ... this item.” How do you say in a polite way?

Students: I would.

Teacher: Very good. I would like. Number 2, send me your brochure and price list. To be polite, how would you say? The teacher was relating to examples in real life to help students understand the concept of chain of shops, more specifically, the chain of Lotteria shops in Ho Chi Minh City. The class was responding collectively. They understood the words in English, the business concept “A chain of shops” thanks to the explanation and the use of Vietnamese by the teacher. The class was a community of language users and the teacher mediated their thinking process.

4.3 Discussion on Data from Questionnaires and Interviews

4.3.1. Similarities in Teachers’ and Students’ beliefs about Classroom Interactions in Large Non-English Majored Classes

This section discusses the similarities and differences in teachers’ and students’ beliefs about classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes as reported in the questionnaires and interviews presented section 4.2 in the light of interactionism and sociocultural theory.

There has been ongoing debate between Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researchers with a sociocultural orientation (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Lantolf, 2000; Swain, 1998; Van Lier, 1996) regarding classroom interactions. The debate also comes from those within the cognitive interactionist paradigm about fundamental questions such as what constitutes interaction, what type of interaction promotes language development, and, the respective roles of learners and teachers in the second language learning process. For example, Chaudron (1987, pp. 106-107) considers interaction in a general sense includes learners who are merely interacting as different from interaction in “the narrower sense of negotiation of meaning in learner-learner or teacher-learner communicative exchanges”. According to

interactionism, opportunities for students to talk in the classroom are vital to the language learning process. In this study, interactions are the exchange of thoughts and ideas via speech.

Data from the questionnaires and interviews show similarities in teachers' and students' responses regarding the roles of both the target language, the first language, the roles of teachers, and peers in the process of classroom interactions.

First of all, with regards to beliefs or personal opinions and attitudes towards classroom interactions, both surveyed teachers and students believed that classroom interactions involved talks between teachers and students ($M=4.83$ and 4.80 for teachers and students respectively (see Table 4.2) and talks between students ($M=4.59$ for teachers and $M=4.54$ for students). Besides, teachers and students similarly considered that classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes are limited because teachers are usually unable to manage classroom interactions ($M=4.55$ and $M=4.53$ for both groups). Clearly, the findings emphasize again the language input environment as pointed out in interactionism.

In terms of the roles of teachers in classroom interactions, the two groups of participants likewise agreed that the atmosphere in large non-English majored classes is teacher-centered ($M=4.18$ for teachers and $M=4.02$ for students, see Table 4.3). Besides, both groups thought that students should be scaffolded by teachers ($M= 4.84$ and $M = 4.78$ respectively).

The interviews provide more specific information regarding teachers and students' beliefs of classroom interactions. Both teachers and students reported drawbacks of large class sizes which tend to limit the interactions in the classrooms. Moreover, they also pointed out the insufficient feedback from teachers and different levels of proficiency of students making it more challenging for effective interactions. To increase talk by students, in the interviews, both groups of teachers and students suggested the use of grouping techniques of group work and pair work or various classroom activities to motivate students with their English use. The

findings for this theme reflects more principles of interactionism than sociocultural theory in terms of less teacher talking time and increased student talking time in classroom interactions.

When asked about the roles of students in classroom interactions, the mean scores for teachers' and students' answers were almost the same, at 4.81 and 4.80 accordingly (see Table 4.4) for the statement, "*It is difficult for students in large non English majored classes to interact with the teacher because students are usually passive*". Furthermore, the mean scores of the two groups were nearly equal (4.7 and 4.6) when they both agreed that modified input created within classroom interactions can be facilitating in explaining linguistic forms for learners. Clearly, the responses of the surveyed teachers and students again confirm the principles of interactionism (Long, 1983, 1985) with the emphasis on language input. Furthermore, both groups tended to think that students can exchange ideas with the teachers (M=3.9 and 3.93).

In the interviews, all the teachers and students again confirmed that students should work in pairs or groups and received guidance from teachers. Some of the interviewed teachers and students also thought that students sometimes should take initiatives in starting their talks in classrooms. Different from data in the questionnaires, data from the interviews with mentioning guidance from teachers to students in classroom interactions emphasize the roles of the more knowledgeable others in sociocultural theory.

Regarding teachers and students' beliefs about the roles of the target language in classroom interactions, both groups achieved a mean score of 4.52 (Table 4.5) for their agreement that interactions mediate the thinking process of learning, between teachers and students and between peers with more capable peers. For this finding, it can be reported that teachers and students in the survey were to some extent aware of the roles of language and the mediating process as described in sociocultural theory (Lantolf, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978). In the interviews, all the teachers and students

confirmed the important role and the necessity of the use of the target language in the classrooms. The interviewed teachers and students explained that the use of the target language contributes to develop communicative competence of students. The findings from the interviews with teachers, however, reflect teachers' understanding of the principles of interactionism with communicative competence development.

Another similarity between teachers' and students' responses was found in their beliefs about the roles of the first language in classroom interactions. They all thought that students can use the mother language to mediate the thinking process of learning when interacting with teachers and more capable peers (M=3.72 for both groups, see Table 4.6) and the first language to help students understand clearly the abstract concepts (M=4.74 and M=4.7). They all also approved teachers' use of a mixture of two languages in the process of teaching in large classes for non English majors (M=4.7 for both groups). In the interviews, most teachers and students approved the use of the first language in classrooms and suggested it should be used complementarily with English. Both interactionism and sociocultural theory emphasize the roles of peers in interactions and learning. In general, data from the questionnaire for teachers and students reflect the features of both approaches. The surveyed teachers and students gave nearly the same evaluation of the roles of peers in interactions (M=4.01 and M=4.10) for this matter. Both groups tended to agree equally to all the statements on the role of the first language.

4.3.2. Differences in Teachers' and Students' beliefs about Classroom Interactions in Large Non-English Majored Classes

Data from questionnaires and interviews represent some differences in the two groups' beliefs about classroom interactions.

Firstly, with regards to classroom interactions and size (Table 4.2), the surveyed teachers tended to think that students can learn from other peers through interactions (M=4.39) whereas the mean score for this statement achieved M=4.0 for students' responses in the survey. Furthermore, they tended to give rather

different evaluation to the statement, “*There is not enough time for students to interact with one another in a large class*” (M=4.27 and M=4.0).

Secondly, while teachers valued teacher-centredness and their dominant roles in class (M=4.18) and guided students (M=4.49), students rated these roles of teachers at lower scores, with the mean scores of 4.02 and 3.53. Students however expected teachers to encourage shy students (M=3.97 for teachers and M=4.2 for students) and to promote learners’ processing capacity (M=3.97; M=3.52). In the interviews, some students said that they needed more prompts, hints from teachers and expected them to create exciting learning environments for more interactions. Clearly, teachers and students, to some extent, had different expectations of what teachers should do for classroom interactions (see Table 4.3). Besides, more students thought that teachers should talk less in the classroom. However, both groups gave a slight different appreciation to the scaffolding of teachers to students in interactions (M=4.84 for teachers and M=4.78 for students) as in line with sociocultural theory in which teachers are considered to be more knowledgeable than others. Also, both groups believed that language input from teachers is necessary for students’ language learning (M=4.68; 4.52, see Table 4.3).

Thirdly, Table 4.4 shows that teachers gave higher evaluation of student-student interactions if teachers provide with language items and arrange students in groups or pairs (M=3.81 for teachers and M=3.0 for students). Besides, teachers were more in favour of peer interactions in large non-English majored classes. Their responses achieved a mean score of 4.77 whereas those of students at 4.33. The results also show that both surveyed teachers and students believed that in large classes, students can learn from their peers through interactions (M=4.63 and M=4.0 for teachers and students accordingly). This indicates a high level of agreement with both interactionism and sociocultural theory as through peer interactions, learners can have both language input and verbal mediation to think and carry out the task at hand.

Another difference in their beliefs is shown in the mean scores for the statement that peer interactions mediates students' thinking process (M=4.77 and 4.33). There was also some discrepancy in both groups on the opinion that peer interaction provides language input for students (M=4.13 and M=3.91 for each group). Interaction hypothesis states that modified input facilitates language learning, however, there was discrepancy in teachers' and students' evaluation of this matter (M=4.7 and 4.6 respectively).

Fourthly, there was a noticeable gap between teachers and students' beliefs about whether only the target language should be used in the classrooms (Table 4.5). The mean score of teachers' answer was 4.52 whereas it was only 3.52 for students' answer. Moreover, when asked about the statement that language learning is the result of interactions between the learner's mental abilities and the linguistic environment, the response of teachers obtained the mean score of 3.71 but that of students was 4.78. Besides, teacher's response achieved the mean score of 3.69 whereas that of students reached 4.03 for the opinion that learners have the possibility to create the input they need when interacting in the target language.

Fifthly, slight differences were found in teachers' and students' responses in their belief of the use of the first language in the classroom. For the statement that the first language helps students to think in learning English, the mean score for teachers' responses was 4.27 whereas that of students' responses was 4.21. Another minor discrepancy was found in both groups' answer to the statement that the first language should be used sometimes by the teacher to help students understand abstract concepts (M=4.72 for teachers and M=4.7 for students). However, one interviewed teacher rejected the use of the first language in the classroom and one student that the first language should be used limitedly.

4.4 Discussion on Data from Audio Recordings of Classroom Interactions

Teacher-students interactions

Analysis of the audio-recording of the class observation in this study reveals that teacher-students interaction featured various types of negative feedback, positive evidence and considerable reliance on interactional routines such as elicitation, non-corrective repetition, drilling and reinforcement (Tognini, 2007). Within instructional contexts, Ralston's (2010) study found that classroom interactions are elicited by teachers. The excerpts from the classroom audio recordings in this study show features of elicitation, non-corrective repetition and reinforcement present in all excerpts where the teacher's voice was recorded. The reciprocal interaction between teachers and students was carried out through the use of prompting questions such as "why", "what else", "how about you", "you please" or teachers used unfinished sentences so that students could continue.

The findings from the audio recording reiterate the dominant of classroom interactions which include a three-part sequential IRE (Information, Response, Evaluation) exchange (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Walsh, 2012). This exchange involves the teacher, in the role of expert, eliciting information (I) from individual students in order to ascertain whether each knows the material. The teacher does this by asking a known-answer question to which the student is expected to provide a brief response (R). The teacher then evaluates the student's response (E) with such typical phrases as "Good," "That's right", or "No, that's not right." The current findings also confirm the study by Hall (1995) which found that in interactions with students, the teacher most often used the IRE pattern of interaction. Clearly, the teachers were used to such interaction patterns of IRE as the patterns of communication in most classrooms are not explicitly taught, but they are implicitly enforced through teachers' use of language (Johnson, 1995).

The transcripts of classroom interactions again show that in large classes, pair work and group work were employed to provide opportunities for students to interact as found in the study by Trần Thị Thanh Thương and Lê Phạm Hoài Hương (2013). These authors revealed that the majority of the teachers in their study reported to adopt team work, group work and pair work as strategies to make

students more responsible and active in their study in large classes. In another study, Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2008) showed that pair work and group work were frequently used by teachers of large classes. Pair work and group work make it easier for students to be involved in various classroom activities.

From the recordings, it is argued that the patterns of classroom interactions are somehow determined by the tasks provided in the course book. In most cases, teachers usually asked students to work on a given task in the course book. Teachers then monitored, facilitated, controlled, managed and reinforced students on the task. It remains unknown what the teacher-students interactions would be if there was no task requirement given.

Interactions as reciprocal knowledge construction

Sociocultural theory (Lantolf, 2000) emphasizes the interdependence of social and individual processes in the co-construction of knowledge. Knowledge can be some concepts in a field of study, certain vocabulary or things that learners have not known or have known and want to share. The extracted excerpts give evidence of the collective sharing of linguistic knowledge and specialized knowledge. For example, students shared and co-constructed their understanding of joining a department (excerpt 3), qualities of good manager (excerpt 9), prepositions to follow certain verbs (excerpt 14), processes to harvest and sell flowers (excerpt 12), and specialized words for business or economics (excerpts 7 and 8). It cannot be confirmed whether all the students in the excerpt have already known the knowledge or not, but it is apparent that classroom interactions gave them opportunities to collectively share understanding.

Sociocultural theory indicates that through repeated participation in interaction activities with more capable members, we acquire the linguistic, sociocultural and other knowledge and competencies considered essential to full participation (Leontiev, 1981; Vygotsky, 1981). The more opportunities for taking part in our activities, the more fully we develop the linguistic, social and cognitive knowledge

and skills needed for competent engagement. Besides, through interactions, the 'expert' can scaffold or mediate others' learning (Lantolf, 2000). Clearly, the teacher in the excerpt played the role of the expert giving guidance to students and helped them solve the problems from the course book. Teachers provided necessary vocabulary and language expressions so that students could continue with the course of thinking and complete the task given.

Interactions for language input and output

Interactionism emphasizes interactions for language input and output. Ellis (1985) defines interaction as the discourse jointly constructed by the learner and interlocutors and input is the result of interaction. Besides, Long (1983) proposed that interaction is necessary for the second language acquisition. According to him, three aspects of verbal interaction can be distinguished: input, production and feedback. Input is the language offered to the learner by native speakers or other learners, production (output) is the language spoken by the language learners themselves and feedback is the response given by the conversational partners to the production of the learner. All the excerpts give evidence that students obtained language input from different sources: The course book, teachers and other peers. The course book provided language task and instructions, the teachers elaborated the task requirement and assisted them along the discussion. Teachers also gave students feedback, a source of input for better use of language expressions and concept building. Not all students' production of language was analyzed in all the excerpts but clearly, through the input from the course book, teachers and other students, the interlocutors were able to proceed with their tasks and use language to express their opinions. Sometimes, the language production of students was not grammatically and linguistically correct. Nevertheless, the message for communication was understood by the teacher and other students. This is the essence of interactions.

Student-student/peer interactions

Peer interaction is also emphasized in sociocultural theory (Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002; Foster & Ohta, 2005; Lantolf, Thorne, & Poehner, 2015; Ohta, 1995; Swain). Studies using sociocultural theory as a conceptual framework pointed out that peers could assist each other in language learning. Peers could provide the needed language expressions, assist each other in task completing and problem solving. All the excerpts in this study illustrate the roles of peer in interactions. Especially, in excerpts 7 and 8, the students were using the target language to practice for reciprocal knowledge building which is how and what to do at business meetings. The students were role playing meeting with business partners and how to expand social networks. Incidents of peers assisting others in explaining what the others do not know were not seen in the recordings. However, the excerpts demonstrate the process of receiving language input and producing language output of interaction hypothesis and features of scaffolding of sociocultural theory.

In excerpts 6-8, the teachers' voices were not heard. It is argued that without teachers' monitoring, students took equal turns in language use. The interaction patterns by students themselves did not follow the IRE (Information, Response, Evaluation) exchange (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) but were rather flexible and unexpected.

The use of the first language in classroom interactions

While teachers highly believed that only English should be used to create a rich language environment as shown from the questionnaire result, their actual practice of interaction demonstrated the frequent use of the first language by teachers. In most excerpts presented, the first language was used. The teacher used the first language to explain task requirement, to manage the class, to explain new words, to monitor group work, to explain business concepts. Thanks to teachers' use of the first language, students were able to proceed with their tasks and understand the concepts well. The fact that they were able to continue their interactions with the

teachers and other students indicates that the first language assisted them and mediated their thinking process. Thanks to the first language, they could use and complete the tasks in the target language. The students also relied on the first language in similar ways employed by teachers. However, they did not use the first language to manage the class or give instructions as their roles were to complete the tasks.

The recordings of classroom interactions reiterate the findings by Lê and McDonald (2004) that the first language was used by students to negotiate task planning and procedure, to share understanding, and to help each other with unfamiliar English words. The current study's findings also confirm that students rely on their mother tongue when they cannot engage in meaningful interaction in the foreign language (Polio & Duff, 1994). Clearly, the first language provides an effective way of getting to grips with what needs to be done in the second language (Nation, 2003).

4.5 Summary

This chapter presented data from questionnaires for teachers and students, interviews with teachers and students, and audio recordings of classroom interactions. It tried to answer the research questions pointing out the similarities and differences in teachers' and students' beliefs about classroom interactions. Analysis of classroom recordings displayed the actual patterns of classroom interactions and how both the first and the target language were used. Data from the audio recordings served to verify teachers and students' beliefs about classroom interactions. Both sociocultural theory and interactionism were employed to analyze the transcript of classroom recordings. The next chapter will summarize the key findings of the study and provide implications.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

5.1 Summary of the Key Findings

This section summarizes the key findings of the current study. The research was set out with the objectives to find out the similarities and differences in teachers' and students' beliefs about classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes and how teachers' and students' beliefs about classroom interactions correspond to their actual practice. Data were collected from questionnaires for teachers and students, interviews and audio-recordings of classroom interactions.

Regarding the similarities in teachers' and students' beliefs about classroom interactions, the findings reveal that first of all, both teachers and students reported that they believed that classroom interactions involved talks between teachers and students with nearly equal mean scores for both groups (M=4.83 and 4.80 for teachers and students respectively). Besides, teachers and students similarly considered that classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes are limited because teachers are usually unable to manage classroom interactions (M=4.55 and M=4.53 for both groups). The two groups similarly agreed that teachers should scaffold students (M=4.84 and M=4.78). They further explained in the interviews that the most considerable drawbacks of large classes is that they limit the interactions in the classroom. Secondly, the both groups gave nearly equal evaluation for the passive roles of students in classroom interactions in large classes (M=4.81 and 4.80 accordingly). Thirdly, teachers as well as teachers' responses achieved almost the same mean scores of 4.7 and 4.6 for the statement mentioning that modified input created within classroom interactions can be facilitating in explaining linguistic forms for learners. In the interviews, all the teachers and students again confirmed that students should work in pairs or groups and received guidance from teachers. Fourthly, the mean score of the responses on the roles of the target language in classroom interactions for both groups stood at 4.52 because they thought that language is used to provoke thoughts and lead learners to move to new

zones of proximal development. In the interviews, all the teachers and students confirmed the important role and the necessity of the use of the target language in the classrooms to develop communicative competence of students. Lastly, all teachers and students in the survey agreed that students can use the mother language to mediate the thinking process of learning when interacting with teachers and more capable peers (M=3.72 for both groups).

As for differences, firstly, with regards to classroom interactions and size, the surveyed teachers tended to think that students can learn from other peers through interactions (M=4.39) whereas the mean score for this statement achieved M=4.0 for students' responses in the survey.

Secondly, teachers tended to value teacher-centredness and their dominant roles in class (M=4.18) and guided students (M= 4.29) more than students. Students however expected teachers to scaffold them (M=4.78) and to provide language input (M=4.21). In the interviews, some students said that they needed more prompts, hints from teachers and expected them to create exciting learning environments for more interactions. Thirdly, teachers were more in favour of peer interactions in non-English majored large classes. Their responses achieved a mean score of 4.77 whereas those of students at 4.33. Moreover, the surveyed teachers and students' responses achieved the mean scores of 3.76 and 3.0 for the statement that interactions lead to development of cognition and language learning with the higher mean score for teachers' responses. Fourthly, the belief that only the target language should be used in the classrooms obtained a mean score of 4.52 from teachers' responses whereas it was only 3.52 for students' answers. Fifthly, all interviewed teachers except one rejected the use of the first language in the classroom and one student said that the first language should be used limitedly.

Another key finding of the study comes from the audio-recordings of classroom interactions. The excerpts from the classroom audio recordings in this study show that features of elicitation, non-corrective repetition and reinforcement were present

in all excerpts except excerpts 6,7 and 8. The reciprocal interaction between teachers and students show the use of prompting questions such as why, what else, how about you or teachers used unfinished sentences so that students could continue. Clearly, the recordings reflect teachers' beliefs of the dominant roles of teachers in managing classroom interactions. The interaction patterns include a three-part sequential IRE (Initiation, Response, Evaluation) exchange (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Walsh, 2012). Usually, the teacher elicited information (I) from students in order to ascertain whether they understand or are able to do the task. The students then provide a brief response (R). The teacher then evaluates the student's response (E). Additionally, the transcripts of classroom interactions confirm teachers' and students' belief that in large classes pair work and group work were employed to provide opportunities for students to interact. However, there was mismatch between what teachers believe and what they actually do in classroom interactions. Despite the fact both teachers and students highly appreciated the opportunities for students to use the target language in the class, the audio recordings generally indicate that teachers took a lot of turns in classroom interactions in the process of managing interactions by eliciting students and engaging students in the discussions. In many recorded excerpts, the turns of teachers' talk were much longer than students. The extracted excerpts also give evidence of the collective sharing of linguistic knowledge in terms of vocabulary, prepositions and specialized knowledge of students in the field of business and economics. In fact, both teachers and students highly believed that language should be used to provoke thoughts and lead learners to move to new zones of proximal development as reported in the questionnaires. The excerpts again show evidence to confirm that through talks, students mediated peers to understand the concepts in the given tasks and to be able to give ideas to contribute to the discussions. The recordings reflect teachers' and students' strong belief about the use of the first language in the process of learning the target language in the survey (excerpts 16, 17 and 18). The use of L1 in the excerpts reduces the opportunities of students to

practice L2 but it facilitated the thinking process to complete the given tasks by students.

5.2 Implications

From the findings of the current study, the following implications are put forward to promote interactions in large non-English majored classes for non-English majors.

Firstly, regarding beliefs of teachers and students about classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes, as both teachers and students had high agreement with the talks between teachers and students and between students, classroom activities therefore should be based on the principles of the communicative approach. In addition, the roles of teachers and students should be those of mediators in conversations, following the principles of sociocultural theory.

As students in the study thought that they needed guiding and scaffolding questions from teachers, teachers therefore should learn how to scaffold students by providing support to students when necessary and withdraw assistance so that students can eventually be independent to do their tasks. In the interviews, most students said that they needed more prompts and hints from teachers. Thus, teachers therefore in conversations with students should use the techniques of prompting and giving hints to students.

Data from the questionnaires also reveal that more teachers appreciated the roles of the first language than students in this study. Teachers therefore need to moderate their use of the first language. As for teachers, it is advisable that teachers should use the target language to motivate students to use the language in the classroom. One way to carry this out is that during classroom interactions, teachers should not take long turns in classroom interactions to save the opportunities and time for students to talk.

The student participants in this study held beliefs in interactions with peers in classroom. The finding indicates that students should make good use of the opportunities to talk to peers when assigned to work in pairs or groups. However, they should be taught the strategies to conduct peer interactions, for example, turn talking, scaffolding, explaining and giving feedback.

Another implication is that beliefs and actual practice may be different. What teachers believe about classroom interactions may not guarantee that they will know how to manage classroom interactions. Teachers should reflect on their language use in facilitating as well as monitoring their classes to find out effective ways to enhance classroom interactions. Similarly, strong beliefs about effective classroom interactions may not guarantee that students will communicate well in the classroom. They therefore should learn the ways to start, maintain, and end discussions.

Secondly, regarding data of the audio-transcript, it is clear from the study findings that classroom interactions are beneficial to students' learning in many ways. They mediate the thinking process, provide opportunities for practicing the target language and serve as tools to complete the given tasks. Students thus need to take opportunities to participate in classroom interactions. Besides, students should prioritize to use the target language in classroom interactions but when necessary they can rely on the first language to deal with challenges that are beyond their levels because the first language can serve as a mediating tool. In addition, to produce long turns of English speaking, students should learn expressions to present their ideas. During classroom interactions, teachers and other peers can help with the given tasks by explaining concepts, providing necessary words in the target language and constructing knowledge of the given tasks. In this sense, they should know how to ask for assistance in the target language to make classroom interactions more effective.

The transcript of this study shows that sometimes, teachers were just too eager to explain to students. As a result, they use long turns of speaking to give details for an issue. Teachers therefore need to learn how to give clear and succinct explanations. The transcripts also show that features of elicitation, non-corrective repetition, and reinforcement were present most excerpts. For these techniques to be used effectively, teachers and students should learn how to use them adequately.

The current study findings may be of interest to administrators or even textbook designers. As teachers and students benefit from classroom interactions and that large size classes may cause difficulties to both teachers and students as revealed in the results from the questionnaire and interviews. Administrators should reduce the number of students in each class to facilitate classroom interactions. Administrators also need to hold workshops for both teachers and students on techniques of managing classroom interactions so that interactions in classes can take place effectively.

As for textbook designers, classroom interactions are an indispensable part of teaching and learning. Tasks from textbooks, to certain extent, influence the ways teachers and students talk. Therefore, if the purpose of a task is to practice a pattern of interaction, then there should be a model, for example, a model of interaction of a problem-solving task. Furthermore, for students to be more active in classroom interactions, textbook activities should target at eliciting students' talks.

5.3 Limitations

Despite the fact that the sample of the current study involved 200 participants, the findings of the study might not be generalized to other contexts where participants' backgrounds are different. The reliability of data from questionnaire and interviews depended on the research participants' consciousness in completing the questionnaires and answering the interview questions. The research site was a city in Vietnam. Other teaching and learning environments might influence the ways participants give their answers on their beliefs of classroom interactions.

Another limitation of the study lies in the design of the questionnaire. It can be understood that all the statements in the questionnaire relate to classroom interactions; however, some statements need some more specific information to relate to the main theme of each cluster of the questionnaire as well to reflect the concepts of the theories used as the conceptual framework in the study. Even though the items were translated into Vietnamese in the data collection, understanding of the participants, especially, student participants, who may not be familiar with those concepts in English language teaching and learning, of the questionnaire items might not completely accurate.

5.4 Suggestions for further study

Future research may focus on how teachers' and students' beliefs about classroom interactions may change according to contexts of teaching and learning. Besides, how their beliefs are actualized in specific language skill teaching and learning need further investigation. Whether teachers' and students' beliefs about classroom interactions change over time is another topic for further study. Such factors as reflections of students and the process of how teachers and other students mediate their thinking process in completing the given tasks. Factors that affect the length of talk turns of teachers and students are worth investigating.

5.5 Conclusion

The current study examined teachers and students' beliefs about classroom interactions, more specifically investigating the roles of teachers and peers in the classroom interactions. Additionally, it studied the roles of the first language and English and how they mediated the thinking process of students when they interacted in classrooms to complete given tasks. To achieve these objectives, a triangulation of questionnaire, interview and audio recording were used for data collection. The contribution of the study is discussed in three aspects: ontology, epistemology, and axiology.

Firstly, “An ontology is a (knowledge) representation that provides a shared and common understanding of a domain” (Baker, Chung & Herman, 2012, p.5). In other words, ontology refers to the study of the existence, nature, or being of a certain entity. Ontology which indicates the study of how something existed, its nature, or being, usually answers the question ‘what’. The current study tried to find out the beliefs about the roles of teachers, peers and the two languages: English and Vietnamese in classroom interactions. The findings indicate the similarities and differences in teachers’ and students’ beliefs on classroom interactions. Specifically, both groups considered that classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes were limited because students did not have a lot of opportunities for speaking. The two groups also agreed that teacher should talk less to give speaking opportunities to students. Teachers as well as students stated that the use of L1 or L2 can provoke thoughts and mediate the thinking process of learning English. However, teachers valued teacher-centredness and their dominant roles in class more than students. In addition, the study reused the domain knowledge of sociocultural theory as well as studies on classroom interactions to dwell into features of classroom interactions such as the roles of teachers in managing classroom, how language mediates learning English and how peer interaction takes place to assist students in completing given tasks. The findings show that teacher-students interactions followed IRF patterns and there was coconstruction of knowledge in peer interactions.

Secondly, epistemology is often considered to be the theory of knowledge and concerns the ways in which we use methods like deduction, observation, inference, etc., to understand things (Hofer & Pintrich, 1997). The current study discloses the understanding of classroom interactions as a social practice interpreted by the principles of socio-cultural theory and interactionism which are the two major approaches in studies of language teaching and learning. The knowledge in the current study is the knowing of interaction beliefs and practices manifested by teachers and students classroom conditions. By deduction from the statistics by

means of questionnaire, and interview transcript, comparison was made to draw out similarities and differences in teachers and students' beliefs about factors influencing classroom interactions. Audio recordings of classroom talks were used to infer what constituted actual classroom interactions. It is worth knowing teachers and students' cognitions because those shape their behaviors in practice in classroom, more specifically, in this study, their interactions. The triangulation of the three data collection methods revealed that most of teachers' and students' beliefs of classroom interactions match with their practice. However, it can be said that due to the influence of the Vietnamese culture which gives high power and control to teachers, their roles in interactions were dominant even though teacher indicated in the questionnaire that the role of peer interaction was of great importance. The recordings also show that in incidents where the teacher did not join the interactions, peers took rather equal turns and their roles were to make collective efforts by using both L1 and L2 to complete the given tasks.

Thirdly, with regards to the question in axiology, or the study of values (Hogue, 2011), a study answers the question how our values affect how we do research and what we value in the results of our research. As an ESP teacher teaching large classes for many years, I have witnessed incidents when classroom interactions failed and witnessed time when not all students in a mixed-level class understood what the teacher said. As a result, I believed that sometimes teachers had to rely on L1 and took class time to explain and manage classroom interactions. However, this way of management consumed lots of student talking time. Also, the Vietnamese cultural value of the hierachial power in classroom with more for the teachers has inspired me to explore if this was the case in other classrooms. The findings of the current study showed the typical feature of classroom interactions with the leading roles of teachers and the mixed use of both L1 and L2. It is therefore suggested that teachers should value the use of both languages in large classes for non-English majored students because it is not always the target of practicing L2 but to understand the concepts related to their majors in these classes. The teacher's

talking time in many cases recorded in this study managed students' interactions and supported them to complete their tasks but took away students' talking time. This finding of the current study suggests that there remains an issue to tackle, which is how teachers should scaffold students but still give them the opportunities to interact in large classes.

REFERENCES

- Allwright, R. (1984). *The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Learning*. Applied Linguistics. Available at: http://appliedjournals.org/cgi/pdf_extract/5/2/. Accessed August 25, 2016.
- Allwright, D. & Bailey, K. M. (1996). *Focus on the Language Classroom*. London. Cambridge University Press.
- Antón, M. & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54(3), 314-342.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241-247.
- Atkinson, D., Nishino, T., Churchill, E., & Okada, H. (2007). Alignment and interaction in a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(2), 169-188.
- Azmitia, M., Diaz, R.M. & Berk, L. E. (1992). Expertise, private speech, and the development of self-regulation. *Private Speech: From social interaction to self-regulation* (pp. 101-122). Psychology Press.
- Baker, E. L., Chung, G., & Herman, J. (2012). Ontology-based educational design: Seeing is believing. *Resource Paper*, (13), 120-127.
- Barnes, D. (1992). *From communication to curriculum*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Battalio, J. (2007). Interaction online: A reevaluation. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 8, 339-352.
- Berg, B. L. (1989). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (4th ed.)*. Long Beach: California State University.
- Bickhard, M. H. (1987). The social nature of the functional nature of language. In M.

- Hickmann (Ed.), *Social and functional approaches to language and thought* (pp. 39-66). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Bộ Giáo Dục Và Đào Tạo (2012). <https://thuvienphapluat.vn/cong-van/Giao-duc/Cong-van-7274-BGDDT-GDDH-trien-khai-de-an-ngoai-ngu-quoc-gia-co-so-giao-duc-dai-hoc-2012-303525.aspx>. Accessed July 2016.
- Bộ Giáo Dục Và Đào Tạo (2012). *Những điều cần biết về tuyển sinh cao đẳng đại học năm 2012* [Information about the university entrance exams in 2012]. Hanoi: Education Publications.
- Bộ Giáo Dục Và Đào Tạo (2014). <https://thuvienphapluat.vn/van-ban/Giao-duc/Thong-tu-01-2014-TT-BGDDT-Khung-nang-luc-ngoai-ngu-6-bac-Viet-Nam-220349.aspx>. Accessed July 2016.
- Borg, M. (2001). Teachers' Beliefs. *ELT Journal*, 55(2), 186-187.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81-109.
- Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. NY: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Breen, M. P. (Ed.), (2001). *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Brooks, F. B., Donato, R. & McGlone, J. V. (1997). When are they going to say "it"right? Understanding learner talk during pair-work activity. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(4), 524-541.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by Principles*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Burns, A. & Knox, J. S. (2011). Classroom as complex adaptive systems: A relational model. *TESL-EJ*, 15(1), 1-15.

- Burns, A., Freeman, D. & Edwards, E. (2015). Theorizing and studying the language-teaching mind: Mapping research on language teacher cognition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(3), 585-601.
- Cao, J., Crews, J. M., Lin, M., Burgoon, J. K., & Nunamake, J. J. (2008). An empirical investigation of virtual interaction in supporting learning. *The DATA BASE for Advances in Information Systems*, 39, 51-68.
- Cazden, C. B (1988). *Classroom Discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classroom: Research on Teaching Learning*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Christison, M. & Krahnke, K. (1986). Student perceptions of academic language study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 61-81.
- Cimiano, P., Reyle, U., & Saric, J. (2005). Ontology-driven discourse analysis for information extraction. *Knowledge Engineering (DKE)*, 55(1), 59-83.
- Cleek, M. (2005). Challenging high potential students in large classes: A hurdles approach. *College Teaching Methods and Styles Journal*, 1(2), 85-92.
- Coleman, H. (1989). *How Large are Large Classes?* Lancaster-Leeds Language Learning in Large Classes Research Project, Report No. 4.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Coulthard, M. (1977). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., Clark, P., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 209-

- 240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. H. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). *Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.
- Crouch, M. & McKenzie, H. (2006). The logic of small samples in interview-based qualitative research. *Social Science Information*, 45(4), 18. Doi:10.1177/0539018406069584
- Đào Thị Thanh Hào (2017). Identify Factors That Negatively Influence: *Non-English Majored Students' Speaking Skills: Higher Education Research*, 2(2), 35-43
- Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The research act in sociology: A theoretical introduction to sociological method*. London: Butterworth.
- Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Ellis, R. (1995). *The study of Second Language Acquisition*. (3rd Ed.) Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford: University Press
- Ellis, R. (1999). *Learning Second Language Through Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin
- Ellis,R. & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analyzing Learner Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

- Enerson, D. M., Johnson R.N., Milner, S. & Plank, K.M. (1997). *The Penn State Teacher II: Learning to Teach; Teaching to Learn*. Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching. The Pennsylvania State University.
- Ernest, P. (1989). The impacts of beliefs on the teaching of mathematics. In Ernest, P. (ed.), *Mathematics teaching: The states of the art* (pp. 249-254). London: Falmer Press.
- Flewitt, R. (2006). Using video to investigate preschool classroom interaction: education research assumptions and methodological practices. *Visual communication*, 5(1), 25-50.
- Foster, P. & Ohta, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied linguistics*, 26(3), 402-430.
- Fraser, C. & Gaskell, G. (1990). *The Social Psychology of Widespread Beliefs* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Garrison, D. R., & Shale, D. (1990). A new framework and perspective. In D. R. Garrison & D. Gass, S. (1997) *Input Interaction and the Second Language Learner*. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Shale (Eds.), Education at a distance (pp. 123-133). Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Gorham, J. (1988): The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning, *Communication Education*, 37:1, 40-53, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634528809378702>.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). *Factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Green, J. & Dixon, C. (1993). Introduction to “Talking knowledge into being: Discursive and social practices in classrooms. *Linguistics and Education*, 5 (3&4), 231-239.
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). *How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability*. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 24. Doi: 10.1177/1525822X05279903

- Gutierrez, K. (1994). How talk, context, and script shape contexts for learning: a cross case comparison of journal sharing. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 335-365.
- Koenig, L., Gray, M., Lewis, S. and Martin, S. (2015). Student Preferences for Small and Large Class Sizes. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5 (1), 20-29.
- Kubanyiova, M. & Feryok, A. (2015). Language teacher cognition in applied linguistics research: Revisiting the territory, redrawing the boundaries, reclaiming the relevance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99 (3), 435- 449.
- Kumar, K. (1992). Does class size really make a difference? Exploring classroom interaction in large and small classes. *RELC Journal*, 23(1), 29-47.
- Hall, J. K. (1995). (Re)creating our world with words: A sociohistorical perspective of face-to-face interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 16 (2), 206- 232
- Hall, R.M. and Sandler B. (1984). *Out of the classroom: a chilly campus climate for women?* Washington D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.
- Hall, J., Binney, W. and Kennedy, W. (2005). An investigation of issues in the teaching and management of large classes. *Designs for Learning 12th International Literacy and Education Research Network Conference on Learning*, Common Ground, Altona, Vic..
- Hall, J. K. & Verplaetse, L.S. (2000) (Ed.) *Second and Foreign Language Learning through Classroom Interaction*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Halliday. M. A. K. (1975). *Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Harmer, J. (2009). *How to Teach English*. London: Longman.
- Harrison, N. & Peacock, N. (2009). Interactions in the International Classroom. *Internationalisation and the student voice: Higher education perspectives*, 125.

- Hativa, N. & Goodyear, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Teacher thinking, beliefs and knowledge in higher education* (Vol. 28, No. 506). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Hedge, T. (1988). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Hickman, M. (Ed.). (1987). *Social and functional approaches to language and thought*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Ho, B. (2011). Solving the Problems of Designing and Teaching a Packed English for Specific Purposes Course. *New Horizons in Education*, 59(1), 119-136.
- Hoàng Phương Trang Nhung (2013). *An investigation into scaffolding in peer interaction by English majors at Hue University of Foreign Languages*. Unpublished MA thesis in theory and methodology of English language teaching. Hue University.
- Hoàng Văn Vân (2008a). Những yếu tố ảnh hưởng đến chất lượng đào tạo tiếng Anh không chuyên tại trường Đại học Quốc gia Hà Nội. [Translated title: Factors affecting the quality of English education at Vietnam National University, Ha Noi]. *Tạp chí Khoa học ĐHQGHN, Ngoại ngữ 24 (2008) 22, 37*.
- Hoàng Văn Vân (2008b). The current situation and issues of the teaching of English in Vietnam. *Khoa học và Đời sống* [The Journal of Science and Social Life], 3(9), 7-16.
- Hofer, B. K. & Pintrich, P. R. (1997). The development of epistemological theories: Beliefs about knowledge and knowing and their relation to learning. *Review of educational research*, 67(1), 88-140.
- Hogue, R. (2011). *Axiology: What do you value in research*. Available at: <http://rjh.goingeast.ca/2011/11/17/axiology-what-do-you-value-in-esearch/>. Accessed August, 2017.
- Hutchinson, D. (2007). Teaching practices for effective cooperative learning in an online learning environment (OLE). *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 18, 357-367.

- Israel, G. D. (1992). *Determining sample size*. Gainesville: University of Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agriculture Sciences, EDIS.
- Jin, L. and Cortazzi, M. (2013). Large Classes. In: M. Byram and A. Hu (eds. 2nd edition), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*, London: Routledge, pp. 398-400.
- Johnson, K.E. (1995). *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, R.(2006). *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Vol.28 No.2 Cambridge University Press.
- Kanuka, H. (2001). University student perceptions of the use of the verb in distance delivered programs. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*,31 (3), 49-72.
- Kline, P. (1979). *Psychometrics and psychology*. London: Academic Press.
- Klopf, D. W. (1998). *Intercultural encounters: The fundamentals of intercultural communication*, (4th ed.). Englewood, Colorado: Morton.
- Kramsch, C. J. (1987). Interactive discourse in small and large groups. *Interactive language teaching*, 17-30.
- Lâm Quang Đông (2011). English for specific purposes: Problems of teaching contents. *Báo Ngôn ngữ và Đời sống [Language & Life]*, 11(193), 27-32.
- Lantolf, J. (1995). *SLA theory building: 'Letting all the flowers bloom!'* *Language Learning*, 46 (4), 713-749.
- Lantolf, J.P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In: Lantolf, J. P., ed. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lantolf, J. P. & Appel, G. (Eds.), (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Norwood, NJ.: Ablex.
- Lantolf, J. P., Thorne, S. L., & Poehner, M. E. (2015). Sociocultural theory and

- second language development. *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*, 207-226.
- Le, P. K. (2002). Problems, Solutions, and Advantages of Large Classes. *Teacher's Edition*, (9), 8-13.
- Lê Phạm Hoài Hương & McDonald, G. (2004). Mediation through the first language: A sociocultural study of group work in Vietnam, *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics* 10(1), 31-49.
- Lê Phạm Hoài Hương (2007). The more knowledgeable peer, target language use, and group participation. *Canadian modern language review*, 64(2), 329-350.
- Lê Phạm Hoài Hương. & Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2014). Interactions in classes of foreign languages in the light of Sociocultural Theory, *Tạp chí của Hội ngôn ngữ học Việt Nam*, 6(224), 12-16.
- Lê Văn Canh (2011). *Form-focused instruction: A case study of Vietnamese teachers' beliefs and practices* (Thesis, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10289/5253> in September 2017.
- Lê Văn Canh, & Barnard, R. (2009). Curricular innovation behind closed classroom doors: A Vietnamese case study. *Teacher's Edition*, 24(2), 20-33.
- Lê Văn Canh & Renandya, W. A. (2017). Teachers' English Proficiency and Classroom Language Use: A Conversation Analysis Study. *RELC Journal*, 48(1), 67-81.
- Lee, B. (1987). Recontextualizing Vygotsky. In M. Hickman (Ed.), *Social and functional approaches to language and thought* (pp, 87-105). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Leontev, A. N. (1981). The problem of activity in psychology. In J. V. Wertsh (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 37-71). NY: M. E. Sharpe.

- Leontiev, A. A. (1981). *Psychology and the language learning process*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Long, M. H. (1983) Native Speaker/ Non-native Speaker Conversation and the Negotiation of Comprehensible Input. *Applied Linguistics 4*, 126-141
- Long, M. (1985) Input and Second Language Acquisition Theory. In: Gass, S.; Madden, C. (Ed.) *Input and Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. p.377-393.
- Long, M. (1996). "The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition". In Ritchie, William; Bhatia, Tej. *Handbook of second language acquisition*. San Diego: Academic Press. pp. 413-468.
- Luu Trọng Tuấn (2010). Infusing cooperative learning into an EFL classroom. *English Language Teaching, 3*(2), 64.
- MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Preacher, K. J., & Hong S. (2001). Sample size in factor analysis: The role of model error. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 36*, 611-637.
- Mackey, A. (1999) Input, Interaction and Second Language Development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 21*, 557-587
- McIsaac, M. S., Blocher, J. M., Mahes, V., & Vrasidas, C. (1999). *Student and teacher perceptions of interaction in online computer-mediated communication. Educational Media International, 36*(2), 121-131. McMillan, J.H., Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education: Evidence based inquiry* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson, Allyn and Bacon.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.
- Mercer, N. (2004). Sociocultural discourse analysis: analysing classroom talk as a social mode of thinking. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1* (2), 137-168.
- Naegle, P. (2002). *The New Teacher's Complete Sourcebook*. USA: Scholastic Professional Book.

- Nguyễn Thị Tố Hoa & Phạm Thị Tuyết Mai (2016). Difficulties in Teaching English for Specific Purposes: Empirical Study at Vietnam Universities. *Higher Education Studies*, 6(2), 154-161.
- Ngô Thu Hương (2015). *An investigation into students' motivation to learn English in higher education in Vietnam*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Queensland University of Technology.
- Nhapulo, M. A. (2013). Teacher and learner beliefs and expectations about English language teaching and learning at a Mozambican university. *Afrika Focus*, 26(2).
- Mishler, E. G. (2000). Validation in inquiry-guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative studies. In B. M. Brizuela & J. P. Stewart & R. G. Carrillo & J. G. Berger (Eds.), *Acts of inquiry in qualitative research* (pp. 119-146). Cambridge: Harvard Educational Review.
- Moll, L. C. (1990). *Vygotsky and education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muramatsu, Y. (2008). *The role of native-speaker status and cultural background a multidimensional case study of teacher-student interaction in English composition classes*. A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the graduate interdisciplinary doctoral program in second language acquisition and teaching in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in the Graduate College, the university of Arizona. Naegle, P. (2002). *The New Teacher's Complete Sourcebook*. USA: Scholastic Professional Book.
- Nassaji, H. & Wells, G. (2000). *What's the use of 'traidic dialogue'?: An investigation of teacher-student interaction*. *Applied Linguistics*, 21 (3), 376-406.

- Nation, P. (2003). *The role of the first language in foreign language learning*. Retrieved 16/4, 2016, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.asian-EFL-journal.com>.
- Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19 (4), 317-328.
- Nguyễn Thanh Nga (2014). *Learner autonomy in language learning: teachers' beliefs* (Doctoral dissertation, Queensland University of Technology).
- Nunally, J. C. & Bernstein, I.H (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology*. Prentice Hall International.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Language Teaching Methodology*. Prentice Hall International.
- Nystrand, M, Gamoran, A., Kachur, R., & Pendergast, C. (1997) *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Ohta, A. S. (1995). Applying Sociocultural Theory to an Analysis of Learner Discourse: Learner-Learner Collaborative Interaction in the Zone of Proximal Development. *Issues in applied linguistics*, 6(2), 93-121. Ontology-driven discourse analysis for information extraction. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 55(1), 59-83.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- Pham, H. & Malvetti, A. (2012). Teacher perceptions of teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP) programs: A qualitative study of problems and facilitative strategies. *Journal of Teaching and Education*, 1(3), 129-142.
- Phạm Hoài Anh & Tạ Thanh Bình (2016). Developing a Theoretical Framework for ESP Teacher Training in Vietnam. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 12(1), 66-84.

- Pham, T., Thalathoti, V., & Dakich, E. (2014). Frequency and pattern of learner-instructor interaction in an online English language learning environment in Vietnam. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 30(6).
- Pica, T. & Doughty, C. (1985). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. Gass & C. Madsen (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Newberry House Publishers.
- Pica, T. (1988). Interlanguage adjustments as an outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction. *Language Learning*, 38 (1), 45-73.
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44(3), 493-527.
- Polio, C. G. & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 313-326.
- Rahangdale, A. & Agrawal, A. J. (2014). Information extraction using discourse analysis from newswires. *International Journal of Information Technology Convergence and Services*, 4(3), 21.
- Raltson, B. A. (2010) *Interaction and language development of ELL students in mainstream classrooms*. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Science in Curriculum and Instruction Department of Curriculum and Instruction College of Education Graduate College University of Nevada, Las Vegas.
- Ratner, C. (2004). *Cultural psychology: Theory and method*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Rivers, W. M. (1987a). *Interactive Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rivers, W. M. (1987b). Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication. In a Wilga M. Rivers (ed). *Interactive Language Teaching*, Cambridge University Press. NY.
- Rogoff, B. & Lave, J. (1984). *Everyday cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rodney, H. J. (2006). *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Vol. 28 No. 2 Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1985). View points: Transaction versus interaction- a terminological rescue operation. *Research in the Teaching of English* 19 (1), 96-107)
- Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. (1999). Confronting sexism in the college classroom. In S.L.Gabriel & I. Smithson (Eds.), *Gender in the classroom power and pedagogy*. (pp. 176-187). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Sakui, K. & Gaies, S. J. (1999). Investigating Japanese Learners' Beliefs about Language Learning. *System*, 27/4, pp. 473-492.
- Schwitzgebel, E. (2006). "Belief". In Zalta, Edward, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Stanford, CA: The Metaphysics Research Lab, retrieved 2008-09-19.
- Shannon, P. (1989). *Broken promises: Reading instruction in twentieth century America*. Granby MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Smagorinsky, P. & Fly. P. (1993). The social environment of the classroom: A Vygotskian perspective on small group process. *Communication Education*, 42 (2), 159-71.
- Smith, H. & Higgins, S. (2006). Opening classroom interaction: the importance of feedback. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(4), 485-502.

- Snow, C. (1983). Literacy and language: Relationships during the preschool years. *Havard Educational Revview*, 53, 165-189.
- Soo, K-S. & Bonk, C. J. (1998). *Interaction: What does it mean in online distance education?* Paper presented at the ED-MEDIA/ED-TELECOM 98 World Conference on Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia and World Conference on Educational Telecommunications, Freiburg, Germany. Through the Community of Inquiry Model.
- Stanovich, K. E. (1980). Toward an interactive-compensatory mode of individual differences in the development of reading fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 16, 32-71.
- Storch, N. & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting?. *TESOL quarterly*, 37(4), 760-769.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64-81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French Immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320-337.
- Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 171-185.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tinto, V. (1999). Taking student success seriously: Rethinking the first year of college. *NACDA Journal*, 19(2), 5-9. Retrieved, February 15, 2006, from <http://www.doso.wayne.edu/SASS.html>.

- Tognini, R. (2007). *Interaction in languages other than English classes in Western Australian primary and secondary schools: theory, practice and perceptions*. A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of Doctor of Philosophy (Applied linguistics). Faculty of Education and Arts School of International, Cultural and Community Studies.
- Tô Thị Thu Hương (2010). Insights from Vietnam. In R. Johnstone (Ed.), *Learning through English: Policies, challenges and prospects. Insights from East Asia* (pp. 96- 114). Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: British Council.
- Toulmin, S. (1978). The Mozart of psychology. *New York Review of Books*, 25(14), 51-57.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but... *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(4), 531-540.
- Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2008) *Exploring strategies used by ESP teachers in teaching large classes at Hue University College of Economics*. Unpublished MA thesis in education. College of Foreign Languages, Hue University.
- Trần Thị Thanh Thương & Lê Phạm Hoài Hương (2013). Managing strategies in teaching English in large classes at College of Economics, Hue University. *Journal of Science*, 88,10, 69-76.
- Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2015). Classroom interactions in non-English majored large classes. Paper presented at the 6th International Conference on TESOL: *Responding to Challenges to Teaching English for Communication*. SEAMEO RETRAC, Ho Chi Minh City, August 2-3, 2015.
- Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2016). Exploring strategies used by ESP teachers in teaching large classes at university in Vietnam. Paper presented at the 12th Annual CamTESOL conference: *Promoting Autonomy in Language Teaching and Learning*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 20-21 February, 2016.

- Tran, T. T. T. & Baldauf, R. B. (2007). Demotivation: Understanding resistance to English language learning - The case of Vietnamese students. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 4, 79-105.
- Trochim, W. (2005). *Research methods. The concise knowledge base*. Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog.
- Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language classroom: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. London: Longman.
- Vrasidas, C. & McIsaac, M. S. (1999). Factors influencing interaction in an online course. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 13(3), 22-36.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (Ed. By M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The instrumental method in psychology. In J. V. Weilsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp, 134-144). Armonk, NY: Sharpe
- Wagner, E. D. (1994). In support of a functional definition of interaction. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 8(2), 6-29.
- Wallace, M. J. (1998). *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-Royal*, 6(1).
- Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: a proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 1-17.

- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a socio-cultural practice and theory of education*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenden, A. (1987). How to be a successful language learner: Insights and prescriptions from L2 learners. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp.143-117). London: Prentice-Hall International.
- York, C. S. (2009). Transitioning from face-to-face to online instruction: How to increase presence and cognitive/social interaction in an online information security risk assessment class. In *Information Communication Technologies for Enhanced Education and Learning: Advanced Applications and Developments* (pp. 313-323). IGI Global.
- Zimmerman, C. B., (1997). Do reading and interactive vocabulary instruction make a difference? an empirical study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31 (1), 121- 140

AUTHOR'S WORKS

Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2008) *Exploring strategies used by ESP teachers in teaching large classes at Hue University College of Economics*. Unpublished MA thesis in education. College of Foreign Languages, Hue University.

Trần Thị Thanh Thương & Lê Phạm Hoài Hương (2013). Managing strategies in teaching English in large classes at College of Economics, Hue University. *Journal of Science, Hue University*. 88 (10), 69-76.

Lê Phạm Hoài Hương & Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2014). Interactions in classes of foreign languages in the light of Sociocultural Theory. *Tạp chí của Hội ngôn ngữ học Việt Nam*, 6 (224), 12-16.

Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2015). Classroom interactions in non-English majored large classes. Paper presented at the 6th International Conference on TESOL: *Responding to Challenges to Teaching English for Communication*. SEAMEO RETRAC, Ho Chi Minh City, August 2-3, 2015.

Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2016). Exploring strategies used by ESP teachers in teaching large classes at university in Vietnam. Paper presented at *the 12th Annual CamTESOL conference: Promoting Autonomy in Language Teaching and Learning*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 20-21 February, 2016.

Trần Thị Thanh Thương and Lê Phạm Hoài Hương (2017). Interactions in Non-English Majored Large Classes in Vietnam. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(2), 106-116.

Trần Thị Thanh Thương (2017) A survey study on teachers' and students' belief of classroom interactions in non-English major large classes at some universities in Ho Chi Minh city. *Journal of Social Science and Humanities*. Đại học Huế.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data for my research paper entitled “Teachers’ and students’ beliefs about classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes in Ho Chi Minh city”. Your cooperation is highly appreciated.

For each statement below, please tick (✓) your choice.

Note: 1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree
5. Strongly agree

No.	Statements	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1.	In large non-English majored classes, teachers should talk less to give opportunities for students to interact more. Trong những lớp đông không chuyên, giáo viên nên nói ít để tạo cơ hội cho sinh viên tương tác nhiều hơn.					

2.	<p>It is difficult for the teacher to interact with students and vice versa in large non-English majored classes.</p> <p>Giáo viên khó giao tiếp với sinh viên và ngược lại trong những lớp học đông không chuyên.</p>				
3.	<p>Interactions between learners' mental abilities and language environment help with language learning.</p> <p>Sự tương tác giữa năng lực trí tuệ của người học và môi trường ngôn ngữ giúp người học học ngôn ngữ.</p>				
4.	<p>In a large class, teachers are usually unable to manage classroom interactions.</p> <p>Trong một lớp học đông, giáo viên thường không thể quản lý những sự tương tác</p>				

	trong lớp học					
5.	<p>Teachers should use guiding questions to help students with their language learning in large non-English majored classes.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, giáo viên nên sử dụng những câu hỏi hướng dẫn để giúp sinh viên học ngôn ngữ.</p>					
6.	<p>The atmosphere in a large class encourages students to interact.</p> <p>Không khí trong một lớp học đông thúc đẩy sinh viên tương tác với nhau.</p>					
7.	<p>Teacher-students interactions are necessary in large non-English majored classes.</p> <p>Tương tác giữa giáo viên và sinh viên là cần thiết trong việc giảng dạy Tiếng Anh</p>					

	trong những lớp học đông không chuyên.					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

8.	<p>The atmosphere in large non-English majored classes is teacher-centered.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, giáo viên đóng vai trò trung tâm.</p>				
9.	<p>Teachers should use audio-visual aids in large non-English majored classes to promote classroom interactions.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, giáo viên nên sử dụng những giáo cụ trực quan nghe nhìn để tăng cường tương tác trong lớp học.</p>				

10.	<p>In large non-English majored classes, students should be scaffolded by teachers.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, giáo viên nên trợ giúp sinh viên</p>					
11.	<p>It is difficult for students in large non-English majored classes to interact with the teacher because of the size of the class.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, sự tương tác giữa sinh viên và giáo viên là khó do kích cỡ lớp học.</p>					
12.	<p>Classroom interactions should be mainly in English in the process of teaching and learning in large classes for non-English majors.</p>					

	<p>Trong quá trình dạy và học trong những lớp đông không chuyên, sự tương tác trong lớp học nên chủ yếu là bằng tiếng Anh.</p>					
13.	<p>Interactions in large non-English majored classes create language input and meaningful contexts for language learning.</p> <p>Sự tương tác trong lớp đông không chuyên tạo ra ngữ liệu ngôn ngữ và những ngữ cảnh có ý nghĩa để học ngôn ngữ.</p>					
14.	<p>A language class with from 40 students or more reduces the speaking opportunities for students to interact to one another.</p> <p>Một lớp học ngôn ngữ từ 40 hoặc hơn 40 sinh viên làm giảm những cơ hội tương tác cho</p>					

	sinh viên với những những người khác.					
15.	<p>There is not enough time for students to interact with one another in a large class for non-English majors.</p> <p>Một lớp học đông không chuyên thường không có đủ thời gian cho sinh viên tương tác với nhau.</p>					
16.	<p>Language classrooms can be seen as sociolinguistic environments which contribute to learners' language development.</p> <p>Những lớp học ngôn ngữ có thể được xem như là môi trường ngôn ngữ xã hội góp phần vào sự phát triển ngôn ngữ cho người học.</p>					

17.	<p>Peer interaction in large non-English majored classes is necessary because students may not have opportunities to talk to classroom teachers.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, sự tương tác giữa các sinh viên cùng trình độ là cần thiết vì sinh viên có thể không có cơ hội để nói chuyện với giáo viên.</p>				
18.	<p>In large non-English majored classes, students would not like to interact because the input level of students is different.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, sinh viên không muốn tương tác cùng nhau vì trình độ đầu vào là khác nhau.</p>				
19.	Teachers can use a				

	<p>mixture of the two languages in the process of teaching in large classes for non-English majors.</p> <p>Giáo viên có thể sử dụng vừa Tiếng Anh vừa Tiếng Việt trong quá trình dạy và học trong những lớp học đông không chuyên.</p>					
20.	<p>Interactions among students in large non-English majored classes occur when teachers set language tasks and group students into pairs or groups.</p> <p>Tương tác giữa sinh viên với sinh viên trong lớp học đông không chuyên xảy ra khi giáo viên phân định nhiệm vụ và nhóm sinh viên thành từng cặp hoặc từng nhóm.</p>					

21.	<p>Students should not be allowed to use the first language in large non-English major classes.</p> <p>Sinh viên nên được phép sử dụng ngôn ngữ mẹ đẻ trong những lớp học đông không chuyên.</p>					
22.	<p>Peer interaction provides language input for students in large non-English major large classes.</p> <p>Trong lớp học đông không chuyên, sự tương tác giữa bạn cùng lớp cung cấp ngôn ngữ cho sinh viên.</p>					
23.	<p>Throughout the process of interaction in the target language, learners have the possibility to create the input they need in order to better</p>					

	<p>understand new information.</p> <p>Thông qua quá trình tương tác bằng ngôn ngữ mục tiêu, người học có khả năng tạo ra ngôn ngữ mà họ cần để hiểu tốt hơn về những thông tin mới.</p>					
24.	<p>Students can use the first language to mediate the thinking process of learning when interacting with teachers and more capable peers.</p> <p>Sinh viên có thể sử dụng ngôn ngữ mẹ đẻ để điều khiển quá trình suy xét củaviệc học khi tương tác với giáo viên và những bạn cùng lớp có khả năng hơn.</p>					
25.	<p>Peer interaction in large non-English majored classes</p>					

	<p>mediates students' thinking process.</p> <p>Trong lớp học đông không chuyên sư tương tác giữa các bạn cùng lớp giúp thúc đẩy quá trình suy nghĩ của sinh viên.</p>					
26.	<p>In large non-English majored classes, the environment is safer because students do not have to answer every question.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, không khí lớp học an toàn hơn vì sinh viên không phải trả lời tất cả các câu hỏi.</p>					

27.	<p>Interactions mediate the thinking process of learning, especially, between students and teachers and between peers with more capable peers.</p> <p>Những sự tương tác thúc đẩy quá trình suy nghĩ về việc học đặc biệt là giữa sinh viên và giáo viên, giữa các sinh viên cùng trình độ với những sinh viên có khả năng hơn.</p>					
-----	---	--	--	--	--	--

28.	<p>Students usually feel shy to speak in large non-English majored classes.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, sinh viên thường cảm thấy e ngại khi nói.</p>					
29.	<p>In a large class, students can learn from other peers through interactions.</p> <p>Trong một lớp học đông, sinh viên có thể học từ những sinh viên khác qua tương tác.</p>					
30.	<p>In large non-English majored classes, students can exchange ideas with the teacher.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, sinh viên có thể trao đổi ý kiến với giáo viên.</p>					

31.	<p>The teacher should encourage shy students in large non-English majored classes to talk more.</p> <p>Giáo viên nên khuyến khích những sinh viên nhút nhát nói nhiều hơn trong những lớp học đông không chuyên.</p>				
32.	<p>Peer interaction in large non-English majored classes helps students understand the lesson better.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông, sự tương tác giữa các sinh viên giúp cho sinh viên hiểu bài học tốt hơn.</p>				
33.	<p>Classroom interactions are to promote learners' processing capacity.</p> <p>Tương tác trong lớp học là để cải thiện khả năng xử lý ngôn ngữ</p>				

	của người học.					
--	----------------	--	--	--	--	--

34.	<p>The interactional collaboration among peers can lead to second/foreign language learning.</p> <p>Sự cộng tác mang tính tương tác giữa các sinh viên với nhau có thể dẫn đến việc học ngôn ngữ thứ hai/ngoại ngữ.</p>					
35.	<p>Peer interaction creates an active learning environment.</p> <p>Sự tương tác giữa các sinh viên cùng lớp tạo nên một môi trường học năng động.</p>					
36.	<p>The teacher should provide language input in large non-English majored classes.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên giáo viên nên cung cấp ngôn ngữ đầu vào cho sinh viên.</p>					
37.	Students can use					

	<p>language to negotiate in peer interactions.</p> <p>Sinh viên có thể dùng ngôn ngữ để đàm phán khi tương tác với bạn cùng lớp.</p>					
38.	<p>The target language is used as a social tool for communication in classrooms.</p> <p>Ngôn ngữ mục tiêu được sử dụng như là một công cụ xã hội trong giao tiếp lớp học.</p>					
39.	<p>The first language should be used sometimes by the teacher in large non-English majored classes to help students understand clearly abstract concepts.</p> <p>Thỉnh thoảng ngôn ngữ mẹ đẻ nên được sử dụng trong những lớp học đông không</p>					

	<p>chuyên để giúp cho sinh viên hiểu những khái niệm trừu tượng một cách rõ ràng hơn.</p>					
40.	<p>Teachers should use only English in large non-English majored classes to create a rich language environment.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, giáo viên chỉ nên sử dụng Tiếng Anh để tạo một môi trường ngôn ngữ phong phú.</p>					
41.	<p>Language is used as a way to provoke thought and lead learners to more development (new "zone of proximal development", Vygotsky 1978).</p> <p>Ngôn ngữ được sử dụng để kích thích sự suy nghĩ và giúp người học phát triển</p>					

	hơn (“vùng phát triển gần” mới, theo Vygotsky, 1978)					
42.	The first language helps students to think in learning English. Ngôn ngữ mẹ đẻ giúp sinh viên suy nghĩ trong việc học Tiếng Anh.					
43.	The modified input created within classroom interactions can be facilitating in explaining linguistic forms that learners found difficult to understand. Ngôn ngữ đầu vào có thay đổi được tạo ra thông qua tương tác trong lớp học giúp thúc đẩy việc giải thích các hình thức ngôn ngữ mà người học cảm thấy khó					

	hiều.					
44.	<p>Classroom interactions include talking between teacher and students.</p> <p>Những tương tác trong lớp học bao gồm việc nói chuyện giữa giáo viên và sinh viên.</p>					
45.	<p>Classroom interactions include talking between students and students.</p> <p>Những tương tác trong lớp học bao gồm việc nói chuyện giữa sinh viên và sinh viên.</p>					

Xin cảm ơn sự hợp tác của Thầy/Cô!

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data for my research paper entitled “Teachers’ and students’ beliefs about classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes in Ho Chi Minh city”. Your cooperation is highly appreciated.

For each statement below, please tick (✓) your choice.

Note: 1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly agree

No.	Statements	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1	In large non-English majored classes, teachers should talk less to give opportunities for students to interact more. Trong những lớp đông không chuyên, giáo viên nên nói ít để tạo cơ hội cho sinh viên tương tác nhiều hơn.					

2	<p>It is difficult for the teacher to interact with students and vice versa in large non-English majored classes.</p> <p>Giáo viên khó giao tiếp với sinh viên và ngược lại trong những lớp học đông không chuyên.</p>					
3	<p>Language learning is the result of interactions between the learner's mental abilities and the linguistic environment.</p> <p>Việc học ngôn ngữ là kết quả của những sự tương tác giữa năng lực trí tuệ của người học và môi trường ngôn ngữ.</p>					
4	<p>In a large class, teachers are usually unable to manage classroom interactions.</p> <p>Trong một lớp học đông, giáo viên thường không thể quản lý những sự tương tác trong lớp học.</p>					
5	<p>Teachers should use guiding questions to help students with their language learning in large non-English majored classes.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, giáo viên nên sử dụng</p>					

	những câu hỏi hướng dẫn để giúp sinh viên học ngôn ngữ.					
6	The atmosphere in a large class encourages students to interact. Không khí trong một lớp học đông thúc đẩy sinh viên tương tác với nhau.					
7	Teacher-students interactions are necessary in large non-English majored classes. Tương tác giữa giáo viên và sinh viên là cần thiết trong việc giảng dạy Tiếng Anh trong những lớp học đông không chuyên.					

8	<p>The atmosphere in large non-English majored classes is teacher-centered.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, giáo viên đóng vai trò trung tâm.</p>					
9	<p>Teachers should use audio-visual aids in large non-English majored classes to promote classroom interactions.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, giáo viên nên sử dụng những giáo cụ trực quan nghe nhìn để tăng cường tương tác trong lớp học.</p>					
10	<p>In large non-English majored classes, students should be scaffolded by teachers.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, giáo viên nên trợ giúp sinh viên</p>					
11	<p>It is difficult for students in large non-English majored classes to interact with the teacher because of the size of the class.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, sự tương tác giữa</p>					

	sinh viên và giáo viên là khó do kích cỡ lớp học.					
12	<p>Classroom interactions should be mainly in English in the process of teaching and learning in large classes for non-English majors.</p> <p>Trong quá trình dạy và học trong những lớp đông không chuyên, sự tương tác trong lớp học nên chủ yếu là bằng tiếng Anh.</p>					
13	<p>Interactions in large non-English majored classes between teachers and students and among students create language input and meaningful contexts for classroom activities.</p> <p>Sự tương tác trong lớp đông không chuyên giữa giáo viên và sinh viên, giữa những sinh viên với nhau tạo nên ngữ liệu ngôn ngữ đầu vào và những ngữ cảnh có ý nghĩa cho những hoạt động lớp học.</p>					
14	<p>A language class with from 40 students or more reduces the speaking opportunities for students to interact to one another.</p> <p>Một lớp học ngôn ngữ từ 40 hoặc</p>					

	<p>hơn 40 sinh viên làm giảm những cơ hội tương tác cho sinh viên với những những người khác.</p>					
15	<p>There is not enough time for students to interact with one another in a large class for non-English majors.</p> <p>Một lớp học đông không chuyên thường không có đủ thời gian cho sinh viên tương tác với nhau.</p>					
16	<p>Language classrooms can be seen as sociolinguistic environments and discourse communities in which interaction is believed to contribute to learners' language development.</p> <p>Những lớp học ngôn ngữ có thể được xem như là môi trường ngôn ngữ xã hội và cộng đồng diễn ngôn nơi mà sự tương tác được cho là góp phần vào sự phát triển ngôn ngữ cho người học.</p>					
17	<p>Peer interaction in large non-English majored classes is necessary because students may not have opportunities to talk to</p>					

	<p>classroom teachers.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, sự tương tác giữa các sinh viên cùng trình độ là cần thiết vì sinh viên có thể không có cơ hội để nói chuyện với giáo viên.</p>					
18	<p>In large non-English majored classes, students would not like to interact because the input level of students is different.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, sinh viên không muốn tương tác cùng nhau vì trình độ đầu vào là khác nhau.</p>					
19	<p>Teachers can use a mixture of the two languages in the process of teaching in large classes for non-English majors.</p> <p>Giáo viên có thể sử dụng vừa Tiếng Anh vừa Tiếng Việt trong quá trình dạy và học trong những lớp học đông không chuyên.</p>					
20	<p>Student-to-student interaction takes place in large non-English majored classes when teachers set language items and group</p>					

	<p>students into pairs or groups.</p> <p>Trong lớp học đông không chuyên, sự tương tác giữa sinh viên với sinh viên xảy ra khi giáo viên phân định nhiệm vụ liên quan đến ngôn ngữ và giáo viên nhóm sinh viên thành từng cặp hoặc từng nhóm.</p>					
21	<p>Students should not be allowed to use the first language in large non-English majored classes.</p> <p>Sinh viên nên được phép sử dụng ngôn ngữ mẹ đẻ trong những lớp học đông không chuyên.</p>					
22	<p>Peer interaction provides language input for students in large non-English majored classes.</p> <p>Trong lớp học đông không chuyên, sự tương tác giữa bạn cùng lớp cung cấp ngôn ngữ cho sinh viên.</p>					
23	<p>Throughout the process of interaction in the target language, learners have the possibility to create the input they need in order to better understand new</p>					

	<p>information.</p> <p>Thông qua quá trình tương tác bằng ngôn ngữ mục tiêu, người học có khả năng tạo ra ngôn ngữ mà họ cần để hiểu tốt hơn về những thông tin mới.</p>					
24	<p>Students can use the mother language to mediate the thinking process of learning when interacting with teachers and more capable peers.</p> <p>Sinh viên có thể sử dụng ngôn ngữ mẹ đẻ để điều khiển quá trình suy xét của việc học khi tương tác với giáo viên và những bạn cùng lớp có khả năng hơn.</p>					
25	<p>Peer interaction in large non-English majored classes mediates students' thinking process.</p> <p>Trong lớp học đồng không chuyên sư tương tác giữa các bạn cùng lớp giúp thúc đẩy quá trình suy nghĩ của sinh viên.</p>					
26	<p>In large non-English majored classes, the environment is safer</p>					

	<p>because students do not have to answer every question.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, không khí lớp học an toàn hơn vì sinh viên không phải trả lời tất cả các câu hỏi.</p>					
27	<p>Interactions mediate the thinking process of learning, especially, between students and teachers and between peers with more capable peers.</p> <p>Những sự tương tác thúc đẩy quá trình suy nghĩ về việc học đặc biệt là giữa sinh viên và giáo viên, giữa các sinh viên cùng trình độ với những sinh viên có khả năng hơn.</p>					

28	<p>Students usually feel shy to speak in large non-English majored classes.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, sinh viên thường cảm thấy e ngại khi nói.</p>					
29	<p>In a large class, students can learn from other peers through interactions.</p> <p>Trong một lớp học đông, sinh viên có thể học từ những sinh viên khác qua tương tác.</p>					
30	<p>In large non-English majored classes, students can exchange ideas with the teacher.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên, sinh viên có thể trao đổi ý kiến với giáo viên.</p>					
31	<p>The teacher should encourage shy students in large non-English majored classes to talk more.</p> <p>Giáo viên nên khuyến khích những sinh viên nhút nhát nói nhiều hơn trong những lớp học đông không chuyên.</p>					

32	<p>Peer interaction in large non-English majored classes helps students understand the lesson better.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông, sự tương tác giữa các sinh viên giúp cho sinh viên hiểu bài học tốt hơn.</p>					
33	<p>Classroom interactions are to promote learners' processing capacity.</p> <p>Tương tác trong lớp học là để cải thiện khả năng xử lý ngôn ngữ của người học.</p>					
34	<p>The interactional collaboration among peers can lead to second/foreign language learning.</p> <p>Sự cộng tác mang tính tương tác giữa các sinh viên với nhau có thể dẫn đến việc học ngôn ngữ thứ hai/ngoại ngữ.</p>					
35	<p>Peer interaction creates an active learning environment.</p> <p>Sự tương tác giữa các sinh viên cùng lớp tạo nên một môi trường học năng động.</p>					

36	<p>The teacher should provide language input in large non-English majored classes.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên giáo viên nên cung cấp ngôn ngữ đầu vào cho sinh viên.</p>					
37	<p>Students play the role of negotiators in peer interactions.</p> <p>Sinh viên đóng vai trò là người đàm phán trong các tương tác với bạn cùng lớp.</p>					
38	<p>The target language is used as a social tool for communication in classrooms.</p> <p>Ngôn ngữ mục tiêu được sử dụng như là một công cụ xã hội trong giao tiếp lớp học.</p>					
39	<p>The first language should be used sometimes by the teacher in large non-English majored classes to help students understand clearly abstract concepts.</p> <p>Thỉnh thoảng ngôn ngữ mẹ đẻ nên được sử dụng trong những lớp học đông không chuyên để</p>					

	giúp cho sinh viên hiểu những khái niệm trừu tượng một cách rõ ràng hơn.					
40	<p>Teachers should use only English in large non- English majored classes so that students can have a rich language environment.</p> <p>Trong những lớp học đông không chuyên Giáo viên chỉ nên sử dụng Tiếng Anh để sinh viên có thể học trong một môi trường ngôn ngữ phong phú.</p>					
41	<p>Language is used as a way to provoke thought and lead learners to more development (new "zone of proximal development", Vygotsky 1978).</p> <p>Ngôn ngữ được sử dụng để kích thích sự suy nghĩ và giúp người học phát triển hơn (“vùng phát triển gần” mới, theo Vygotsky, 1978)</p>					
42	<p>The first language helps students to think in learning English.</p> <p>Ngôn ngữ mẹ để giúp sinh viên</p>					

	suy nghĩ trong việc học Tiếng Anh.					
43	<p>The modified input created within classroom interactions can be facilitating in explaining linguistic forms that learners found difficult to understand.</p> <p>Ngôn ngữ đầu vào có thay đổi được tạo ra thông qua tương tác trong lớp học giúp thúc đẩy việc giải thích các hình thức ngôn ngữ mà người học cảm thấy khó hiểu.</p>					
44	<p>Classroom interactions include talking between teacher and students.</p> <p>Những tương tác trong lớp học bao gồm việc nói chuyện giữa giáo viên và sinh viên.</p>					
45	<p>Classroom interactions include talking between students and students.</p> <p>Những tương tác trong lớp học bao gồm việc nói chuyện giữa sinh viên và sinh viên.</p>					

Xin cảm ơn sự hợp tác của các bạn!

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR TEACHERS

1. What are classroom interactions in your opinion?
Theo Quý Thầy /Cô tương tác trong lớp học là gì?
2. What do you think about classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes?
Quý Thầy /Cô nghĩ gì về tương tác trong những lớp học đông Tiếng Anh không chuyên?
3. How should teachers deal with classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes?
Quý Thầy/ Cô nên xử lý tương tác trong những lớp Tiếng Anh đông không chuyên như thế nào?
4. How should students deal with classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes?
Những sinh viên nên xử lý tương tác trong những lớp Tiếng Anh đông, không chuyên như thế nào?
5. Which language, the target language or the first language, should be used in large non-English majored classes? Why?
Ngôn ngữ gì nên được sử dụng trong những lớp Tiếng Anh đông, không chuyên: ngôn ngữ đích hay ngôn ngữ mẹ đẻ? Tại sao?
6. What are the roles of the target language in non-English large majored classes?
Những vai trò của ngôn ngữ đích trong những lớp học Tiếng Anh đông không chuyên là gì?
7. What are the roles of the first language in large non-English majored classes? Những vai trò của ngôn ngữ mẹ đẻ trong những lớp học Tiếng Anh đông không chuyên là gì?
8. What are some difficulties that teachers face in dealing with classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes?
Những khó khăn mà Thầy/Cô gặp phải trong việc trực tiếp thực hiện tương tác trong lớp học Tiếng Anh đông không chuyên là gì?

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR STUDENTS

1. What are classroom interactions in your opinion?

Theo em tương tác trong lớp học là gì?

2. What do you think about classroom interactions in large non English majored classes?

Em nghĩ gì về tương tác trong những lớp học đông Tiếng Anh không chuyên?

3. How should teachers deal with classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes in your opinion?

Theo emThầy/Cô nên xử lý tương tác trong những lớp Tiếng Anh đông, không chuyên như thế nào?

4. How should students deal with classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes in your opinion?

Theo em những sinh viên nên xử lý tương tác trong những lớp Tiếng Anh đông, không chuyên như thế nào?

5. Which language, the target language or the first language, should be used in large non-English majored classes? Why?

Ngôn ngữ nào nên được sử dụng trong những lớp Tiếng Anh đông, không chuyên: ngôn ngữ đích hay ngôn ngữ mẹ đẻ? Tại sao?

6. What are the roles of the target language in large non-English majored classes?

Những vai trò của ngôn ngữ đích trong những lớp học Tiếng Anh đông, không chuyên là gì?

7. What are the roles of the first language in large non-English majored classes?

Những vai trò của ngôn ngữ mẹ đẻ trong những lớp học Tiếng Anh đông, không chuyên là gì?

8. What are some difficulties that teachers face in dealing with classroom interactions in large non-English majored classes in your opinion?

Theo em những khó khăn mà Thầy /Cô gặp phải trong việc trực tiếp thực hiện tương tác trong lớp học Tiếng Anh đông, không chuyên là gì?

APPENDIX E

A SAMPLE OF AUDIO RECORDING TRANSCRIPT (For a 5 -period lesson)

T (Ms Bích): OK, now let's go.

S 1: Hi everyone, my name's Stephany, and I'm joining Marketing department, I've just finished a degree in business, business study. Last summer, I worked in expectancy ... at the States, but this is my first job and I'm looking to working with you.

T: Ok, the next part.

Student1: Cô ơi em chưa thuộc mấy phần đó, chỉ mới học phần unit 2 thôi cô.[Teacher, I haven't learned that part. I've just completed unit 2 only]

T: Now, go back to your seat. You have 5 more minutes for preparation. Em có thêm 5 phút nữa để chuẩn bị thôi nha [You have five more minutes]. Now the next student, Cù Thị Thúy Trâm, are you here? Yeah, come here

S 2: Hi everyone, my name's Stephany, and I'm joining...

T: The marketing department

S2: and I'm joining Marketing department, I've just a degree in business...Độc tiếp nha cô? [Shall I continue, teacher?] Last summer,

T: I worked...

S2: I was.... Em chưa thuộc phần đó luôn cô, chỉ thuộc phần làm nhóm thôi. [I've not learnt that section yet, just only the work in group part.]

T: OK, you can work in groups, call your group here. Nhóm của bạn đâu? [Where's your group?].

S2: Các bạn hỏi bữa mà cái phần 3 người đọc 1 đoạn listening phần thứ 3. [There are guys doing speaking section for a group of three in the third part of listening tape.]

T: Em có lý do gì đặc biệt không vậy? [Do you have any special reason for that?] 1 tuần rồi. [One week already.]

Students: *discussing*

T: OK, go back to your seat. 5 phút nữa cô sẽ gọi lại. [I'll call you in 5 minutes]. The next student, Trần Thị Như Tâm.

S3: Hi everyone, my name's Stephany, and I'm joining Marketing department, I've just finished a degree in marketing, business study. Last summer, I worked in ... in the States, but this is my first job and I'm looking to working with you.

T: OK. The next. You talk about the... in speaking part.

S3: Em đọc 1 vai thôi hả cô? [I just only read one part, right?]

T: Yes, one part.

S3: Hi everyone. My name is Ly Chon.

T: Ly Chon.

S3: Ly Chon. And, I 'm joining a system manager, manager in the, in the human resource. I have a degree in economic... em quên rồi cô ơi. [teacher, I don't remember it]

T: What's your name?

S3: Trần Thị Như Tâm.

Teacher: Go back to your seat. OK, please open you book, page, let me see, page 10 again, page number 10. Mở ra ở đó chưa? [Are you there?]

S: Rồi ạ. [Yes, we're already]

T: Các bạn xem cô Stephany cô nói nè [Listen to Ms. Stephany], “I’m joining”, rồi sau cái từ joining là gì ạ [What is the phrases used after “joining”?] Marketing department – là cái bộ phận hay là nghề nghiệp? [Is this a department or a job?] Là một cái vị trí công việc hay là 1 cái bộ phận nào? [A job or a department?]

Ss: A position.

T: Nói mãi mà chúng ta vẫn chưa nhớ là sau “joining” thì phải dùng cái gì ạ? [I have reminded you for many times but you don’t remember what words should be used after joining]

Ss: Human resources.

T: Human resources là cái gì? [What is it?]

Ss: Bộ phận. [A department]

T: Bộ phận [A department]. Good. Như vậy muốn dùng joining thì phải nói là gì ạ? [So, if you want to use “joining”, how should you say?]

Ss: Human resources department

S: *opening the book*

T: Rồi, xem ở trong bài số 3 [OK, look at exercise number 3], nhìn vào chỗ Camon nói nào. [look at what Camon says]. “Well, ...” cái gì nào? [What’s next?] “I’d like you to meet Stephany, Stephany has just joined the marketing department as ...” thấy chưa? Đã thấy chưa? [Have you got it, class? Did you see it?] “...as our new assistant” hay là “as an assistant” [or “as an assistant”]. Thì đây là cách để nói tham gia vào bộ phận nào và cái gì, vị trí nào. [This is how to speak when you want to join any department, thing and position] Lần trước cô đã nhắc các bạn cái này chưa? [Did I remind it for you last time?]

S: Rồi cô. [Yes, you did].

T: Rồi, cứ nhắc rồi, lại quên rồi. [OK, I reminded it then you all forget it again]. OK then, bạn tiếp theo nào. [next student]. Phạm Thị Mai. Sorry, Vũ Thị Mộng Thu.

S4: Hi everyone, my name's Stephany, and I'm joining the Marketing department, uhm, ...

T: I have just...

S: I have just finished degree business study. Last summer, *hesitating*. Last summer, worked in ... at the ...

Teacher: Về nhà các em có học bài không vậy? [Did you study the lesson at home?]

S: *talking*

Teacher: Nãy giờ không có bạn nào học bài đạt yêu cầu hết á. [No one has done it well up to now]. Mỗi phần nói chỉ khoảng 5 câu thôi. [Each part only has about five sentences to speak]. 5 câu mà từ thứ 5 tuần trước tới thứ 5 tuần này, mỗi ngày chỉ học 1 câu thôi, có học được không? [Five sentences from last Thursday to this Thursday, you just learn one sentence for each day, can you?] Nếu kết hợp cả phần của Stephany, phần của Stephany thì đã có sẵn chưa? [Combine with Stephany part, was it available?] Có sẵn 5 câu rồi ạ. [There are five sentences]. Với lại phần bài mới mấy câu ạ? [How many sentences in the next lesson?]

S: 5 câu. [Five sentences.]

T: 5 câu. [Five]. Làm tương tự hay làm khác ạ? [Do it the same or difference, class?]

S: Tương tự. [The same.]

T: Tương tự. [OK, the same]. là 10 câu đi. [Give it ten sentences]. 7 ngày học 10 câu. [Ten sentences for a week]. Là mỗi ngày học bao nhiêu câu ạ? [So, how many sentences do you learn everyday?]

S: *talking*

Teacher: 1 câu rưỡi thôi. [Just one and a half]. Vậy có cái lý do gì đặc biệt để các em không học được 1 câu rưỡi nói 1 ngày không vậy? [So, do you have any special reason not to learn to speak one and a half sentences a day?]

S: *silent*

T: Một câu thì khoảng mười mấy từ, mỗi ngày mà học được 1 câu dài khoảng mười mấy từ như vậy không học được hả? [A sentence is about ten words, everyday you can't learn it by heart, can you?] tuần trước cô đã cho các em chuyển sang tuần này mới nói. [I allowed to move this speaking part to this week to practice.] Tới tuần này cũng không nói được. [But you can't speak until this week].

S: *silent*

T: Mỗi ngày chỉ bớt ra khoảng 5, 10 phút gì đó là thuộc cái câu đó thôi. [Spend somewhat five or ten minutes and you can learn it well]. 5 – 10 phút để học thuộc 1 câu, các em có thời gian đó không vậy? [Five to ten minutes for one sentence a day, can you?]

S: *silent*

T: Hay là ngày nào cũng tắt bật từ sáng tới tối tới nổi không dư ra 5 hay 10 phút nào để học 1 câu vậy? [Or you're too busy not to have five or ten minutes a day to learn a sentence, are you?]

S: *silent*

T: Rồi bạn đầu tiên lên lại. [Well, the first student again]. làm phần cá nhân và gọi nhóm của mình lên làm phần nhóm cho cô luôn. [Do the individual task and call your group to complete the work in group.] Ai là người đầu tiên? [Who's the first one?]

S1: ...

T: Rồi. [OK]. Come here.

S1: Hi everyone, my name's Stephany, and I'm joining Marketing department, I've just finished a degree in business study. Last summer, I work in ... agency. But this is my first ...

Class: *talking*

T: Please, listen.

S1: But this is my first and I'm looking forward to working with you. Nhóm hả cô?
[Shall I do with group?]

T: No, you have to talk about someone in speaking first. Who did you choose to talk about?

S1: Hi...

T: Who?

S1: Hi everyone, my name's Charlie.

T: Charlie Ryan, right? OK, Charlie Ryan.

S1: and I'm joining sales department. I have ... sales and marketing. I have 6 months..., uhm, and one year, uhm, and 1 year as customer service assistant manager. Uhm, uhm, and I'm looking forward, uhm, this effort, but exercise about the

T: Bạn nói vậy được chưa ạ? [Now everyone, is that ok?]

S: ...

T: Mọi người thấy phần nói của bạn như thế nào rồi ạ? [Now, what do you think about her speaking?]. Mỹ Duyên.

S5: ...

Teacher: OK, Nhật Thanh.

S6: ...

Teacher: Can you speak louder please? I cannot hear you.

S6:

Teacher: Anything else?

S6:

T: OK, thank you. Now say that again. Try to speak more fluently. Em nói lại đi, cố gắng nói cho trôi chảy xem nào?

S1: Hi everyone, my name's Charlie and I'm joining sales department. I have diploma sales and marketing. I have 6 months..., uhm, in ... and one year

T: As a customer...

S1: and 1 year as customer service assistant Uhm, manager, uhm, and I'm really...uhm, but this is my first...and I'm really looking forward... Cô cho em coi phần thông tin cuối được không cô? But little bit nervous, but exercise about new job.

S4: Hey Richard, excuse me, have you got a minute?

S5: Yes, of course, Camon.

S4: Well, I'd like you to meet Stephany R., Stephany just, just, marketing department as our new assistant, assistant, uhm, Stephany, uhm, Richard Amon is our director of sales and marketing.

S1: Nice to meet you, Amon.

S5: It's good to meet you, Stephany. Please to call Richard. We use first name here.

T: Can we go on?

Hiên: Ah, Dieu, Excuse me! Have you got a minute?

Diệu: Yes of course, Hien.

Hiên: Well, I'd like to meet Dieu. Dieu has just joined the marketing department. Dieu! Hieu, department at our leadership ... Hieu is our director of sales and marketing.

Diệu: Nice to meet you, Hieu.

Hiếu: It's good to meet you, Dieu. Please call me Hien. We use first name here.

T: Hey! Do you have any comments about their conversation?

Ss: *discussing*

T: Is that OK or not? What's your name, please?

S4: Nguyễn Thị Hiền

T: Nguyễn Thị Hiền. Are you Hiền? Now, Did Hien use some information in the file in speaking? Who did you talk about? Charlie Ryan?

S4:

T: Em dùng thông tin của ai để giới thiệu vậy? [Whose information did you use?] Do you understand the requirement of the speaking part? Now, student A, file 1, page 78, and then introduce yourself to others, so you use the information of these people A, B, C, D here.

S: *discussing*

T: Now for exercise number 2, in speaking part, please use the information of student A, B, C and D in file 1, file 12, file 27 and file 33, not use your own information, right?! Now go back to your seat and do it again. Oh my God, trời ơi là trời. các em có hiểu đề không? [Did you understand the requirement?] Không hiểu đề thì phải email hỏi cô hay gọi điện, hay nhắn tin cái gì đó chứ. [In case you don't understand it, email or call me even text me something.] Cứ ngồi bình tĩnh cho đến lúc làm sai thì thôi. [why always be silent until do it wrong] Nào, [OK] please come here. Listen to her.

S2: Hi everyone, my name's Stephany, and I'm joining Marketing department, I have just a degree in business study. Last summer, I worked in advertising agency in the States, but this is my first job and I'm really looking forward to working with you.

Hi everyone, my name's Charlie and I'm joining sales executive in the sales department. I have just finished diploma in sales and department, and marketing.

Last summer, I worked in 6 months in call center, 1 year as a customer service assistant manager. Uhm, I'm really looking forward to a little bit nervous but excited, but excited in the new job

T: Your group.

S2: Nhóm em chưa có làm, chỉ mới đọc phần thôi ạ.

T: Go back to your seat. *sigh* Nếu các em vẫn lười như thế này thì phần speaking sẽ bỏ qua, và mai mốt thi ai được 1 và 0 thì ráng chịu. [If you all are still lazy like this, we skip the speaking, and you get one and zero at your own risk]. Nếu hôm nay chúng ta học và ngày mai chúng ta học lại, mà thực ra thì trong cái điều kiện mà khi mà bắt buộc hôm nay học bài 1, đúng không ạ? [Should we learn it today and tomorrow we do it again, actually we have to study lesson 1 today, right?] Học speaking, ngày mai học bài 2 – speaking, thì các em cũng phải làm gì ạ? [Study speaking section, then study lesson 2 – speaking, so what you have to do?] Phải làm gì? [What?]

Ss:

T: Phải thuộc thôi chứ làm sao. [Only learn it by heart] Có ai học thay cho các em đâu. [No one learn for you] Nếu bây giờ các em không học dần dần thì cho tới lúc thi các em sẽ bò ra học từ ngày cho tới đêm, từ khuya cho tới sáng. [So if you don't do it day by day, you will drag yourself to learn all day and all night. Và trong tình trạng rất là hoảng, và có học được gì không? [And in a state of panic, will you get something?]

Ss:

T: Không. [No] Bây giờ các em có muốn học dần dần không? Do you want to learn it step by step? Tại sao 1 tuần rồi, hôm nay lên viết không xong, nói không được. [Why do you neither write nor speak it well after a week?] Buổi thứ 4 rồi, coi như học được nửa chương trình rồi đó, có 10 buổi là chúng ta kết thúc thôi. [It's fourth week, a half of the module, and we only have ten section to complete] Đến 1 nửa rồi

mà chưa học nữa hả? [Why don't you learn?] còn đừng định vậy vài bạn không. [Why does it still some students?] Một vài bạn không thuộc chứ gọi bạn nào cũng không thuộc hết tron á. [Some students don't but why there is no one learn the lesson.] Các em học kiểu gì hay quá vậy? [Which way do you all study too well?]

Ss:

T: Cô đồng ý là các em bận những môn khác nữa nhưng mà các em phải phân thời gian ra chứ? [I can agree that you all still have other subjects but you have to manage your time.] Cân đối thời gian lại. [Balance it] Tại vì mai một mấy môn kia thi, rồi còn môn này có thi không? [Other subjects have exams, how about this subject?]

Ss: *silent*

Teacher: Có không? [Has or not?] Cân đối thời gian của mình lại, mỗi ngày ngủ 5, 6 tiếng gì đó, còn lại bao nhiêu tiếng để học môn nào thì phải chia nó ra. [Modify your own time, sleep five or six hours a day, divide remaining hours to study each subject.] Đến học kỳ 2 của năm 1 rồi mà còn chưa biết cân đối thời gian nữa hả? [Second semester of first year already, why can't you manage your time?] OK, move to unit 2, rồi phần nói của unit 1 nếu hôm sau không có tập và hôm sau thông báo với cô là chúng em đã nói thành thạo rồi là cô bỏ qua. [OK, move to unit 2, I skip the speaking part of unit one unless you practice or I'll be noticed that you all speak it fluently next time.] Bây giờ cứ phần nào mà không chuẩn bị tốt là bỏ qua. [Any part without good preparation is skipped for now] Không kiểm tra và không la kể từ ngày hôm nay. [No check and no argument from now] Cả lớp không tốt phần nào bỏ qua phần đó. [If whole class isn't good in any part, we'll skip it] Now, listening unit 2 – page 30.

Ss: *opening the book*

T: Did you listen to Unit 2 at home?

Một vài sinh viên trả lời [*few students answer*]

T: Yes or no?

Ss: Yes.

T: OK, now, exercise number 1. What can you see?

Một vài sinh viên trả lời [*few students answer*]

T: huh? What can you see in exercise number 1? Trong bài số 1 thì các em nhìn thấy gì đây? 3 companies' organograms. OK, what does that mean?

Một vài sinh viên trả lời (Sơ đồ)

T: Là những cái gì ạ? [What are these?]

S3: sơ đồ. [a chart]

T: Sơ đồ gì ạ?

Một vài sinh viên trả lời (Bộ máy) [organization]

T: À, tổ chức của cái gì ạ? [Whose organization?] Công ty. [Companies.] Look at the three companies' organograms. How are these organizations different from each other? Are they different or the same? Những cái này giống nhau hay khác ạ? Different or the same?

S4: Different.

T: Ah, different – khác. Business unit. What does that mean by business unit? Unit – what does “unit” mean? Trong từ điển cho ra nghĩa của từ “unit” là gì? Bài, đơn vị, đúng không ạ? [Lesson, measurement, right?] Business?

Một vài sinh viên trả lời (kinh doanh) [*few students answer: “an enterprise”]

T: nhiệm vụ, kinh doanh. [unit, business] Là gì ạ? [What is it?] Các đơn vị kinh doanh, hay các bộ phận kinh doanh. [It is unit doing business or business department] Unit còn có 1 nghĩa nữa là sản phẩm. [Unit also mean product] Sản phẩm kinh doanh. [business product] B/ Functional organization. Organization?

Một vài sinh viên trả lời (Tổ chức) [*few students answer: “association”]

T: Tổ chức. [association] Functional?

Một vài sinh viên trả lời(Chức năng) [*few students answer: “utility”]

T: chức năng. [utility] Là gì ạ? [What is functional organization?] Tổ chức theo kiểu chức năng của từng bộ phận. [Organization has a special activity or task for each unit] Parent company and subsidiary?

Nhiều sinh viên cùng trả lời *many students answer together*

T: Công ty gì ạ? [What is type of a company?]

S6: Công ty mẹ. [holding company]

T: Công ty mẹ và gì ạ? [And?]

S7: Công ty con. [official firm of a parent company]

T: Công ty mẹ và công ty con. [parent company and subsidiary] OK, now, exercise number 2. Who can tell me what is the requirement of exercise 2? Ai nói cho cô biết yêu cầu của bài 2 là gì nào?

Ss: *discussing*

T: OK, you please.

S6: Thưa cô là, ... *trả lời nhỏ và nhanh bằng tiếng Việt* [*answer with small and fast voice by Vietnamese*]

T: Can you say that again and slowly? Em nói lại và chậm hơn 1 tý được không?

S6: Thưa cô là, bài nghe là... nói chuyện với 3 nhân viên của 3 công ty khác nhau. [The listening is about talking to three employees from three different companies]

T: OK.

S6: về cách xử sự tốt trong công ty đó. [about good manner in company]

T: OK.

S6: *trả lời thêm ý* [*additional answer*]

T: Which organogram? what does that mean? Cái sơ đồ tổ chức nào?

S6: *trả lời* [*answer*]

T: Are they describing? Họ đang mô tả. OK, thank you. Now listen to Peter Wilson. Hãy nghe Peter Wilson who is talking to employees – người mà đang nói chuyện với ai ạ? Nhân viên [Employee] from the 3 different companies in one. Uhm, nhân viên ở đâu ạ? [Where are they?] 3 công ty khác nhau ở trong bài 1 [three different companies in section 1], about their organizations, về các tổ chức của họ. which organogram are they describing? Họ đang mô tả sơ đồ nào. Now listen and tell me, which organogram does each person describe? OK?

playing the tape twice

Playing the tape again and pause after the first speaker

Teacher: OK, which speaker is it? Speaker 1.

Một vài sinh viên trả lời *some students answer* (C)

T: C?

S: C

T: Why do you know that's C? sao bạn biết đó là C nào?

S7: *reading some sentences*

T: OK, thank you. Now it's a main company of a group. Now listen again.

playing the tape again

T: Now, "this is the main company of a group."

playing the tape

Teacher: "we own three smaller companies" chúng tôi sở hữu 3 công ty nhỏ hơn, hay là công ty con.

playing the tape

T: “One in Italy and 2 in the UK”. So this is A, B or C?

Ss: C

T: C, so speaker 1 – C, right?!

play the tape and pause after speaker 2

T: A, B or C? A or B?

Một vài sinh viên trả lời (A)

T: A. why do you know that? Sao các bạn biết là A? at the top, who?

Một vài sinh viên trả lời *some students answer* (managing director)

T: The managing director. And now, we are divided according to...? According to what? Now, listen again.

playing the tape

T: OK, at the top there's the managing director. And then, reporting to him, there are some employees. Là báo cáo cho tổng giám đốc hay là giám đốc điều hành thì có ai ạ? Một số nhân viên ở các bộ phận nào? [Which unit are they in?]

playing the tape

T: “some employees in positions like... human resources and information technology”

play the tape

T: “the big difference is, now we are divided according to products”. Can you see television? DVD players? Air conditioner? Are these products? Đây phải là những sản phẩm không? [Are there products?]

Some students: Yes / Có

T: Yes, OK. So, that is A – speaker 2.

play the tape and paused

T: Is that B? phải B không ạ?

Ss: Yes.

T: Yes? Why do you know that? Can you hear “production”?

Some students: finance and...

T: Finance?

Ss: and marketing.

T: Marketing, and?

Ss: *say something*

T: personnel. What did you hear?

play the tape

T: marketing, production, finance.

play the tape

T: “at the top of the tree” - ở đầu, phí trên của cái cây, phía trên của cái sơ đồ.

play the tape

T: “Is the right structure for us” – là cấu trúc đúng cho chúng tôi. OK.

play the tape

T: “It’s always been like this” – Nó đã từng luôn như thế.

play the tape

T: “And it’s always worked OK” – và nó đã luôn luôn hoạt động tốt, hay là vận hành tốt. Now exercise 3. Listen to part 1 again, how was the company organized in 1996? What does this question mean? Câu hỏi này nghĩa là gì? Who knows? Ai biết nào?

Ss: *discussing*

T: Hằng!

S8: thưa cô theo em là, vào năm 1996 thì cái tổ chức của công ty như thế nào. [In my opinion, there's how the organization of company was in 1996.]

T: can you say that again? Vào năm 1996? [In 1996?]

S8: tổ chức của công ty như thế nào. [how the organization of the company was]

T: tổ chức của công ty như thế nào hay là công ty được tổ chức như thế nào? [How the organization of the company was or how the company was organized?]

S8: dạ, công ty được tổ chức như thế nào. [oh, how the company was organized]

T: OK, thank you. Vào năm 1996 thì công ty được tổ chức như thế nào. [how the company was organized in 1996]. Exercise 4. Who changed the organization? What does this question mean? Who knows? You please!

S9: Thưa cô là, ai là người đã thay đổi tổ chức? [It is who was the person changing the organization]

T: ai là người đã thay đổi tổ chức? [Who was the person changing the organization?] OK, thank you. And number 3, why does the company have a traditional organization? What does it mean by this question? Câu hỏi này nghĩa là gì?

S10: Thưa cô là, tại sao công ty này có cách tổ chức theo kiểu truyền thống. [It is why the company have organization in a traditional way] OK.

T: Tại sao công ty này có cách tổ chức theo kiểu truyền thống. [why the company have organization in a traditional way] OK, thank you. Now, listen again and answer these questions.

Play the tape

T: “Back in 1996, there was just this office” – quay trở lại năm 1996 thì chỉ có cái văn phòng này thôi, và gì nữa?

Play the tape

T: “and a factory in Düsseldorf” – và một nhà máy ở Düsseldorf. Just this office and a factory in Düsseldorf.

play the tape

T: “Has the company been always been organized like this?” – Cái công ty đã luôn được tổ chức như vậy, phải không?

play the tape

T: “or is this a new arrangement?” – Hay đây là một sự sắp xếp mới.

play the tape

T: “A few years ago, the organization was very different.” – một vài năm trước thì tổ chức giống bây giờ hay khác ạ?

Ss: Khác. [Different]

T: Uhm, very different.

play the tape

T: “then...?”

S: ...we got...

T: ...we got a?

Ss: ...new managing director.

T: ...new managing director. Và rồi chúng ta có, sorry, chúng tôi có 1 giám đốc điều hành mới. [and then we got a new managing director]

play the tape

T: “And he decided to change it, of course.” – Và ông ấy đã quyết định thay đổi nó và gì ạ?

play the tape

T: So, the question: “Who changed the organization?”

A student: the new managing director.

T: huh? The new managing director. OK. Now we move to number 5.

play the tape

T: Why does the company have a traditional organization? Because we think it’s the ...?

Một vài sinh viên trả lời [*some students answer*]

T: ... it’s the right structure for us at the moment. Tại vì họ nghĩ đó là cấu trúc gì? [Because which is the structure they think?] đúng hay sai ạ? [Right or wrong?]

S: đúng. [Right]

T: đúng cho họ vào lúc này - at the moment – hay là ở hiện tại. Anything else? Gì nữa không ạ?

play the tape

T: And because it always worked OK. Và bởi vì nó như thế nào ạ? [How did it work?]

Some students: Vận hành tốt. [it worked well]

T: Uhm, đã luôn vận hành tốt. [Yes, always worked well]

5 minutes later

T: Now, have you finished writing?

Ss: *Keep writing and talking*

T: Now, have you finished writing?

Some student: Yes.

Some student: No

Ss: *Keep writing and talking*

T: Now listen. You listen to this part again at home, and I'll check next week. Các em nghe lại phần này và hôm sau cô kiểm tra nhé.

S10: Kiểm tra cái gì cô? [What will you check?]

T: Chưa biết. [Not know yet] Về nhà cứ nghe cho thuộc cái đã, rồi kiểm tra bằng hình thức nào thì hôm sau tính. [learn it first at home, then check it by how that is next week]

Nhiều sinh viên đặt câu hỏi. [Many students give questions].

T: Yes.

Ss: *talking*

T: Now, page 14. We move to Reading. Chuyển sang phần Reading nào.

Ss: *discussing*

Teacher: Now, did you read about Pelo and Mortan at home? Do you have any question? Các em có hỏi gì không? No question.

Ss: *discussing*

T: OK, what do you have to do with the reading? Cái phần Reading này phải làm gì nào?

Some students: Sắp xếp. [Arrange it]

T: Uhm, sắp xếp. Re-arrange, sắp xếp lại. So, for Pelo, which will be the first paragraph? "I don't really have break". The second one, đoạn thứ 2 nào.

Some students: I usually ...

T: I usually start by going. OK, and the next,

Some students: I usually start at about 9.

T: at about 9, uh huh. And the last one.

Some students say something.

T: In the afternoon?

S10: Yes.

T: That is the last one? OK, and then, Mortan, page 82. Now, Mortan number 1, I'm an assistant brand manager. Number 2,

Some students: the first thing...

T: the first thing I do when I arrive, OK. Number 3,

Some students: The first meeting might be...

T: The first meeting might be. OK. Number 4.

Some students: Then after lunch.

T: Then after lunch. And number 5.

Some students: I can work.

T: I can work. Right! OK. And exercise 3 – complete the table with the information from the text or your text about Pelo's job. What's her job? Nghề của cô này là gì ạ?

Several students give different answers: trợ lý / thư ký... [assistant/ secretary]

T: uhm, personal assistant, right! Company?

Some students give answers

T: France. OK. Place?

Some students give answers

T: right. Product or service.

Ss: Product.

T: Sản phẩm hay dịch vụ của công ty này là gì? [What is the company's product or service?]

Some students give answers

T: OK. Boss, who's her boss? Ai là chủ hay là lãnh đạo của cô này?

Some students give answers: father

T: Father. Typical morning activities? Những hoạt động buổi sáng tiêu biểu là làm gì?

S11: workshop.

T: workshop. Anything else?

S11: speaking my dad.

T: Speak to my dad. OK, afternoon?

Some students give answers: go out to lunch / go out of office.

T: go out of office.

S11: meet customer.

T: meet customers. OK, evening?

Some students: go home, make....

T: go home, stay in town to meet and make friends. OK, Mortan? How about Mortan? Job?

S11: Assistant brand manager.

T: Assistant brand manager. Company?

Some students give answers....

T: huh?

S11: Unilever.

T: Unilever. Place?

S11: Copenhagen

T: right! Copenhagen. Product or service?

Some students: household product.

T: Multinational food and household products, right. Boss?

Some students: brand manager.

T: brand manager. Typical morning activities?

Some students: check mail and...

T: Check voice mails and emails

Ss: report.

T: Report to brand manager. OK. Afternoon?

Ss: meeting

T: meeting?! What else?

Ss: *discussing*

T: Evening?

Some students give answers.

T: OK, now, here are the answers.

handing out the paper

Ss: *discussing and talking*

10 minutes later

T: What are you going to learn in Grammar? Các bạn sẽ học cái gì trong phần Grammar nào?

Some students: Present Simple

T: Present Simple. What does Present Simple mean?

Some students: Thì hiện tại đơn. [Simple Present]

T: Dễ hay khó? [Easy or difficult?]

Ss: Dễ. [Easy]

T: Describing routine. Routine – what does that mean? Routine nghĩa là gì ạ?

Ss: *discussing*

T: Thói quen. [Regular activity]. Mô tả những thói quen. [Describe a routine] Can you tell me your daily routine?

One student: get up late.

T: uhm, get up late. Get up at 9, and then have lunch at 12

Ss: *laughing and talking*

T: to save money. Đúng ko? [Right?] Thức dậy vào lúc 9 giờ, ăn trưa lúc 12 giờ để tiết kiệm tiền ăn sáng đúng không? [Get up at nine and have lunch at twelve to save breakfast money, right?]

Ss: Yes. *laughing and talking*

T: anything else? And after lunch, what do you do? Sau bữa trưa thì làm gì?

Ss: đi học.

T: uhm, go to school. And then?

Some students: go home *discussing*

T: Go to class and wait for the break time, và đợi chờ giờ ra chơi.

Ss: *laughing and talking* Yes, yes.

T: and then,

Ss: đợi giờ ra về. [wait for finish time]

T: Yes. Waiting for these phrases: Oh, you can go home now, right?!

Ss: Yes.

T: Và đợi chờ cô nói cái câu là: “A, các em được đi về rồi”. Yeah, and then go home.

S12: Let’s go home.

T: Is that all?

S12: Come back home.

T: Come back home, have dinner, go out with friends. Ăn tối và đi chơi với bạn.

Ss: *laughing and talking around*

T: Oh, I know, and then surf the internet – rồi bắt đầu lướt web ạ. Sign in your facebook.

Some students: ZALO

T: oh, sign in your ZALO and facebook account, right?! Bắt đầu là nhảy vào Zalo hay là facebook. [Ready to jump into Zalo or Facebook] And then?

several students give some answers, others discuss and talk around

T: And then, do your homework.

S13: No homework / đi ngủ. [go to sleep]

T: And then, go to bed at 12.

sS: *keep talking*

T: at 2AM?! Sau đó thì đi ngủ vào lúc mấy giờ? [Then what is the bed-time?]

S13: 4h, 3h, [four a.m, 3 a.m]

T: rất nhiều giờ. [many periods of time] Tùy theo tối hôm đó có bao nhiêu người ở trong Zalo và bao nhiêu người online trên facebook và có đang xem dở mấy tập của bộ phim nào, đúng không? [It depends on people on Zalo and Facebook at that night and being watching some episodes of films, right?]

Ss: Đúng [Yes] *laughing and talking around*

Teacher: hay là đang chuẩn bị lên cấp, lên level của cái game nào, đúng không? [Or being ready to level up some games, right?]

Ss: *laughing*

T: Chắc luôn. [Definitely] Và sau đó, khi mà mọi người đã ngủ được một giấc lâu thật là lâu mình mới lên giường. [When everybody slept deeply for a while, you just went to sleep after then] OK, I know. Now, exercise number 1. Và kết quả là chiều thứ 5 nào cô cũng phải la mắng về cái tội gì ạ? [At the result, what is the thing I have to scold every Thursday afternoon?]

S14: không học bài. [That's not learning the lesson]

T: uhm, không chuẩn bị bài. [no preparation for lesson] Vậy thôi. [That's it] Vì thế từ nay chuyển từ việc la mắng sang: 1 là cho ZERO, 2 là bỏ qua phần đó. [So from now on, I change the argument to give you Zero or skip that part]. Rồi cứ từ từ xem tiếp, chép phạt, đóng phạt, cho 0, trừ điểm. [Then take another consideration, perhaps penal writing, pay fine, zero point, minus your mark] Chiều nay về suy nghĩ xem còn cái hình thức nào nữa, hay là phong tỏa facebook hay Zalo gì để xem cái đã. [Let me think more if there's any form, or way to block facebook or zalo, something like that]

Ss: *talking*

T: Now, number 1. Complete these forms of Present Simple. Can you do that? Làm phần này được không?

S4: được. [yes]

T: I, you, we, they – were; he, she, it...?

Ss: *talking*

T: he, she, it...?

Some students: was

T: he, she, it...?

Class: was.

T: was. Right! I, you, we, they don't work. He, she, it...?

S4: doesn't

T: Uhm, doesn't. where do you work? Where...?

S4: does...

T: does she/he/it work, right?! Exercise 2, I don't know anything about the requirement of exercise 2. Who can help me? Cô chẳng biết gì về yêu cầu của bài 2 hết, có ai trợ giúp được không?

Ss: *talking*

T: what does that mean?

Ss: *discussing*

T: Now, who else? OK, you please.

Ss: *say in Vietnamese*

T: Yes, do you understand the requirement now? Các em hiểu yêu cầu chưa?

S14: Rồi.

T: For example, Pelo lives in Madrid. Yes or No?

Ss: No.

T: No, she doesn't live in Madrid. She lives in Barcelona. And number 1 – 6? You go on like this. Từ số 1 – 6 thì các em làm giống như ví dụ này. Được chưa? Now, quickly.

APPENDIX F

RELIABILITY OF THE PILOT RESULTS OF STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.917	45

Item-Total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
cau_1	175.8500	162.695	.598	.914
cau_2	175.9250	164.174	.549	.914
cau_3	176.2250	171.512	.232	.917
cau_4	174.8500	164.336	.536	.914
cau_5	175.3500	165.105	.491	.915
cau_6	175.8500	164.336	.536	.914
cau_7	174.8500	164.336	.536	.914
cau_8	175.3500	168.182	.360	.916
cau_9	175.3500	166.644	.461	.915

cau_10	174.6500	166.438	.557	.915
cau_11	174.7000	166.677	.476	.915
cau_12	175.7500	166.141	.466	.915
cau_13	175.2000	171.190	.214	.917
cau_14	175.6500	160.490	.519	.915
cau_15	175.3500	159.156	.546	.915
cau_16	174.8500	164.028	.554	.914
cau_17	174.9500	173.228	.042	.919
cau_18	175.7500	160.859	.566	.914
cau_19	176.1500	169.156	.394	.916
cau_20	174.7000	167.856	.433	.916
cau_21	176.3500	173.054	.089	.918
cau_22	175.9500	167.587	.329	.917
cau_23	175.4500	166.254	.494	.915
cau_24	175.7250	168.666	.337	.917
cau_25	175.6500	169.464	.368	.916
cau_26	175.0500	167.997	.438	.916
cau_27	175.0500	165.690	.560	.914
cau_28	175.4500	166.818	.423	.916
cau_29	175.2500	170.295	.316	.917
cau_30	175.3500	161.926	.494	.915

cau_31	175.4250	167.225	.488	.915
cau_32	175.1500	161.003	.623	.913
cau_33	176.3500	159.156	.546	.915
cau_34	175.2000	169.959	.359	.916
cau_35	175.8500	167.926	.376	.916
cau_36	174.9500	164.510	.612	.914
cau_37	175.0500	167.844	.505	.915
cau_38	174.8500	164.849	.630	.914
cau_39	175.2500	174.962	-.097	.919
cau_40	175.5500	168.408	.315	.917
cau_41	174.7500	167.526	.409	.916
cau_42	175.4500	167.638	.439	.916
cau_43	175.1500	174.695	-.068	.919
cau_44	175.1000	168.605	.313	.917
cau_45	174.7500	166.962	.447	.915

APPENDIX G

RELIABILITY OF THE PILOT RESULTS OF TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.910	45

Item-Total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
cau_1	186.4000	124.662	.597	.906
cau_2	186.0000	122.966	.619	.905
cau_3	185.8667	132.257	.346	.909
cau_4	185.0000	129.448	.560	.907
cau_5	185.1000	130.024	.436	.908
cau_6	185.9000	122.369	.581	.906
cau_7	184.9000	132.162	.342	.909
cau_8	185.4000	126.041	.551	.906
cau_9	185.3000	125.045	.583	.906

cau_10	184.7333	133.375	.319	.909
cau_11	184.8000	131.683	.449	.908
cau_12	185.6667	131.264	.332	.909
cau_13	185.2000	131.476	.329	.909
cau_14	185.7000	124.493	.545	.907
cau_15	185.3000	129.803	.359	.909
cau_16	184.8000	132.786	.330	.909
cau_17	185.0667	131.099	.403	.908
cau_18	185.6000	131.766	.390	.909
cau_19	186.6000	132.041	.452	.908
cau_20	184.7333	131.582	.429	.908
cau_21	185.8000	131.269	.409	.908
cau_22	186.1000	130.369	.334	.909
cau_23	185.4667	132.120	.478	.908
cau_24	185.8000	131.338	.403	.908
cau_25	185.6667	131.747	.396	.909
cau_26	184.8333	130.902	.424	.908
cau_27	185.1000	131.748	.346	.909
cau_28	185.5000	130.741	.461	.908
cau_29	185.3000	131.459	.309	.909
cau_30	185.2000	131.062	.362	.909

cau_31	185.7000	130.769	.397	.908
cau_32	185.6000	126.593	.532	.907
cau_33	185.8000	125.269	.530	.907
cau_34	185.6000	132.386	.329	.909
cau_35	185.6000	129.214	.439	.908
cau_36	185.0000	130.828	.436	.908
cau_37	185.0000	130.483	.364	.909
cau_38	184.9000	130.921	.460	.908
cau_39	185.4667	137.292	-.169	.913
cau_40	185.5000	132.052	.340	.909
cau_41	184.7000	133.390	.363	.909
cau_42	185.1000	131.403	.376	.909
cau_43	185.1000	131.886	.334	.909
cau_44	185.6000	132.110	.303	.909
cau_45	184.9000	131.059	.447	.908

APPENDIX H

MINIMUM-MAXIMUM

Class Size and Classroom Interactions

Statements	Teacher		Student	
	Min	Max	Min	Max
1. A language class with from 40 students or more reduces the speaking opportunities for students to interact to each other.	3.00	5.00	2.00	5.00
2. It is difficult for the teacher to interact with students and vice versa in large non-English major classes.	2.00	5.00	2.00	5.00
3. There is not enough time for students to interact with one another in a large class.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
4. In a large class, teachers are usually unable to manage classroom interactions.	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
5. The atmosphere in a large class encourages students to interact.	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
6. In a large class, students can learn from other peers through interactions.	2.00	5.00	2.00	5.00
7. Teacher-students interactions are necessary in teaching large non-English classes.	3.00	5.00	2.00	5.00
8. Classroom interactions include talking between teacher and students	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
9. Classroom interactions include talking between students and students	3.00	5.00	2.00	5.00

Roles of Teachers in Classroom Interactions in Large Classes

Statements	Teacher		Student	
	Min	Max	Min	Max
10. The atmosphere in large non-English major classes is teacher-centered.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
11. In large non-English major classes, teachers should talk less to give opportunities for students to interact more.	2.00	5.00	2.00	5.00
12. Teachers should use audio-visual aids in large non-English major classes to promote classroom interactions.	3.00	5.00	2.00	5.00
13. Classroom interactions are to promote learners' processing capacity.	3.00	5.00	2.00	5.00
14. In large non-English major classes, students should be scaffolded by teachers.	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
15. The teacher should provide language input in large non-English major classes.	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
16. The teacher should encourage shy students in large non-English major classes to talk more.	2.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
17. Teachers should use guiding questions to help students with their language learning in large non-English major classes.	3.00	5.00	2.00	5.00
18. Interactions in large non-English major classes create language input and meaningful contexts for language learning.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00

Roles of Students in Interactions in Large Classes

Statements	Teacher		Student	
	Min	Max	Min	Max
19. It is difficult for students in large non-English major classes to interact with the teacher because students are often too passive.	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
20. Students feel shy to speak in large non-English major classes.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
21. In large non-English major classes, students would not like to interact because the input level of students is different.	2.00	4.00	2.00	4.00
22. In large non-English major classes, students can exchange ideas with the teacher.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
23. Student to student interaction takes place in large non-English major classes when teachers set language items and group students into pairs or groups.	3.00	5.00	2.00	4.00
24. Peer interaction in large non-English major classes is necessary because students may not have opportunities to talk to classroom teachers.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
25. Peer interaction in large non-English major classes helps students understand the lesson better.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
26. Peer interaction in large non-English major classes mediates students' thinking process.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
27. The interactional collaboration among peers can lead to second language learning	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
28. Peer interaction provides language input for students in large non-English major classes.	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00

29. Peer interaction creates an active learning environment.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
30. The modified input created within classroom interactions can be facilitating in explaining linguistic forms that learners found difficult to understand.	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
31. In large non-English major classes, the environment is safer because students do not have to answer every question.	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
32. Students play the role of negotiators in peer interactions.	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.00

Roles of the Target Language in Classroom Interactions

Statements	Teacher		Student	
	Min	Max	Min	Max
33. Classroom interactions should be mainly in English in the process of teaching in large classes for non-English majors.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
34. The target language is used as a social tool for communication in classrooms.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
35. Throughout the process of interaction in the target language, learners have the possibility to create the input they need in order to better understand new information.	3.00	4.00	3.00	5.00
36. Teachers should use only English in non-English major large classes so that students can have a rich language environment.	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
37. Language learning is the result of interactions between the learner's mental abilities and the linguistic environment.	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00
38. Interactions mediate the thinking process of learning, especially, between students and teachers and between peers with more capable peers.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
39. Language is used a way to provoke thought and lead learners to move to the new zones of proximal development.	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
40. Language classrooms can be seen as sociolinguistic environments and discourse communities in which interaction is believed to contribute to learners' language development.	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00

Roles of the First Language in Classroom Interactions

Statements	Teacher		Student	
	Min	Max	Min	Max
41. The first language helps students to think in learning English.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
42. The first language should be used sometimes by the teacher in large non-English classes to help students understand clearly abstract concepts.	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
43. Students should not be allowed to use the first language in large non-English major classes.	2.00	4.00	3.00	5.00
44. Students can use the first language to mediate the thinking process of learning when interacting with teachers and more capable peers.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
45. Teachers can use a mixture of the two languages in the process of teaching in large classes for non-English majors.	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00