



**QUESTION-FORMATTED IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION TO ATTRACT  
PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENT ATTENTION IN ONLINE CLASSROOM**

**Sofi Yunianti<sup>1\*</sup>, Idhoofiyatul Fatin<sup>2</sup>, Nina Veronica<sup>3</sup>**

Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya Jl. Sutorejo No. 59 Surabaya, Indonesia.

\*corresponding author: sofiyunianti@um-surabaya.ac.id

---

**Abstract**

*Online learning is increasingly used around the world due to covid-19. Therefore, this research aims to investigate on conversation analysis that focuses on how the teacher's question which can engage students' interaction in classroom. It is known that it is very complex in engaging students 'in online class, especially first grade primary students. While prior studies regarding online class interaction has not been scrutinized in detail regarding how teacher's question and students' responses. Therefore, this study eager to analyzes the teacher and students' conversation in online class. This study employed qualitative method. The data collected from a series of classroom zoom video. In addition, the data analysis has three stages. First, reduction the utterance, it is based on the question formatted types. Second, coding the data and analyzed the data based on question formatted types. The third is concluding in order to find in the questions-formatted types in online classroom. The types are preserve the sequential implication, slightly alter the sequential implications, following student's question, and deviant case. The result illustrates in this research is slightly later the sequential implications as the only type which occurred in first grade primary school online classes. It occurred because in online classes it is very demanding to engage student's attention in online classroom. It is therefore teacher gave questions and pointed directly to students. Consequently, this study implicates on how the pedagogical insight in teaching online learning.*

**Keywords:** *Question-Formatted, Classroom Interaction, Conversational Analysis, Student Attention*

**How to Cite.** **How to Cite :** Yunianti, S., Fatin, I., & Veronica, N. (2022). Question-Formatted In Classroom Interaction To Attract Primary School Student Attention in Online Classroo. Jurnal Edupedia Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo, 6(2): 129-140

---

©2022 Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo. All rights reserved

ISSN 2614-1434 (Print)

ISSN 2614-4409 (Online)

**INTRODUCTION**

Covid-19 caused serious problem. From 2020 until in the end of 2021, it causes thousands of losses, around 143,000 deaths throughout Indonesia (*Peta Sebaran COVID-19*, n.d.). The problems are not only in healthy, it also

has tremendously consequence in education. Consequently, Covid-19 encourages all students study in home due to prevent it. In addition, Learning process mostly change from face to face interaction to be online learning because of covid-19 and also education system in

order to minimize the risk of infection (Mishra et al., 2020; Singh et al., 2021). The use of online learning system leads to technology advancement. Therefore, it needs various application or online platforms to conduct distance learning. They are usable for teaching and learning process. Teachers use various platform to conduct teaching and learning process, such as zoom, google meet and Microsoft teams and they also utilize various evaluation platform, for example quizzes (Muthuprasad et al., 2021).

Considering the changing learning interaction, there must be obstacle in online learning. One of the main problem is how to attract students in online classes. It is more challenging because in home, there must be so many distraction and it very hard to maintain student's focus during online class. In addition, it also reduces student and teacher engagement. The students no longer engage in class discussion and it is difficult to get student's feedback when teachers give question (Oyedotun, 2020). Another researches reflect that in online classrooms have various obstacles such as internet devices, understanding the learning subject, needing intensive assistance, motivation, assessment, and plagiarism (Hermansyah & Aridah, 2021; Saputra et al., 2022; Sofyan & Wini Fitriana Wati, 2022). While, those problems in online

learning can be encounter by using peer-tutoring, selecting interesting and easy-to-use online learning platforms, and implementing the Project-based Learning model (Yosintha & Yuniarti, 2021). These solutions can be implemented in secondary and higher education but in primary school it is very difficult to apply. Moreover, attracting primary school attention is also difficult. Based on Piaget, children need complex relation to improve cognitive development and teacher eager to provide positive interaction in learning process environment for solving the difficulty in gaining student's attention and cognitive development (Ömeroğlu et al., 2009). Furthermore, teachers also have varying problems in shifting environment from online to offline. Teachers often faces problem in adopting from face to face to online teaching because it needs appropriate skills in technological advancement (Radu et al., 2020). It is therefore teacher usually has problem in motivating students to take part in learning process.

Regarding the problem, some teachers have strategy to motivate student and to tackle the problems. Therefore, it is interesting to scrutinize how the teacher and student's interaction in online class, especially the question formed. Moreover, Previous research's about classroom interaction frequently give emphasizes on

medical institutional setting and adult learning process. They tend to analyze the conversation in order to gain patient conversation who diagnosed in epileptic seizures (ES)(Cornaggia et al., 2012). Moreover, another prior research is analyzing learning material by using telepresence robot mediated. This research focused on multimodality in learning material to conduct the interactional work (Jakonen & Jauni, 2021). The third previous research regarding conversation analysis, this research analyzed how conversation analysis between students and teachers. The students delayed the responses from the teacher by using laughter and smiling (Looney & He, 2020). The fourth research is about teacher's feedback, it reveals how affiliative interactional from teachers minimize the distance between teachers and students (Shvidko, 2021). Students often have problem in asking teacher's help. Svahn and Bowden analyzes how the multimodal conversation analysis in student's help-seeking (Svahn & Bowden, 2021). This research fills the gap in analyzing student and teacher conversation in primary school because these five previous researches do not analyze teacher and student's interaction in primary school, especially in early grade. Moreover, this research focuses on the

questioned formatted in order to reproached to know how the question arouse the student's interaction because mostly research analyzed pauses and gap in turn taking and how question formatted in reproaches students (Klattenberg, 2021; Maroni, 2011).

Based on the previous studies, this research focuses on conversation analysis in online classroom interaction. Classroom interaction is every interaction between teacher and students and in learning process, there is cooperation between both side and effective communication during learning process (Dagarin, 2004). In this interaction, communication plays important role in interaction. Classroom Interaction can be effective based on two factors, first pleasant atmosphere in classroom, the atmosphere is related to the teacher cognition and beliefs because there is inter-relationship interaction in what teacher do, beliefs and how they interact with their students, moreover, the second is encouraging students to be effective communicators because this conversation is related to how the students and teacher's talks turn into actions in classroom (Dagarin, 2004; Gardner, 2019; Li & Walsh, 2011). It is therefore conversation analysis is one of tool for discovery how the ambience of learning process.

With regard to the important role of conversation analysis in classroom interaction, conversation analysis is started from Ethnomethodology, it focusses on action which are manifested through talk (Paul Seedhouse, 2016). It means that conversation analysis is not only about how the circumstance of conversation but also it is reflected how the conversation influences the action. Sacks in Schegloff states that conversation analysis is organizational formats for talk-in-interaction and it also refers to speech exchange system (Emanuel A Schegloff, 1999). The interaction which takes in different place will reflect different pattern. Therefore, speech system depends on the context, for example on the institutional setting. Conversation appears in business meeting; the organizational format will be different from conversational in talk show or schools. This organizational format circumstance reflects the relationship between talk and the social structure which occurs in it (Schegloff, 1992). The social structure is in how the talk shapes based on classes, ethnic groups, age-grade groups, gender, and professional relations. In professional relations, classroom interaction, as prominent parts in teaching and learning, is real social context because it provides face to face activities (Ayunda et al., 2021). It means that talk is prominent

trigger for actions, as well as how the talks is interpreted (Mondada, 2019). However, nowadays, the interactions mostly do not conduct in offline face to face activities, but in online activities. It is therefore very interested to analyze in-depth how the conversation applied in minimal action.

Concerning online activities, the chance for representing conversation interaction is greater than offline (Salomonsson, 2020). Mostly conversation analysis is dealing with adjacency pair and turn taking. This study concerns with online interaction. Therefore, this study focus on how the conversation taking turn and the respond since in online the engagement of learning process is in conversation and minimal in gesture and action. Moreover, recently numerous research regarding conversation analysis in online learning are conducted and focused on turn taking, some scholar began to analyze transcription methods, repair texts, and function in context (Paulus et al., 2016). In accordance to recently research, this study focuses how teacher return the floor to their students in answering the question. Question formatted is how teacher give turn to students for contributing in learning process (Willemsen et al., 2020). It means that it is appropriate to analyze this study by how the teacher gaining students contribution in learning process and the

students responses because this study is in online and discover how the students' behavior, especially motivation in joining online class, especially in an elementary school in Surabaya. It is chosen because this school has inclusion class. Question formatted has four types, the first is practice that preserve the sequential implications, this part consists of nonverbal pass-on and teacher leads students to respond it. The second is practice that slightly alter the sequential implications, this part, teacher slightly alter the projection and change the sequential implications to the students. The third is following student's questions. This part is a question-answer adjacency pair, put together in interrogative syntax. Teacher makes response relevant by pass-on to others students. The last is deviant case, in this case, students do not respond teacher or student's question but pass-on turn to the others students.

## **METHOD**

This research use qualitative research since this analysis based on phenomena which describe about classroom activity (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Cresswell, 2009; Merriam, 1998). The subject of this study is first grade primary school students and the teachers. It is located in one of primary school in Surabaya, East Java. The data came from

collected a series of classroom zoom video recorded between one teacher and 20 students. After collecting the data by using recording and observing stages, the data analysed in three stage. First, reduction the data based on utterance which is in question formatted. Second stages are data display, this stage analysed the data based on four categories of question formatted which practice that preserve the sequential implications, practice that slightly alter the sequential implications, following student's questions, and deviant case. This four categories reflects that conversational analysis as the main method and analysed the detailed of observation attributions and displays (Liddicoat, 2021; Sidnell & Stivers, 2013) The last stage is drawing conclusion, in this step, the result was revealed (Miles & Saldana, 2014).

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

Based on Question formatted illustrates that question can leads into four categories: (1) preserve the sequential implications; (2) practice that slightly alter the sequential implications; (3) following student's questions; and (4) deviant case. These four categories are discussed in order to search what is the pattern of question formatted in order to motivate students to answer.

### Practices that preserve the sequential implications

In this part, teacher who leads the activity use question formatted that does need answer from the students. It can be gesture with nonverbal pass-on turn, repetition, and imperative. In this part, students and teacher do not present nonverbal action. Teachers tends to motivate students to speak up and answer all the question. For second type, partial repetition, also did not appear in this classroom interaction. Teacher directly pointed the students who wanted to answer the question. It is because teacher noticed from the screen that the microphone turns on.

#### Extract 1

1. Teacher 1: I am has 3 sticks of ice cream on the left and on the right there are 3 sticks of ice cream, Uh:m (0.2) (.) what is the number symbol?(.) wh:o will answer? Okay, \*(0.2) student 1, (.) who represents class 1 camel, (.) what is the number symbol, student 1(0.2)
2. student 1: eh:m (0:3) thirty-three, thirties, three units

Teacher gave explanation about counting. In first section, teacher 1 used ice cream stick as the media for counting. Then, she asked the students to answer it. She directly pointed the name of student 1 because she can see it in zoom screen. In line 2, student 1 directly answer it and it also occurred in another utterance fragment. Therefore, there is no partial

repetition. For third type, also did not occurred in the class because there are no students who spontaneous answer in the middle of teacher 1's explanation. Students took turn when teacher asked it.

#### Extract 2

11. Teacher 1: →OK, \*(0.2) what's the name of the number?(0.2)
12. Student 3: sixteen,
13. Teacher 1: →good job sis student 3, (0.2) good job cool everyone

#### Extract 3

40. Teacher 2: Who can say the rules when playing with friends?(.)Those who dare, please raise your hand, okay, \*(0.2) please student 8, (0.2) turn on the microphone
41. Student 8: eh:m (0:3) the three are tens and three units
42. Teacher 2: what dear?
43. Student 8 : Uh:m (0.2) thirty three

In line 11 to line 13, teacher asked question and directly student 3 answered it. There was no chance for others students to take turn and spontaneous answer the question because the meeting is online class by using zoom as the internet platform. It is different from offline class; teacher can easily notice the students who answer the question. However, in zoom class, it is difficult to notice and cannot clearly listen, if there are more than one students to speaks in the same time. It is also reflected in line 40 to 43. The teacher asked students to answer and the student felt hesitate to answer. The teacher waited the students to answer it and asked the student again to answer it. Then, the

student answered it. There were no students to spontaneously answer it.

### **Practices that slightly alter the sequential implications**

In this part, teacher who leads the activity use question formatted which reflect the alter sequential implication of problem solving and yes/no interrogative. Teacher give the problem to arouse student inquiry and participate in classroom interaction. This indicates the teacher motivate the students to being engage in classroom interaction. Teacher also pointed directly on the students to answer the question.

#### Extract 1

1. Teacher 1: Iam has 3 sticks of ice cream on the left and on the right there are 3 sticks of ice cream, Uh:m (0.2) (.) what is the number symbol?(.) who will answer? Okay, \*(0.2) student 1, (.) who represents class 1 camel, (.) what is the number symbol, student 1(0.2)
2. student 1: eh:m (0:3) thirty-three, thirties, three units

#### Extract 4

6. Teacher 1: I have four bundles, then on the right, I have five sticks of ice cream, how many numbers do you mean?(.) Who wants to answer raise your hand, who dares,okay,\*(0.2)student 3, how many numbers do you mean?Student 3: →forty five
7. Teacher 1: OK, \*(0.2) good job Students 3 (.) it means that all this time,if you have explained by me, you have understood have understood, OK, good job, Students 3, class 1 rabbit. Next next.

8. Teacher 1: Next on the left are how many bundles and on the right are the notes of the ice cream stick, what number do you mean? Who dares to try(.) okay, \*(0.2) Student 4, how much?
9. Student 4: →one tens and six units
10. Teacher 1: OK,\*(0.2) what's the name of the number?
11. Student 4: →sixteen,

Based on the extract 4 and 6, teacher gave students problem in counting the ice cream stick. After the teacher demonstrated the counting ice cream stick, teacher asked a question and students directly answered. Teacher gave emphasizes on the media in order to gain student attention, then they eager to answer the question. This problem solving part frequently occurred in classroom interaction because it is a way in arousing student's attention in classroom interaction. Students also directly answered the question without waiting for long time. Students 4 also seems understand the answered and without taking long time directly got the answered. Moreover, student 4 also answered in two time without any destruction from other students.

Yes/no interrogative is part of practice that slightly alter the sequential implications. It can be students question in order to check their understanding or it can be teacher question in asking about student's understanding and confirm the

situation. This conversation is reflected classroom interaction in learning process. It is not only teacher who asks question but also student can ask question.

#### Extract 5

44. Teacher 2:     oops Maisya is still working on math, honey, haven't you finished the math yet?
45. Student 9:     eh:m (0:3) not yet
46. Teacher 2:     → oo no... after this is done again, is there anyone who is confused, is students 9 confused in mathematics?
47. Student 9:     eh:m (0:3) no
- In line 44 to 47, teacher asking question in order to know how students condition. In this part, teacher confirming what students do and if there is problem. Students answered it but it takes long time, it indicates she felt doubtful and afraid to explain the problem. However, teacher give solution if there was problem the student can ask him. In this chance, students also said that she had no problem although she cannot finish her worksheet. In yes/no interrogative, teacher always asks the question and there are no students who ask a question.

#### Following the student's questions

In this part, students ask questions to teacher in order to confirming their understanding and analyze in-depth how teacher answer it. It can be they answer it directly or delay it by giving turn to other students who can answer it. It means that this part is reflecting the students' active

interaction. Therefore, the motivation of student can analyze based on following the student's questions.

#### Extract 5

44. Teacher 2: oops student 9 is still working on math, honey, haven't you finished the math yet?
45. Student 9:     eh:m (0:3) not yet
46. Teacher 2: → oo no... after this is done again, is there anyone who is confused, is students 9 confused in mathematics?
47. Student 9: eh:m (0:3) no

Based on this part, it can be illustrated that the students felt afraid to ask a question. Even, there is problem in doing their worksheet. The teacher also gave help but they seem hesitate to accept it.

#### Deviant Cases

There are no deviant cases in this classroom interaction. Students directly answered the question without passing the turn to others students. Students also answered directly the teacher's questions. It is because in zoom cannot hear clearly when there is more than one person who take turn.

#### Discussion

Based on four types of question formatted, there is no preserve the sequential implications type because students and teacher do not present nonverbal gesture and repetition utterance question (Klattenberg, 2021). This

phenomenon occurred because the meetings hold in online class and it is very difficult to distinguish which student who answer the questions. Moreover, it is hard to notice nonverbal behavior. It is in line with the research which analyzed the online question and answer sessions. It revealed that online class often has lack interaction between students and teachers and becomes biggest challenges (Selvaraj et al., 2021). Following student's questions type, also did not occur in this classroom interaction. Students did not ask question and they tend to be passive, only teacher who asked a question. Deviant case did not occur in this classroom interaction because student will directly answer the question and did not turn to their friend. The only type occurred in this classroom interaction was practice that slightly alter the sequential implications. Teachers frequently gave students problem and solution case. They gave ice cream stick to count. Moreover, teachers also delivered yes and no question because their purpose was gaining student attention.

Regarding the only occurrence of question-formatted types is slightly alter the sequential implication. As a result, the implication is the online classroom in primary school leads the teacher to be active. The teacher also encouraged to be creative in creating problem solution case

in classroom in order to engage the student's attention. Moreover, the classroom ambience can be more attractive. Students also did not have willingness to take turn in answering the question if the teacher did not ask them. This finding is different to prior research due to the condition is online classroom. In offline classroom, students did not only answer the teacher question in verbal but also they gave gesture, smile and laughter (Looney & He, 2020). In conclusion, the different ambience of online and offline classroom is clearly can be seen in student's interaction between teacher and student. In online students can be more passive. Meanwhile, in offline classroom student can be active and expressive.

## **CONCLUSION**

The only question-formatted type which occur is practice that slightly alter the sequential implications. This indicates that the online classroom tends to be passive. Moreover, it also needs teacher creativity to attract the student's attention for example by giving case and asking student to answer. It also more difficult if the students is in the early stage of primary school because it easy to distract children's concentration.

## **REFERENCES**

Ayunda, A., Komariah, E., & Diana, A. (2021). An Investigation of EFL

- Classroom Interaction by Using Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS). *Research in English and Education (READ)*, 6(2), 89–100.  
<http://www.jim.unsyiah.ac.id/READ/article/view/17326>
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theories and methods*.
- Cornaggia, C. M., Gugliotta, S. C., Magaudda, A., Alfa, R., Beghi, M., & Polita, M. (2012). Conversation analysis in the differential diagnosis of Italian patients with epileptic or psychogenic non-epileptic seizures: A blind prospective study. *Epilepsy and Behavior*, 25(4), 598–604.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2012.09.003>
- Cresswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Third Edit). SAGE Publications Inc.
- Dagarin, M. (2004). Classroom Interaction and Communication Strategies in Learning English as a Foreign Language. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 1(1–2), 127–139.  
<https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.1.1-2.127-139>
- Emanuel A Schegloff. (1999). Discourse, pragmatics, conversation analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 1(4), 405–435.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445699001004002>
- Gardner, R. (2019). Classroom Interaction Research: The State of the Art. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(3), 212–226.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2019.1631037>
- Hermansyah, H., & Aridah, A. (2021). Teachers' Perception toward the Challenges in Online English Teaching during Covid-19 Pandemic. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 6(1), 63.  
<https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v6i1.342>
- Jakonen, T., & Jauni, H. (2021). Mediated learning materials: visibility checks in telepresence robot mediated classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 12(1–2), 121–145.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2020.1808496>
- Klattenberg, R. (2021). Question-formatted reproaches in classroom management. *Classroom Discourse*, 12(3), 214–232.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2020.1713834>
- Li, L., & Walsh, S. (2011). 'Seeing is believing': looking at EFL teachers' beliefs through classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 2(1), 39–57.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2011.562657>
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2021). Applying Conversation Analysis. In *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*.  
<https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350090675.0018>
- Looney, S. D., & He, Y. (2020). Laughter and smiling: sequential resources for managing delayed and disaligning responses. *Classroom Discourse*, 00(00), 1–25.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2020.1778497>
- Maroni, B. (2011). Pauses, gaps and wait time in classroom interaction in primary schools. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(7), 2081–2093.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.12.006>
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, H., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Method of Source Book*. SAGE Publications.
- Mishra, L., Gupta, T., & Shree, A. (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research*

- Open*, 1(August), 100012.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100012>
- Mondada, L. (2019). Contemporary issues in conversation analysis: Embodiment and materiality, multimodality and multisensoriality in social interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 145, 47–62.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.01.016>
- Muthuprasad, T., Aiswarya, S., Aditya, K. S., & Jha, G. K. (2021). Students' perception and preference for online education in India during COVID -19 pandemic. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 3(1), 100101.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2020.100101>
- Ömeroğlu, E., Büyükköztürk, Ş., Aydoğan, Y., & Özyürek, A. (2009). Determining the views of preschool and primary school Teachers over the support of problem solving skills at children. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 1969–1974.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.346>
- Oyedotun, T. D. (2020). Sudden change of pedagogy in education driven by COVID-19: Perspectives and evaluation from a developing country. *Research in Globalization*, 2(October), 100029.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resglo.2020.100029>
- Paul Seedhouse. (2016). Conversation Analysis as Research Methodology. In P. S. Keith Richards (Ed.), *Applying Conversation Analysis* (pp. 251–266). Palgrave Macmillan.  
[https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230287853\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230287853_8)
- Paulus, T., Warren, A., & Lester, J. N. (2016). Applying conversation analysis methods to online talk: A literature review. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 12, 1–10.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.04.001>
- Peta Sebaran COVID-19*. (n.d.). Retrieved December 19, 2021, from <https://covid19.go.id/peta-sebaran-covid19>
- Radu, M. C., Schnakovszky, C., Herghelegiu, E., Ciubotariu, V. A., & Cristea, I. (2020). The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the quality of educational process: A student survey. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(21), 1–15.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17217770>
- Salomonsson, J. (2020). Modified output and learner uptake in casual online learner-learner conversation. *System*, 93, 102306.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102306>
- Saputra, D. B., Ayudhia, H. Y., & Muswari, R. (2022). Teachers' perceptions of challenges in online learning: Voices from secondary EFL teachers. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature)*, 7(1), 104–119.  
<https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v7i1.18855>
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). On Talk and Its Institutional Occasions. *Talk at Work : Interaction in Institutional Settings, January 1992*, 101–134.
- Selvaraj, A., Radhin, V., KA, N., Benson, N., & Mathew, A. J. (2021). Effect of pandemic based online education on teaching and learning system. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 85(June), 102444.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102444>
- Shvidko, E. (2021). Relating through instructing: affiliative interactional resources used by the teacher when giving feedback on student work. *Classroom Discourse*, 12(3), 233–254.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2020.1742174>
- Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (2013). The

- Handbook of Conversational Analysis. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Introduction* (p. 825). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Blackwell. <http://claire-bull.artistwebsites.com>.
- Singh, J., Steele, K., & Singh, L. (2021). Combining the Best of Online and Face-to-Face Learning: Hybrid and Blended Learning Approach for COVID-19, Post Vaccine, & Post-Pandemic World. In *Journal of Educational Technology Systems* (Vol. 50, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395211047865>
- Sofyan, & Wini Fitriana Wati, E. (2022). Needs Analysis of Nursing Students in English Online Learning. *VELES Voices of English Language Education Society*, 6(1), 233–246. <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v6i1.5142>
- Svahn, J., & Bowden, H. M. (2021). Interactional and epistemic challenges in students' help-seeking in sessions of mathematical homework support: presenting the problem. *Classroom Discourse*, 12(3), 193–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1686998>
- Willemsen, A., Gosen, M. N., Koole, T., & de Glopper, K. (2020). Teachers' pass-on practices in whole-class discussions: how teachers return the floor to their students. *Classroom Discourse*, 11(4), 297–315. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1585890>
- Yosintha, R., & Yuniarti, S. S. (2021). Learner Autonomy in EFL Online Classes in Indonesia: Students' Voices. *Langkawi: Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*, 7(1), 119. <https://doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v7i1.2637>