

ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE PEDAGOGICAL FOCUS IN
TEACHER LED FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS IN PRACTICUM

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

GÖZDE BALIKÇI

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

SEPTEMBER 2018

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tülin GENÇÖZ
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bilal KIRKICI
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Gölge SEFEROĞLU
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Paşa Tevfik Cephe (Gazi Uni., İNG) _____
Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu (METU, FLE) _____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kemal Sinan Özmen (Gazi Uni., İNG) _____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hale Işık-Güler (METU, FLE) _____
Assist. Prof. Dr. S. İpek Kuru-Gönen (Anadolu Uni., İNÖ) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Gzde BALIKI

Signature :

ABSTRACT

ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE PEDAGOGICAL FOCUS IN TEACHER LED FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS IN PRACTICUM

Balıkçı, Gözde

Ph.D., Department of English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu

September, 2018, 236 pages

This micro-analytic L2 classroom interaction study aims to unearth establishment and maintenance of the pedagogical focus in EFL classrooms led by pre-service teachers. 16 pre-service EFL teachers' teachings in 43 different lessons in practicum context were video-recorded and transcribed using Jefferson transcription convention. Employing conversation analysis as research method, the data were analyzed to investigate the emerging contexts in EFL classroom interaction led by pre-service teachers. And then interactional and pedagogical resources to establish and maintain those emerging contexts were identified. With regards to teaching opportunities, the resources were analyzed to decide their potential to open or hinder space for teaching. The findings indicate that *focus on form*, *focus on meaning* and *focus on fluency* were the contexts that emerged in classroom interaction. Pre-service teachers employed some pedagogical and interactional resources to facilitate teaching opportunities. When teacher candidates focused on form, they *requested for full sentence* for learners to repair their next turns. The second action is to initiate self-stories in *focus on fluency* to involve learners and elicit their contributions in the following turns. On the other hand, some

interactional practices hindered teaching opportunities and this study was the first one to analyze *missed teaching opportunities* using conversation analysis. The actions that led preservice teachers to miss teaching opportunities were leaving learners' questions, word searches or claims of insufficient knowledge unattended and passing up third turn. The implications for teacher education, classroom research and classroom interactional competence framework were provided in the light of the results.

Keywords: Pre-service EFL teachers, practicum, conversation analysis, classroom interactional competence

ÖZ

ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARININ STAJ KAPSAMINDA ANLIK ÖĞRETİM HEDEFLERİNİN KURUMU VE SÜRDÜRÜMÜNÜN KONUŞMA ÇÖZÜMLEMESİ YOLUYLA İNCELENMESİ

Balıkçı, Gözde

Doktora, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu

Eylül 2018, 236 sayfa

Bu çalışmada 4. Sınıf İngilizce öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin okul deneyimi dersi kapsamında okullarda işledikleri derslerde pedagojik hedeflerini kurma ve sürdürme yolları konuşma çözümlemesi yoluyla incelenmiştir. 16 öğretmen adayının ders anlattığı 43 farklı ders video kameralarla kaydedilmiş, çeviriyazıya aktarılmış ve konuşma çözümlemesi yolu ile analiz edilmiştir. Öğretmen adaylarının öğrencilerle beraber pedagojik hedefleri doğrultusunda yarattıkları bağlamların *yapının odak olduğu, anlamın odak olduğu* ve *akıcılığın odak olduğu* bağlamlar olarak 3 e ayrıldığı bulunmuştur. Bu farklı ve kendine özgü etkileşimsel kaynaklar yardımıyla kurulan odakların sürdürülmesi ve öğretim fırsatlarının ortaya çıkması için öğretmen adaylarının kullandığı etkileşimsel ve pedagojik kaynaklar incelenmiştir. Öğretmen adayları yapı ve doğruluğa odaklandıkları durumlarda öğrencilerden cümlenin tamamını söylemelerini isteyerek öğrencilerin takip eden söz sıralarında onarım yapmalarını sağlamıştır. Akıcılığın odak olduğu bağlamlarda öğretmen adayları kendi kısa hikayelerini anlatarak öğrenci katkılarını etkin bir şekilde almayı başarmışlardır. Bu iki etkileşimsel ve pedagojik kaynak sınıf içi

etkileşimsel yeti içinde yerini alabilir. Öte yandan öğretmen adaylarının dil kullanımı bazı öğretim fırsatlarını kaçırmalarına sebep olmuştur ve bu çalışma kaçırılan öğretim fırsatlarının konuşma çözümlemesi yoluyla incelenmesi açısından bir ilktir. Öğrenciler yetersiz bilgi iddialarında bulduklarında, bilinmeyen kelime arayışına girdiklerinde ve soru sorduklarında öğrencilerin bu sorunlarına yönelmedikleri ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca değerlendime yapılması beklenen son söz sırasını da atladıkları bulunmuştur. Bu pratiklerin de öğretme fırsatlarının değerlendirilmemesine yol açtığı ortadadır. Tezin sonuçları ışığında öğretmen eğitimi, sınıf içi araştırma yöntemleri ve sınıf içi etkileşimsel yetinin gelişimi ile ilgili önerilerde bulunulacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hizmet öncesi İngilizce öğretmenleri, staj, konuşma çözümlemesi, sınıf içi etkileşimsel yeti

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Pursuing a PhD degree on classroom interaction is a long, laborious process but at the same time a journey of self-discovery and great learning opportunity for me as someone who loves learning and dares to teach. In this process, my thesis supervisor Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu accepted me as her student and listened to my endless worries in each and every step of the process and offered me solutions in her busy schedule. She was the best supervisor one could have in this journey. Assoc. Dr. Hale Işık-Güler's challenging questions always pushed me and helped me to produce more improvised drafts. Assist. Dr. S. İpek Kuru-Gönen's comments and suggestions for each and every sentence of the manuscript supported me when I got lost in long writing process. Prof. Dr. Tevfik Paşa Cephe and Assoc. Dr. Kemal Sinan Özmen kindly accepted to be in my defense jury and their comments helped to finalize the dissertation.

Although he was not able to attend the jury, Dr. Olcay Sert was the initiator of this dissertation. Thanks to his great faith in conversation analysis and his endless energy to teach, I started to study in this area. The center Hacettepe University Micro-Analysis Network Research Center (HUMAN) he founded was a second school for me. I was able to follow data sessions and present my data regularly which was a great chance for me. The research center was a valuable space for me to follow other researchers' on-going studies, to familiarize myself with the discipline, to attend data sessions.

Without official permission from MoNE and support of the teachers in the schools I would not manage to collect data for three months in two different schools. I'm also really grateful that participants accepted to be video recorded in the classrooms. Thanks to their cooperation, I managed to write this dissertation.

I'm grateful for thought-provoking and meticulously designed lessons I took as part of my PhD studies in ODTU. Not only my professors but also the learning environment and the campus itself offered me a great living and learning space. I will always feel lucky to have spent my 8 years in this inspiring and wonderful campus. The people also made this journey easier for me. I would like to thank my PhD fellows, Orhan Demir and Alena Iriskulova for their support and friendship.

EF-B 27 is a room in which I have been working as a research assistant in the department but the room is also a school within a school for me. Those former PhD students and who are now sharing their wisdom and knowledge with their students in different parts of the country: Dr. Zeynep Ölçü-Dinçer, Dr. Seda Örmengül, Dr. Özlem Türe Abacı and Dr. Seda Coşar Çelik were all great teachers for me.

Room EFB 27 is still a school with many wonderful friends who are understanding and supportive and carrying on the spirit of our office. Mehmet Akkuş, Özlem Arslan and Sinem Oruç kindly took over my responsibilities in the office when I was writing the dissertation. Elzem Nazli showed his friendship when I needed to rest and have fun when we gave long breaks in the office. My dear fellow Fatma Gümüşok encouraged me to continue. She was also a member of the support group (sometimes face-to-face sometimes online) that always spared their time for me in their busy schedule. Sadener Doğan Aslantatar, Banu Çiçek Başaran and Gülden Taner was also the active members of this group. I would like to thank Pelin Altıparmak, Kadriye Bağlıoğlu Şen, Nimet Takım-Şatıroğlu, Yağmur Adal, Tolga Karataş and Sinem Sonsaat, who were just a phone call away whenever I needed.

People say that friends are the family we choose for ourselves. So I need to thank Hüma T. Yücelli-Ataş, Ufuk Ataş and my dear sister Gülden Taner for being a family for me. We started and completed our PhD in the same week with Ufuk It was wonderful to share our concerns, happiness and

achievements together in this long journey. We spent so many hours and days with Hüma in the library that we could find each other without asking for our places in the building. Gülden was the second advisor for me and I'm grateful for her enthusiasm, energy and trust for me in each and every step of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF EXTRACTS	xv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Scope and Purpose of the Study	6
1.3 Methodology and Research Questions	7
1.4 Significance of the Study	10
1.5 Research Context	11
1.6 List of Terminology	12
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	14
2.1 Introduction	14
2.2 Issues in L2 Classroom Discourse	16
2.2.1 Approaches to L2 classroom	16
2.2.2 Approaches to Language and Language Learning in the Classroom	18
2.3 Conversation Analysis and Learning	21
2.3.1 Teacher-Fronted Classroom Interaction	25
2.3.2 Teacher Talk	31
2.3.2.1 Learning Opportunities in Teacher Talk	36
3. METHODOLOGY	43

3.1 Introduction.....	43
3.2 Purpose of the Study and Research Questions.....	43
3.2.1 Significance of the study	44
3.3 Participants, Research Context and Data Collection Procedures.....	46
3.3.1 Gaining Access to the Research Context and the Role of the Researcher.....	46
3.3.2 Practicum Context and the Participants	46
3.4 Data Analysis	55
3.4.1 Conversation Analysis.....	55
3.5 Validity and Reliability	69
3.6 Conclusion	74
4. RESULTS.....	75
4.1 Introduction.....	75
4.2 Focus on Form	76
4.2.1 Establishment and Maintenance of the Pedagogical Focus.....	77
4.2.2 General Summary of Focus on Form	106
4.3 Focus on Meaning.....	109
4.3.1. Summary and Discussion of Focus on Meaning.....	131
4.4 Focus on Fluency:	134
4.4.1 Discussion of Focus on Fluency.....	164
5. CONCLUSION	170
5.1 Summary of Findings and Discussion.....	170
5.2 Implications for Classroom Interactional Competence	175
5.3 Implications for Teacher Education	177
5.4 Implications for Classroom Research.....	181

5.5 Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research .	182
REFERENCES.....	184
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Ethics Committee Approval/ Etik Kurulu İzni	201
Appendix B: Permission from MoNE	202
Appendix C: Consent Form for Participants	203
Appendix D: The Database.....	204
Appendix E: Coursebook Page.....	205
Appendix F: Coursebook Page.....	206
Appendix G: Coursebook Page	207
Appendix H: Coursebook Page.....	208
Appendix I: Coursebook Page.....	209
Appendix J: Coursebook Page.....	210
Appendix K: Examples for Teacher Actions.....	211
Appendix L: The Jefferson Transcription System	212
Appendix M: Vita	214
Appendix N: Turkish Summary/Türkçe Özet.....	216
Appendix O: Tez İzin Formu/Thesis Permission Form	236

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 The number of lessons recorded in total.....	53
Table 4.1 PTs interactional and pedagogical resources in focus on form.....	107
Table 4.2 Teacher actions hindering and opening space for teaching	108
Table 4.3 Interactional and pedagogical resources in focus on meaning.....	134
Table 4.4 Teacher actions hindering and opening space for teaching	134
Table 4.5 Interactional and pedagogical resources in focus on fluency	168
Table 4.6 Teacher actions hindering and opening space for teaching	168
Table 4.7 Summary of the teacher actions	169

LIST OF EXTRACTS

Extract FF 1: Pt1_5B_TT.....	78
Extract FF 2: Pt11_Prep K_FT.....	84
Extract FF 3: Pt4_Prep B_ Pt4_Prep B_FT.....	87
Extract FF 4: Pt14_Prep K_FT.....	90
Extract FF 5: Pt9_Prep D_FT.....	94
Extract FF 6:Pt2_5B_TT.....	98
Extract FF 7: Pt3_Prep B_FT.....	102
Extract FM 1: Pt4_PrepB_ST.....	110
Extract FM 2: Pt7_Prep D_FT.....	114
Extract FM 3: Pt5_Prep B_ST.....	117
Extract FM 4: Pt11_Prep F_ST.....	122
Extract FM 5: Pt11_Prep F_ST.....	124
Extract FM 6: Pt7_Prep D_TT.....	127
Extract FLU 1:Pt16_Prep K_ST.....	135
Extract FLU 2:Pt9_Prep D_FT.....	139
Extract FLU 3:Pt12_Prep H_TT.....	142
Extract FLU 4: Pt 15 _Prep K_FT.....	145
Extract FLU 5 Pt3_Prep B_TT.....	148
Extract FLU 6_Pt2_5B_TT.....	151
Extract FLU 7: Pt 15_Prep K_FT.....	156
Extract FLU 8: Pt 13_ Prep H_ST.....	160
Extract FLU 9: Pt 6_ Prep D_FT.....	163

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will present a brief introduction to the study. Background and the need for the study will be explained first. Secondly, the scope and the purpose of the study will be provided. The research questions and the methodology of the study will be reported on in the following section. The significance of the study and the research context will be described in the final part.

1.1 Background to the Study

English has been taught as a compulsory foreign language starting from primary level in state schools in Turkey. English language teaching in Turkey has always been a key issue and the curriculum changes have been put into practice especially with respect to the starting time and the amount of class hours (Kırkgöz, 2007). Since 2013, the English instruction has been given from the 2nd year onward till the 12th grade (TTKB, 2018). Although the students in state schools receive 1000 hours of English by the time they graduate from the high school (TEPAV, 2014), the quality of the English instruction has always been under discussion (Doğançay- Aktuna 1998, Doğançay- Aktuna & Kızıltepe, 2005). Doğançay-Aktuna (1998) asserts that graduates of the high school can be categorised as *false beginners* even after significant amount of English instruction. In EF English Proficiency Index (2017), Turkey was listed in *very low proficiency band* (ranking 62nd among 80 countries).

TEPAV's (2014) report on the needs analysis for English language learning in state schools in Turkey highlighted the fact that the language was taught merely as a lesson not as a vehicle for communication in the classrooms. Although the language proficiency of language teachers were found to be adequate, the methodology used in the classrooms made learners consider English as a subject to memorise. The "unrealised potential of teachers" and the "grammar-based teaching" were the first two critical findings that resulted in failure to learn English in schools according to the report. The needs analysis showed that English was not seen as a language of communication but conceptualised as a set of rules to learn by heart and evaluated mostly by multiple choice tests. However, the analyses of the curriculum set by MONE show that it is designed and updated continuously to teach English communicatively with recent teaching methodologies (Kırkgöz, 2007; Yücel, Dimici, Yıldız & Bümen, 2017). In other words, there is an apparent paradox between the regulations and the curriculum in theory and the operation and application of the program in the real classroom environment.

Considering the fact that Turkey is an EFL setting and the classrooms are the only places where most of the learners have the mere opportunity to learn and use English, the role of the classrooms become critical. In order to understand the reasons for low proficiency of English among Turkish speakers reported by many reports (TEPAV, 2014; EPI, 2017) the classrooms are one of the key locations to observe and explore. The detailed classroom observations can help researchers investigate the implementation of English curriculum in practice in the situated environment.

To account for the discrepancy between the continuous effort put by the stakeholders in education (e.g. MONE, teacher education programs, teachers, students) to teach English and language proficiency level of the graduates at the end of the school; the micro-analytic moment by moment investigation of the language teaching in the classrooms might help . Although there is a need to describe the language teaching and learning process in detail, there are few

studies on classroom discourse showing the micro-details of the learning and teaching in Turkey (Aydınlı & Ortaçtepe; 2018).

In Turkey, the studies on classroom discourse and interaction mostly use discourse analysis as a research method (e.g. Öztürk, 2016; Bağ, Martı& Bayyurt, 2014) and the code-switching is extensively researched area with respect to classroom research (Aydınlı & Ortaçtepe, 2018) via pre-determined coding systems. Analysing classroom via pre-determined codes may cause researchers to miss richness and situated nature of classroom discourse shaped by the ongoing talk (Seedhouse, 2004). The conversation analysis provides researchers with analytic tools to explore the everyday talk or institutional talk such as classroom interaction. The distinguishing features of the conversation analysis (hereafter CA) and difference between CA and discourse analysis (hereafter DA) will be thoroughly explained in the methodology chapter. It is evident that conversation analysis is a new (Sert, Balaman, Can-Daşkın, Büyükgüzel, Ergül; 2015) and promising research methodology to study and explain intricacies of classroom discourse and interaction in Turkey.

In the classrooms, language teaching is orchestrated by the teachers. English language teachers have a big role in the whole process of teaching and learning as managers of the instructional practices in the classroom. In this sense, the teachers' first professional and official contact with the real classrooms is significant which might yield indications of future teaching practices. In Turkey, pre-service language teachers go, observe and teach in the language classrooms in the last year of their teacher education program as part of their practicum.

The role of the practicum in teacher education is highlighted by many studies (Busher, Gündüz, Cakmak, & Lawson, 2015; Eröz-Tuga, 2013; Gürbüz, 2006)with respect to its function as an introductory phase for pre-service teachers' entry to the profession. In addition to providing space for transition to teaching as a professional practice, practicum experience offers pre-service

teachers valuable learning opportunities. Legutke and Schocker-v. Ditzfurth (2009) defines the practicum as follows:

for us, the practicum is the major site of teacher learning where relevant aspects of L2 teaching (such as the design of materials and tasks or discourse analysis) may be experienced and experimented with, where student-teachers become aware of their own capacity to construct and to make sense of the processes their working-plans trigger, and or where courses derive ideas for relevant content to be dealt with from the experience of the practicum (p. 213).

Hence, the practicum is full of opportunities for pre-service teachers in terms of first-hand experience of teaching and learning to teach. It is clear that the classroom context in practicum is rather different from the classrooms the pre-service teachers teach in future when they graduate. That is to say, the practicum is still a learning and experimenting stage for the pre-service teachers who need to complete the observation and teaching tasks in assigned time and reflect on their own practice. Their mentors and their supervisor also observe and grade pre-service teachers' teaching along with offering continuous professional support. As a result, the classroom discourse in practicum has distinctive features distinguishing itself from the language classroom discourse and provide a valuable setting for researchers to investigate pre-service language teachers' first teaching practice. Still, the investigation of the classroom discourse in practicum gives us insight and clues about the teacher candidates' future practices.

There are also studies focusing on pre-service language teachers in state-run universities which are remarkably similar to the research setting of this dissertation. To exemplify, Cephe (2009) gave account of the effect of methodology courses on pre-service teachers' formation of teaching philosophy with respect to change in teacher beliefs; Savaş (2012) studied benefits and challenges of video-recording use in micro-teachings in methodology courses. Seferoglu (2006) reported on the opinions of teacher candidates about the methodology and practicum courses and voices concerns of the future teachers about the program. Hatipoğlu (2017) presented the

contribution of the linguistic courses to the future language teachers' language proficiency. Şallı-Çopur (2008) explored in-service teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of the teacher education program they graduated from. Tezgiden-Çakçak (2015) worked on the teacher roles and the type of teacher the program prepares for the future. With respect to the practicum, pre-service teachers' strengths and weaknesses in practicum (Gürbüz, 2006); pre-service teacher reflection via videos in practicum (Eröz-Tuğa, 2013) were some other studies to better understand the nature of the practicum courses in foreign language education departments.

The cited studies above provide us with the insight into dynamics of the teacher education programs and the perception of pre-service teachers about the contribution of the program to their professional development. They may also give the readers a broader picture of the research setting in which the data were collected. However, in Turkey, conversation analytic studies which give the microscopic view of the language classrooms are scarce.

There are a few conversation analytic studies of EFL classrooms in preparatory schools in university setting (e.g. Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; Can-Daşkın, 2015; 2017; Özbakış & Işık-Güler, 2017; Duran, 2017). Aşık and Gönen (2016) reported on the EFL pre-service teachers' self-reflection practice using CA informed Self Evaluation Teacher Talk (henceforth SETT) framework in practicum. There are only two studies (MA theses) focusing on EFL pre-service teachers' teaching practice in practicum in Turkey. Bozbiyık (2017) presented a micro-analytic study of pre-service teachers' questioning practices and reflection on their own questioning practice in practicum. Karadağ (2017) studied pre-service EFL teachers' classroom management moves in young learner classrooms.

This study attempts to zoom into the EFL classrooms in secondary and high schools to analyse the learning and teaching practices managed by EFL pre-service teachers. It is clear that there are great differences between theory and practice and micro-analysis of the process of language teaching and learning

practices in classroom interaction will give an answer to the question: “what really happens in language classrooms? . In this vein, the purpose and the scope of the dissertation will be explained in detail in the following section.

1.2 Scope and Purpose of the Study

Approaches to second language acquisition have been changing and evolving as the conceptualisation and understanding of *language* change. Firth and Wagner’s (1997) call for reconceptualization of second language acquisition research and social turn in SLA (Block, 2003) developed an approach focusing on language use and language learning as a social accomplishment (Firth & Wagner, 2007) which clearly distinguishes itself from the nativist and cognitivist accounts of language acquisition. The idea of language as a social action and the employment of conversation analysis in everyday talk led to the emergence of “interactional competence” (Galaczi & Taylor, 2018) as a fifth skill (Walsh, 2006). With respect to instructed language learning in classrooms, the work of Seedhouse (2004) depicts the interactional organization of the classroom interaction and its strong connection to the pedagogical purpose. Seedhouse’s (2004) description of interactional *architecture* of language classrooms paves the way for a different conceptualisation of the teacher talk by Walsh (2006): *classroom interactional competence* suggesting that language teachers’ use of language and interaction can facilitate or hinder language learning opportunities.

Based on social approaches to SLA and particularly conversation analytic approach to SLA (Markee, 2008; Kasper, Wagner, 2011) and Seedhouse (2004) and Walsh’ s (2006) understanding of classroom interaction; this dissertation aims to analyse language learning and teaching practices through pre-service teacher (PTs hereafter) talk in teacher-fronted EFL classrooms.

The sequential organization of pre-service EFL teacher talk in teacher-led classroom interaction will show the way PTs establish and maintain their pedagogical focus throughout the classroom interaction, and thereby depict

the pedagogical organization of their talk as well. Seedhouse (2008) asserts that for trainee teachers, to establish and maintain the pedagogical focus in the classroom is a complex interactional task that needs to be learned. Hence, this PhD dissertation will report on the contexts PTs construct through their talk depending on their pedagogical focus first. Further, the primary purpose of the study is to examine the sequential analysis of PTs talk in those contexts and the way PTs set and maintain their pedagogical agenda through their talk. The methodology and the research questions will be explained in the next section.

1.3 Methodology and Research Questions

This section will briefly introduce the research questions and the methodology of the dissertation. The research questions that will be addressed are presented below:

1. What are the emergent contexts in Pt- led EFL classroom interaction in secondary and high school?
2. How do Pts establish and maintain their pedagogical foci when they focus on:
 - form
 - meaning
 - fluency
- 2.1 What are the interactional and pedagogical resources to establish and maintain the pedagogical focus and thereby create teaching opportunities in the contexts?

Since this is a data driven research study, the results for the first research question shape the second research question. That is, first the emergent contexts were identified in the data and then the interactional resources were analysed in relation to their potential to open space for teaching opportunities.

Brief introduction to conversation analysis as a research methodology will better explain the basic tenets of the research questions. Conversation analysis basically is the study of talk in interaction and focuses on talk as an

accomplishment of particular actions. The main aim of CA is to portray the interactional organization of the social activities that are accomplished through language and embodied language, such as gaze, gestures and other embodied resources (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Conversation analysis argues that there is order in interaction, each and every utterance shapes the following utterance and is shaped by the previous one; that is, contributions to the interaction are context shaped and context renewing (Seedhouse, 2004). This principle is called *next-turn proof procedure* and refers to the emic nature of data analysis. Conversation analysts look at the sequential organization of talk and justify their claims pointing to the next turns of the speakers since they are the evidence for participants' own orientations to the interaction. In other words, participants themselves make their orientation clear via their talk and co-construct the talk together in interaction. Finally, CA studies naturally occurring interaction, captured by tape-recorders or video recorders. Video-recorded naturally occurring interaction gives the analyst a chance to produce detailed transcriptions and view the recordings repeatedly and share the data with others when needed.

In order to describe co-constructed actions in interaction, turn-taking, preference and repair organization of the interaction are sequentially revealed. In institutional settings, talk has a prominent role such as in courtrooms, psychotherapy settings, hospitals and classrooms (Antaki, 2011). The language learning practices in classrooms are largely documented through CA showing the development of L2 interactional competence and development over time (Hall, Hellerman & Pekarek-Doehler, 2011) or tracking learner behaviour to demonstrate second language acquisition (Markee, 2008). Seedhouse's (2004) work on interactional architecture of language classrooms and display of the contexts also prove the powerful methods of CA to describe language classrooms. With a special focus on language teacher talk, Lee (2007), Waring (2008, 2009, and 2012) presents thorough CA analytic accounts of classroom discourse showing the suitability of the methodology for classroom research.

In line with CA's principles, 16 Pts' teaching videos in 43 EFL lessons in secondary and high schools were analysed line by line in this dissertation. The first research question refers to the pedagogical contexts emerged through and shaped by the interaction in EFL classrooms. After the identification of the contexts in this unique setting, establishment and maintenance of the pedagogical contexts through interactional resources will be presented as it is stated in the second research question. As a sub-question to the second question, the teaching opportunities emerging in specific contexts will be displayed.

Throughout the dissertation, the term *teaching opportunity* will be used to imply the potential of teacher talk to facilitate learning. Teaching opportunity is operationalised as the teaching or/ and teachable moments manifesting themselves in the sequential organization of Pt's talk in classroom interaction. To provide evidence for teaching or teachable moments, in alignment with CA's principles, the participants' (that are Pts and students) own orientations to the ongoing classroom interaction will be identified. In other words, the students' initiations or expansions in the ongoing sequence in the form of questions, or the way PTs design their turns will be presented to mark teachable moments.

On the other hand, in some instances when the Pts do not orient to students' questions they miss those teaching opportunities and fail to fulfil teaching task. These are marked as missed teaching opportunities since Pts do not orient to students' initiatives and participants make it clear that they are having trouble. While sometimes participants' orientations make it evident that the teaching opportunity is missed, sometimes that is not the case. In those cases, the progressivity of the lesson is maintained and participants do not show any interactional trouble. However, as an analyst and a PhD candidate in English Language Teaching, the researcher identifies something that goes wrong. That is, the macro institutional goal as Seedhouse (2004) mentioned: "teacher will teach the students" is not fulfilled. The Pts pass the

repair to correct incorrect utterances or do not shape learner contributions (Walsh, 2006) in the ongoing interaction.

Although identifying and marking *missed* teaching opportunities that nobody in the interaction naturally orient to is a challenging task to accomplish within the boundaries of CA, it is clear that the institutional goal of the language classrooms (Seedhouse, 2004) is not fulfilled. Thus, this dissertation argues that Conversation Analysis is a powerful method to describe participants' use of interactional resources to accomplish institutional business such as language teaching in classrooms; however, it is not prescriptive (Kitzinger, 2011). Thus, the analyst as an outsider to the interaction might make claims to inform and improve practice of language teaching.

In this sense, this dissertation aims to display sequential analysis of Pt-led EFL classrooms in secondary and high schools in Turkey and present implications for English Language Teaching practices in those settings stretching the boundaries of Conversation Analysis.

1.4 Significance of the Study

As it is stated in the background section, the conversation analysis is a newly emerging research methodology and this dissertation will contribute to the conversation analytic accounts of EFL classroom interaction in Turkey. Micro-analytic focus will give the opportunity to explore the moment-by moment interaction within the EFL classrooms, and thereby provide a microscopic view of teaching and learning English in practice. The sequential analysis of EFL classrooms will provide a vivid picture of classroom and give stakeholders in education a real insight into the causes of the present situation of English language teaching in Turkey.

This PhD dissertation is the first study to report on teaching or/and missed teaching opportunities in Pt-led classroom interaction in EFL classrooms in secondary and high schools. In order to identify missed teaching opportunities, conversation analysis was employed but as the data suggested,

etic perspective on data were found to be necessary to inform and improve language teaching practice. In this respect, this dissertation is thought to bring new perspective to the applied CA in EFL language classrooms.

It is widely acknowledged that CA can help pre-service language teachers to reflect on their own practices and improve their talk (Walsh, 2006; Seedhouse, 2008; Sert, 2010; Wong & Waring, 2010). The CA informed practices has a lot to offer pre-service teachers such as data led tools to make reflection on their own talk (Mann & Walsh, 2015; Aşık & Kuru-Gönen, 2016). With this in mind, this PhD dissertation will display line by line analysis of the first official professional teaching experiences of the pre-service teachers in the classroom settings. It is hoped that the analysis will pave the way for a more comprehensive understanding of pre-service teachers' current practices and competence to manage classroom interaction. It is also a further attempt to contribute to the Classroom Interactional Competence framework (CIC henceforth) as suggested by Walsh (2006). As Walsh (2006) pointed out CIC is a concept to be more explored and developed in different contexts and settings. A practicum context in EFL setting in Turkey will expand the scope of the Classroom Interactional Competence and bring new understandings to the pre-service language teacher competence. As a result, the findings will inform and even shape the teacher education programs to cater for pre-service teachers needs to develop their classroom interactional competence.

In the implications part of the dissertation, a CA-informed course outline that could be integrated into methodology and practicum courses in teacher education programs will be provided and suggested.

1.5 Research Context

This part will briefly introduce the research context, participants and practicum setting. The participants of this study were 16 pre-service teachers of English who were assigned to two state schools as part of their practicum work in 2015-2016 academic year. 14 Pt s were placed in a high school and 2

Pts went to a secondary school. All of the participants were 4th year students in a department of foreign language teaching at a state university. To fulfil requirements of the practicum, Pts were required to work with a mentor teacher (an English language teacher in the practice school), do the observation tasks assigned by the supervisor (a faculty member in the university), perform four teaching tasks which were observed and graded by the mentor and the supervisor. The data set consisted of these four teachings at the practice schools.

The data collection process began in November, 2015 and in January 2016 the last teaching was recorded. 43 lessons were recorded in three months. The recording was done by the researcher and she was at the classroom at all times. In addition to the researcher, the mentor teachers were present in the teachings and the final teachings of the PTs were observed and graded by their supervisor.

Since 14 Pts were assigned to the high school and 2 Pts were placed in the secondary school, the number of the lessons recorded in the high school (40 lessons) is much higher than the secondary school (3 lessons). In addition, the Pts were assigned to preparatory classes in high school in which students received 20 hours of English. Similarly, the secondary school had an intensive foreign language program. Although they were both state schools, the secondary school had a grammar based instruction and teachers and students used Turkish in the classrooms, while at the high school there was a strict *L2 only policy* along with the grammar based instruction. The characteristics of the schools were also provided here to give background information, yet, the particular characteristics of schools were already reflected in the ongoing interaction.

1.6 List of Terminology

Context: Seedhouse (2004) defines the *context* as a piece of discourse shaped by the pedagogical focus of the participants in the classroom interaction.

Designedly Incomplete Utterance: Koshik (2002) defined it as incomplete utterances produced by teachers to elicit missing information in the shape or utterance completion.

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

IRF Pattern: IRF pattern is defined as three part classroom discourse sequence (Sinclair, Coulthard, 1975), a centrepiece of teacher-led classroom discourse. It consists of teacher initiation, student response and teacher feedback.

Known-answer question: & Information-seeking question (Mehan, 1979)
These are also called display and referential question. The first one refers to the questions asked by the teachers to check students' knowledge. Their answers are known by the teacher. On the other hand, information-seeking questions are real questions whose answers are not known by the teacher.

Mode Shift: In order to describe the transitions between the modes, Walsh (2006) introduces mode shift and presents this as a part of Classroom Interactional Competence.

Mode: Following the framework of Seedhouse, Walsh (2006), suggested the term *mode* to underlie the relationship between pedagogical goal and teacher talk.

Pre-service teacher (Pt): Trainee teacher, future teacher and teacher candidate are also used to refer to the student teachers who are receiving undergraduate education in foreign language education departments.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The research on classroom discourse acknowledges the fact that spoken interaction is at the heart of the learning and teaching practice. What makes communication so important in classroom discourse is that teaching most of the time takes place through spoken interaction in classrooms, students are also able to demonstrate what they have learnt through language (Cazden, 2001). Cazden (2001) clearly put that “The basic purpose of the school is achieved through communication” (p. 2). Mehan (1971) defined classroom discourse as *speech events* and interactional accomplishment of the participants in situated environments. “Classroom communities are, as Sharrock and Anderson (1982: 171) put it, engaged in the work of “talking through a subject in such a way that it can be learned” (Gardner, 2013, p. 606).

These definitions refer to any classroom discourse on any subject. With respect to language classrooms (henceforth L2 classrooms) where a group of learners come together to learn a language with the help of a teacher in an English as a foreign language or English as a second / additional language setting, the significance of talk draws more attention. Use of language as subject of instruction and medium of instruction adds complexity to the interaction in L2 classrooms. Gardner (2013) underlined the fact that “learners have an additional task: conducting their interaction with limited linguistic resources” (p. 593) in those classrooms. Seedhouse (2004) based his theory of L2 classrooms on this simple fact that language is both the medium

of instruction and the subject to be learned. This makes L2 classrooms (in our context EFL classrooms) more complex and the interaction multi-layered.

Language classrooms are institutional settings with rules and regulations constituting the core part of the education system. Teachers, in this respect, are the key players in shaping classroom interaction. Similarly, teacher talk in classroom discourse is critical since it has many functions as Cazden (2001) mentions controlling and facilitative function of learning:

... whereas in classrooms one person, the teacher is responsible for controlling all the talk that occurs while class is officially in session—controlling not just negatively, as a traffic officer does to avoid collisions, but also positively, to enhance the purposes of education.
(p.2)

As a consequence, teacher talk requires attention in classroom discourse. With these in mind, the literature review chapter is organized as follows to develop into review of teacher talk. This chapter will first introduce the issues in L2 classroom discourse: approaches to L2 classroom, approaches to language learning in L2 classroom. In the rest of this dissertation, L2 classrooms refer to the classrooms in which English is taught as a Second (ESL) or Foreign language (EFL) unless indicated otherwise.

Next, CA as research methodology will be briefly described. The approach that CA has in relation to language learning will be explained. And then, the representative studies showing CA's approach to language, language learning and teaching foreign language in classrooms will be presented. The characteristics of teacher fronted classroom discourse will be described. In a similar vein, general overview of teacher talk will be provided to set the grounds for the main focus of the study. Finally, language teacher talk with a special focus on teaching opportunities will be presented.

2.2 Issues in L2 Classroom Discourse

2.2.1 Approaches to L2 classroom

Chaudron (1988) listed four traditions in L2 classroom research: psychometric, interaction analysis, discourse analysis and ethnographic (p. 13). In a more recent article, Kumaravadivelu (1999) argued that the interaction approach and the discourse approach are widely used approaches in classroom observation.

In his comprehensive review, Nunan (2005) reported that in the 1960s, researchers compared different language teaching methodologies using experimental designs, which are classified under psychometric tradition. Different methods such as grammar translation method and audio-lingual method were being compared to prove one method's superiority over another method. The methods comparison studies did not yield any satisfactory results; since, as it was revealed by another study 20 years later, they did not take implementation of the methods by teachers in the classroom into consideration (Nunan, 2005). That is, the classroom observations were not done to support the pre and post-tests.

Pressing need for observing classrooms contributed to the classroom observation instruments which are specific coding systems to mark each and every event in classroom, thereby reaching statistical data to document and quantify interaction. The use of classroom observation instruments can be grouped under the *interaction analysis*. Interaction analysis was a sociological method to investigate group processes (Chaudron, 1988). Chaudron listed 23 instruments designed to observe and code L2 classrooms. Some of them were Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) by Flanders (1970), Foreign Language Interaction (FLINT) by Moskowitz (1971), Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) by Allen, Fröhlich and Spada (1984). Having presented the instruments, Chaudron (1988) concluded that the instruments needed validation and there was no way of making comparison

across studies since each researcher employed the instruments according to his /her own theoretical orientation. Moreover, this way of observation does not reflect the realities of classroom. Although they focused on interaction, interaction involved more than pre-determined actions. Emphasising the role of the context, van Lier (1988) asserted that:

the teaching profession is ill-served by pedagogical recommendations which isolate specific observable phenomena, such as types of questions asked, time lapses between answer and evaluation, and so on, without showing how such phenomena flow naturally from the kinds of activities that are conducted (p. 215).

In line with these, Walsh (2006) summarised the instruments' limitations as follows: there are some instances that cannot be matched to the pre-determined categories, pre-determined codes do not allow for the coding of overlaps, interruptions, hesitations, that are the features of naturally flowing interaction; different observers observe the same instance but disagree on how to code it. However, still, classroom observation instruments are in use especially for language teachers. For instance, Walsh (2003) developed a classroom observation instrument for language teachers to self-reflect on their own talk. Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk (henceforth, SETT) was based on an *ad hoc* approach, different from the observation instruments listed above. Walsh (2006) argued that *ad hoc* approach is a more flexible approach and addresses specific classroom problems and helps language teachers to analyse their own classrooms.

The third tradition Chaudron (1988) listed in classroom research was discourse analysis which was based on both descriptive linguistics and ethnographic and sociolinguistic approaches. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) analysed the discourse of L1 British elementary school classrooms comprehensively. They described the discourse in a hierarchical way: Lesson, Transaction, Exchange, Move and Act. Act is the smallest unit and acts are described in terms of their discourse function (Walsh, 2006). For L2 classrooms their IRF (Initiation/ Response/Feedback-Follow up) model has

been largely used as it is believed to explain the interaction in teacher led foreign language classrooms (Seedhouse, 2004). They listed structural and functional units employed in L2 discourse analysis. The structural units are *utterance, turn, T-unit, communication unit* and *fragment*. The functional units are *repetition, expansion, clarification request, comprehension check, confirmation check, repair* and *model* (p. 45).

The last one in the list, the ethnographic tradition satisfies the need for a more authentic and detailed analysis of classroom discourse. In recent categorisations of classroom research, discourse analysis is also grouped under classroom ethnography (Waring, 2016). For ethnographic L2 classroom research, the works of Mehan (1979), van Lier (1982), Kumaravadivelu (1993) and Canagarajah (1999) could be given as examples although they can be grouped under different sub-categories with respect to their research focus. For instance, Kumaravadivelu, (1999) suggested a framework “Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis” distinguishing itself from other approaches. Yet, they share some fundamental characteristics: focus on participants’ perspective (emic perspective), extended time spent in the classroom, in-depth and detailed analyses of social interaction in classrooms. After a brief summary on approaches to classroom research, approaches to language learning in the classroom will be reviewed.

2.2.2 Approaches to Language and Language Learning in the Classroom

Approaches to second language acquisition basically evolve around two traditions: cognitivist and social. These traditions have particular understanding and conceptualisation of *language, language learning* and thereby, offer implications for teaching.

To argue against Chomsky’s (1965) conceptualisation of language as a set of rules in our minds, Hymes (1972) put forward the *communicative competence* to emphasise the functional use of language adding sociolinguistic competence. In SLA discipline, Canale and Swain (1983) adapted the

communicative competence theory into SLA and introduced the concept of discourse competence in 1983 (Johnson, 2004).

Meanwhile, in the 1980s, Long put forward *the interaction hypothesis* as a major causal variable in Second Language Acquisition (Nunan, 2005). This hypothesis focused on learner and student talk in classroom distinguishing itself from the nativist approaches. The interaction hypothesis maintained the idea that modifications to interaction such as clarification requests, confirmation checks to solve communication breakdowns in classrooms facilitate language acquisition. Negotiation for meaning through asking for clarification provides comprehensible input for learners especially if there is a competent interlocutor available as Long stated to explain improvised version of the hypothesis in 1996 (Walsh, 2006). However, Leowen and Sato (2018) in their review of interactionist research pointed out that most of the studies were done in the laboratory settings to control other variables emerging in the classroom. Thus, it is apparent that authentic classroom interaction studies are needed to explain the instructed second language acquisition.

Johnson (2004) also argued that communicative competence theory was a cognitive theory and interaction was conceptualised as a cognitive task in the mind of an individual person. The understanding and conceptualisation of context and discourse was static and unable to reflect the dynamic nature of interaction in communicative competence in SLA.

To put the interaction in the centre, Young (1999) proposed “interactional competence” and defined it as follows: Interactional competence (henceforth IC) is “a theory of the knowledge that participants bring to and realize in interaction and includes an account of how such knowledge is acquired” (p. 118). It refers to context specific, situated co-constructed competence with the participants in any setting rather than general language competence. “According to interactional competence, knowledge of language is jointly co-created by all participants in interaction” (He & Young, 1998 as cited in Johnson, 2004). This view of context-specific nature of competence and

language as co-constructed accomplishment between participants in situated contexts constituted basis for theoretical framework of this dissertation. Galaczi and Taylor (2018) summarised the current position of *Interactional Competence* in language teaching methodologies and especially in testing and emphasised interactional competence as fifth skill to be taught and tested.

Along with SLA theories, socio-cultural theory which comes from Vygotsky's psychology introducing concepts like *scaffolding*, *mediation* and *Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)* recognizes and promotes the value of interaction with "knowledgeable other" (Waring, 2016) and its critical role in learning and development. In this sense, the role of language teacher as a scaffolder is always emphasised in classroom environment. In recent applications of socio-cultural theory into SLA, learning is seen as a situated practice and participation into the social practices through adaptation to the changing contexts (Seedhouse, 2005).

Lave (1993) conceptualises their understanding of "*learning*" as follows:

there is no such thing as 'learning' sui generis, but only changing participation in the culturally designed settings of everyday life. Or, to put it the other way around, participation in everyday life may be thought of as a process of changing understanding in practice, that is, as learning. (pp: 5-6)

The approach that this dissertation draws on with respect to language and language learning is *socio-interactional approach*. Based on Mehan (1979) and Sinclair and Coulthard (1975)'s work on discourse, Firth and Wagner's (1997) call for reconceptualization of SLA research in light of socio-cultural approach and introduction of interactional competence (Young, 1999); the socio-interactional approach focuses on language *use*, rather than acquisition. (Eskildsen & Majlesi, 2018) and it strongly acknowledges that participants learn *in* and *through* interaction and participating in interaction.

While learning is seen as participation, language is considered both as an action and as a resource to maintain the participation. Markee and Kasper

(2004) argued that “language is the local, collaborative, and intersubjective achievement by members of conventionalized, mutually recognizable, and socially shared linguistic resources”. In this sense, language learning is argued to be traceable through participants’ own orientations such as their displays of the recognition of and orientations to something *learnable* as Eskildsen and Majlesi (2018) suggested. Markee (2008) illustrated *interactional competence* involving three components:

- language as formal system (including grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation)
- semiotic systems, including turn taking, repair, sequence organisation
- gaze and paralinguistic features (p. 406)

At this point, Conversation Analysis as a research methodology and theoretical framework comes into play. In the next chapter, conversation analysis will be comprehensively described, so here it will be only presented in relation to language learning and language teaching.

2.3 Conversation Analysis and Learning

Originated from the works of Sacks and Schegloff in sociology, conversation analysis analyses the naturally occurring interaction among people to uncover the organization and order of talk. The main aim is to find out how people organize their talk turn by turn to understand each other and maintain and achieve inter-subjectivity through their interaction. To do this, sequence and repair organization are analysed through turn taking and preference mechanisms. Conversation analysis views interaction as an organized and situated practice accomplished by actions of members on a moment-to-moment basis. Interaction is shaped by the previous turns and it shapes the upcoming turns, which explains the fact that utterance of a speaker is display of understanding of the previous utterance of the other interlocutor. Thus CA

has an emic perspective; unless participants in interaction orient to any contextual details as important, contextual factors are not taken into consideration. Participants' own displays of orientations are important and *CA for SLA* approach relying on CA's emic perspective claims to bring evidence for language learning through learners' visible orientations to learning in classrooms.

Salsström (2011) explained that considering learning as a situated activity taking place in and through interaction, conversation analysis as a research method to describe interaction would provide a clear understanding of learning.

In initial stages, conversation analysis as a method to describe sequential organization of talk approached classrooms only as a social setting. This approach refers to the analysis of interactional organization of classrooms as any setting without presenting any argument for learning. The organization of turn-taking (McHoul, 1978) in classrooms is also the classic example of CA's investigation of classroom discourse. This is the pure CA approach based on ethnomethodology which endeavours to uncover the theory of everyday life based on participants' own methods excluding other theories (Seedhouse, 2005).

Later, conversation analysis's analytic power in tracking learning has been recognized. Researchers conducted many studies in which learning is documented longitudinally through participants' developing interactional practices (e.g. Hellermann, 2008) such as repair and this approach considers learning as changing participation based on socio-cultural theory of learning (Salsström, 2011). Hellerman's (2007, 2008) work demonstrated how learners learnt to participate in classroom with special focus on task openings or task disengagements. Using interactional competence and participation framework, Watanabe (2017) tracked EFL learners' post expansion sequences to show their developmental pattern of interactional competence. Following

Eskildsen's (2009) work on employment of usage based linguistics and CA, Hauser (2010) showed L2 negation development in one learner in one-to-one tutoring. Eskildsen and Wagner (2015) tracked learning of prepositions accomplished and accompanied by certain gestures. Or development of certain interactional tasks such as responding to the daily routine inquiries were investigated through CA analytic tools by Waring (2013). Those approaches use CA in combination with other learning methods such as socio-cultural theory or usage based linguistics to account for developmental change. However, Pekarek-Doehler and Lauzon (2015) raised validity issues and reminded that longitudinal studies might miss key learning moments that occurred outside of the recorded data. Markee and Kunitz (2015) also argued that using exogenous learning theories might involve methodological risks. Longitudinal studies may show the developmental changes in accomplishment of interactional tasks, whereas "microgenetic CA analysis allows us to uncover and systematically describe how participants' orientations to learning and learning processes are deployed on a moment-to-moment basis within sequential unfolding of social interaction" (Pekarek Doehler & Lauzon, 2015 p. 412).

Learning is not only a product but in and through interaction, people are *doing* learning. Salsström (2011) explained that "...among the many things people do, learning can be considered one, in addition to treating learning as an outcome of changes in the ways people do things, other things, and while doing so, learn" (p. 48). For instance, Lee (2010) tracked learners' sense-making practices and carefully designed questions and through these orientations he provided evidence for learning. Thus, participants' contributions to ongoing context document their orientation to learning.

This is the goal CA-for-SLA movement pursue to achieve. Markee (2008) defined CA-for-SLA as follows: "CA for SLA shows how participants analyse each other's real time conversational practices to achieve particular social actions (such as language learning behaviours) that occur naturally during

talk-in-interaction” (p. 405). Markee and Kunitz (2015) argued that CA for SLA is a purist and excludes exogenous learning theory with a detailed focus on tracking learning objects.

Thus, CA is a behavioural discipline documenting observable behaviour in naturally occurring interaction and attempts to bring evidence for learning through participants’ own orientations in the interaction. Markee (2015) emphasised the importance of primary data in conversation analytic research and argued that the secondary data used in ethnographic triangulation (such as post hoc think aloud protocols) might give misleading impression as Young (2009) demonstrated (Markee, 2015, p. 12).

According to CA for SLA, observable learning behaviours are: repair sequences accompanied by embodied actions; changes of epistemic state displayed through acknowledgment tokens (e.g. oh), translations from one language to another, “independently volunteering new information that connects the learning object to practices or knowledge that are already part of their interactional repertoires” and producing new language (Markee & Seo, 2009, p. 45).

Naturally, there are some arguments concerning use of CA to research. Based on his data on Chinese language classrooms, He (2004) explored the limits of conversation analysis in language classroom research. In terms of the organization of learning contexts and accomplishment of promotion of language learning opportunities, He (2004) supported the use of CA. However, He (2004) reminded that CA was not a learning theory and it could only show the observable behaviour, in other words only one part of second language acquisition. Still, CA has a great potential to unearth classroom interaction and describe its complexity and particularities. The next section will review conversation analytic accounts of teacher-fronted classroom interaction.

2.3.1 Teacher-Fronted Classroom Interaction

Based on the theoretical framework of the conversation analysis and learning, a general overview of teacher-led classroom interaction will be provided in this section. Sert (2015) argued that “L2 classroom discourse is the collection and representation of *socio-interactional practices* that portray the emergence of teaching and learning of a new language through teachers’ and students’ co-construction of understanding and knowledge in and through the *use of language-in-interaction*” (p. 9). In other words, classroom is a co-constructed interactional and instructional setting in which participants come together to achieve the goal of language learning. In order to understand the basic nature of teacher fronted classroom interaction, the general characteristics will be described. These are *IRF exchange, contingent nature of classroom discourse, reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction* and lastly *the participation framework*.

2.3.1.1 IRF Exchange

The classrooms are social settings that have been frequently and comprehensively studied in many respects. Among these, the appreciation of context and situated language use in classroom research dates back to 1970s. The most acknowledged interactional phenomenon is the three part sequence (Teacher initiation- Learner Response- Teacher Follow-up or Feedback) found out by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) in British primary schools (Seedhouse, 2015). The IRF structure has been extensively studied in terms of its organization, distinction between E (Evaluation) or F (Follow-up) moves (Wells, 1993); different realisations according to the teachers’ purposes (Hall, 1998; Nassaji & Wells, 2000), prosodic and syntactic work (Hellerman, 2003) students’ reconstructions of IRF (Waring, 2009) or teachers’ reconstructions of IRF (Zemel & Koschmann, 2011) and learning opportunities (Wells, 1993; Waring, 2008; Wong & Waring, 2009). These studies acknowledge this triadic dialogue’s (Lemke, 1990) dominance and value in classroom discourse but at the same time they show varied re-construction of the basic sequence in the

unfolding nature of interaction. van Lier (1996) pointed out that the IRF pattern naturally controlled the turn-taking between student and teacher, gave a sense of progression in planned manner to the participants in interaction and the pattern provided students with immediate feedback about their response.

With regard to disadvantages, van Lier (1996) wrote that IRF pattern might lead to unwillingness to participate on part of students which is already a prevalent phenomenon in classrooms. The exchange pushes students to display their knowledge in a very limited way (in one turn) and the third turn closes the sequence usually without any elaboration.

Referring to Nystrand et al.'s (1997) finding about the negative correlation between Evaluation (E) move and learning outcomes, Hall (2000) argued that teacher follow-up move (F) led to learning opportunities for students. Follow-up move through "asking students to expand their own thinking, clarify their opinions, comment on others' contributions, or make connections to their own experiences" (Hall, 2000, p. 174) enhanced learning opportunities. After extensive examination of core structure of classroom interaction, a more general framework that connects basic parts is proposed: contingency.

2.3.1.2 Contingency

Ethnographic and micro-analytic studies who focus on interaction in classrooms point out one aspect of classroom discourse: "*contingency*" that is central to teaching and learning (van Lier, 1996; Lee, 2010; Waring, 2016). Contingency refers to sequential unfolding of interaction; that is, one initiation turn by teacher may make a wide range of possible next turns from students relevant. As a response in the third turn, the teacher needs to design her turn in such a way that it both addresses the previous turn and moves forward the sequence to accomplish multiple aims. This is called contingent nature of classroom interaction. The contingent nature of classroom discourse is sequentially presented in many studies. Lee and Takahashi (2011) compared

the lesson plans and the lessons and demonstrated the gap between what was planned and what happened in reality. Lee's (2007) micro-analytic study of language teachers' third turns showed that third turns were contingent upon the previous turn and they shaped the ongoing discourse. When students take initiative, the contingency of classroom interaction becomes more significant (Jacknick, 2011; Garton, 2012; Waring, 2011)

van Lier (1996) suggested that "education is not matter of choosing, then imposing one way of interacting" (p. 178) and noted that "contingency is the key that unlocks all varieties of social interaction and, in doing so, simultaneously unlocks our students' learning potential" (p.184).

According to Waring (2016) contingent nature of the classroom necessitates "*being responsive to the moment*", "by addressing simultaneity of the moment, adjusting shifting demands of the moment, and preserves the integrity of the moment (p. 126)". To explain this, Waring (2016) cites John Dewey's definition of experienced teacher:

... has acquired the requisite skill of doing two or three distinct things simultaneously – skill to see the room as a whole while hearing one individual in one class recite, of keeping the program of the day and, yes, of the week, and of the month in the fringe of consciousness while the work of the hour is its centre" (p. 133).

In parallel with this, van Lier (1996) and many others (Walsh, 2006; Lee, 2010; Waring, 2016) defined teaching "moment-to moment interactional decision making". Each moment has a potential teaching and learning value and L2 teachers' task is to turn these "local contingencies" (Lee, 2010) into learning opportunities. That also points to the idea that teaching and interaction are naturally intertwined which will be addressed below.

2.3.1.3 Reflexive Relationship between Pedagogy and Interaction

The contingent nature of language classrooms led to the idea that there is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction or one can claim that the reflexive relationship induces contingency.

The macro goal of the language classrooms naturally has a significant effect on the interaction taking place in classrooms. In a similar vein, the ongoing interaction among participants of the classroom discourse influences the pedagogy and participants' next moves. This relationship between pedagogy and interaction is displayed by Seedhouse (2004). In his own words, his theory is as follows:

There is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction in the L2 classroom, and that this relationship is the foundation of its context-free architecture. This relationship means that, as the pedagogical focus varies, so the organisation of the interaction varies. However, this also means that the L2 classroom has its own interactional organisation which transforms intended pedagogy into actual pedagogy (Seedhouse, 2005, p. 172).

Seedhouse (2004) in his influential book titled the *Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: a CA perspective*, refutes a number of assumptions of current communicative language teaching methodology. He argues that the teachers cannot create *genuine or natural conversations* (in CA sense) in language classrooms as language classrooms are institutional places having definite pedagogical purposes and norms to obey. He refers to the methodology as the *task-as work plan* and this work plan is subject to change and will be shaped by the interactional organization of the L2 classroom. Thus, he states that "Ca methodology suggests that the researcher should analyse and evaluate the extract according to participants' own orientations by matching the pedagogical focus to the resultant patterns of interaction" (Seedhouse, 2004, p.79). Taking pedagogical focus into centre of his arguments and based on classroom data, Seedhouse (2004) suggests four contexts emerging out of classroom discourse: "*form and accuracy, meaning and fluency, task-oriented context, procedural contexts.*"

The names of contexts points out to the pedagogical focus of the participants. In addition to the pedagogical focus, they are completely different in terms of the turn taking, preference and repair mechanisms. The different interactional organization and the pedagogical focus make them distinct. If a teacher

teaches linguistic structures and wants students to produce linguistically correct sentences that is form and accuracy context. In form and accuracy context, turns are given by the teacher and the linguistically correct answers are preferred. The teacher activates repair mechanism, which is mainly teacher initiated teacher repair.

The contexts in which the teacher wants students to express themselves and does not focus on the correctness of the language are called *meaning and fluency*. To get as much student talk as possible is a preferred action in those contexts. Thus, the turn taking is more voluntary and the self-initiated self-repair is employed.

Task-oriented contexts refer to the discourse when the students are given a task and they accomplish these tasks mostly in groups. Thus, in those contexts, the interaction between the students to accomplish the task comes to the fore. Lastly, in procedural contexts the teacher gives instructions or information about the upcoming task or activity.

Seedhouse (2004) asserts that these contexts which are based on pedagogical focus of the teacher will shape and be shaped by the interactional organization of the classroom. In the data analysis section, Seedhouse's contexts will be referred to again to show the tenets of pedagogical focus on *form, meaning and fluency*.

In addition to Seedhouse's conceptualisation of language classrooms, Walsh (2006) identified four modes, each involving "distinctive interactional features aligned with specific pedagogical goals" (Walsh, 2013, p. 17). These are *managerial, skills and systems, materials and classroom contexts* modes. They will be referred again in learning opportunities section.

2.3.1.4 Participation Framework in Teacher Fronted Classroom Discourse

The third characteristics of language classroom is the way participants participate in interaction. In addition to overall organization of classroom

discourse, the participation structure in classroom interaction is also described employing CA analytic tools although the focus is on teacher in teacher-fronted classrooms, the participation patterns may vary.

With regard to teacher fronted classroom interaction, Markee and Kasper (2004) noted that:

Whereas ordinary conversation is a locally managed, equal power speech exchange system, teacher-fronted classroom talk is an unequal power speech exchange system, in which teachers have privileged rights to assign topics and turns to learners and also to evaluate the quality of students' contributions to the emerging interaction through other-initiated, second-position repairs (Markee, 2000). Participants exhibit a preference for classroom talk to be organized in terms of initiation-response-evaluation or question-answer-comment sequences (McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). These question answer-comment sequences are initiated and closed down by teachers, who own the question and comment turns. Learners, however, are responsible for the answer turns in this prototypical classroom sequence (p. 491).

Although it is true that teacher-fronted classroom interaction basically operates on IRF exchange controlled by the teacher, there are some other approaches to participation patterns (Appel, 2007; Schwab, 2011). While Appel (2007) defines language teaching as performance underlining the publicity of language teaching in classrooms, Schwab (2011) defined the teacher-fronted interaction as "multilogue". This participation framework argued that even in a limited IRF sequence between a teacher and student, there are always over hearers or bystanders in the classroom addressed. The classroom interaction is a multi-party activity involving all the participants in the classroom even they are not speaking.

All in all, teacher-fronted classroom interaction is orderly, contingent and situated talk maintained by participants who come together to achieve institutional and pedagogical goals, that is teaching and learning.

Having described general characteristics of classroom interaction through the lenses of conversation analysis, the rest of the chapter will focus on teacher talk with special focus on learning opportunities.

2.3.2 Teacher Talk

Language teacher talk in L2 classrooms are being explored in many respects. Language teachers' turn allocation actions (Kääntä, 2012), embodied resources accompanying their talk, question design (Markee, 1995; Koshik, 2002; Lee, 2008), use of wait time (Ingram & Elliot, 2016), giving instructions (Kääntä & Kasper, 2018), language teachers' way of shaping learner contributions (Walsh, 2006; Can-Daşkın, 2015), management of repair work, feedback and assessment, responding to students' initiatives, management of learners' insufficient knowledge, management of L1 use, teachers' construction of IRF sequences are all recurring research topics in language teacher talk. There are also some distinctive actions identified such as *Designedly Incomplete Utterances* (DIU, Koshik, 2002) and its consequences in learning (Marguritti, 2010; Netz 2016); Epistemic Status Check (ESC, Sert, 2013), Reference to Past Learning Event (RPLE, Can-Daşkın, 2017).

In addition, the talk of beginning teachers, expert teachers or student teachers are also under investigation in different language classrooms or one-to-one tutoring settings. The ultimate aim of most of the studies is to pave the way for sophisticated and micro-analytic understanding of teacher talk's role in learning. In a similar vein, a growing body of literature on language teacher talk is also used to empower and enrich teacher education practices such as Classroom Interactional Competence framework (CIC, Walsh, 2006) ; Waring's call for Interactional Competence for teaching (Waring, 2016(a); Seedhouse, 2008). In the rest of the section, a selective literature review on micro-analysis of language teacher talk will be reported on. In order to set the ground for teacher talk, research areas regarding teacher talk and action in classroom interaction will be presented.

2.3.2.1 Turn-Taking

Since taking turns is one of the basic accomplishment in interaction and has critical consequences in terms of students' participation in learning practice, it

has been thoroughly studied (e.g. Mortensen, 2008; Waring, 2013 b). Most of the time in teacher-led classroom interaction, teacher selects a learner who will take the turn While Mortensen (2008) demonstrated ways of selecting a willing next speaker, Waring (2013b) reported on one teacher's practices to manage *over-willing* student. Sert (2015) also gave CA informed suggestions for pre-service teachers on how to be aware of the embodied clues of unwillingness to participate in interaction monitoring students' body postures or gaze aversions. Kääntä (2012) displayed the highly competent and sensitive ways of teachers' managing speaker changes through embodied resources in teacher fronted classroom discourse. It is apparent that turn-taking practice is mostly undertaken through gestures smoothly while spoken interaction continues. Therefore this characteristics of interaction points to multi-modality.

2.3.2.2 Multi-modality

Not only in managing turn-taking but also in other instructional practices, teachers use embodied resources. Seo and Koshik (2010) studied one tutor's gestures' to initiate self-correction. Belhiah (2013) displayed one ESL teacher's coordination of talk and hand gestures to teach vocabulary. In their micro-analytic study of unplanned vocabulary explanations, van Compernelle and Smotrova (2017) showed sequential evidence of teachers' competent use of gestures to contextualise vocabulary and prevent misunderstandings. In their micro-analytic study of gestures, they showed one ESL teacher's *thinking-for-teaching* through her gestures. As they saw "language teaching as a fundamentally multimodal process in which language and gesture work together in an integrated system" (p. 15), they advised that pre-service teachers should be equipped with the role of gestures in teaching.

2.3.2.3 Code-switching

Code-switching is another widely studied aspect of language classrooms. Ustünel and Seedhouse (2005) provided the first CA analytic account of code-

switching in Turkish EFL university setting. They analysed teacher-induced and teacher-initiated code-switching in relation to the pedagogical focus of the moment and demonstrated that L1 use is also a preferred action in contingent nature of classroom discourse and should be seen as an interactional resource. In a different context, young learner EFL classroom, aus der Wieschen and Sert (2018) displayed divergent choices of learners opt for in terms of language use and management of intersubjectivity between the teacher and the students.

2.3.2.4 Question Design

Apparently, questions have a prominent place in teacher talk. They set the topical and action agenda, control the interaction and are functional tools to achieve institutional goals in specific settings. (Hayano, 2013). In classroom discourse, Mehan (1979b) distinguished between *known answer* and *information seeking questions* in order to show unique interactional organization of classrooms. And then most of the teacher question literature focus on the use of these questions (e.g. display vs. reference questions as Long and Sato (1983) named) (Waring, 2012). Walsh (2006) in his CIC framework suggested informed use of both to facilitate interaction and learning.

Of course the research is not limited to only two types. There are many question types found in conversation analytic studies of L2 classrooms: pursuit questions (Wong& Waring, 2009) to check understanding, counter questions (Markee, 1995) to take the control of the class and reinitiate IRF exchange; wh-as challenges (Koshik, 2003) and yes-no questions that are syntactically designed questions to achieve particular aims by teachers (Koshik, 2002b; Waring, 2012); student- initiated questions such task or content related (Duran, 2017).

Teachers are provided with many suggestions on question use. Sert (2015) based on micro-analysis of EFL and ESL classrooms, warned teachers asking

too many questions in a row without checking for understanding. Wong and Waring (2009) suggested use of pursuit questions to check whether learners understood.

2.3.2.5 Repair

According to van Lier (1988) “everyone involved in language teaching and learning will readily agree that evaluation and feedback are central to the process and progress of language learning” (p. 32). In this sense, evaluation and feedback practices employed through teacher talk designed to cater for learners’ needs in distinctive sequential positions are among the primary concerns of conversation analytic studies of classroom interaction.

Seedhouse (2004) asserted that the organization of repair practice changes in different pedagogical contexts (e.g. form and accuracy vs. meaning and fluency). As repair refers to any practice to overcome problems in understanding or hearing in naturally occurring interaction, the place of repair and difference between repair and instructional correction is hotly debated since the latter is argued not to be employed to overcome *real* understanding or hearing problems. (Hall, 2007; Seedhouse, 2007). Seedhouse (2004, 2007) asserted that classroom interaction is a particular social setting and corrections should be treated as repairs in that specific environment since they are employed to overcome problems as well. Still, in instructional settings, different terminologies regarding repair are used. van Lier (1988) differentiated between didactic repair (e.g. in form-and accuracy context) and conversation repair (e.g. in meaning and fluency context) (as cited in Rolin-Ianzotti, 2010). Throughout the dissertation, repair and correction are used interchangeably to refer to the practices that participants undertake to overcome trouble sources such as misunderstandings or ungrammatical uses of language. Language teachers’ repair work is extensively studied since they give insights into teaching and learning.

In an adult ESL program in the United States, Fagan (2015) studied an expert language teacher who was a PhD student in applied linguistics and with 35 years of experience in order to track her management of errors in real time in IRF sequences. The micro-analytic examination of error management practice demonstrated that the teacher first focused on achievement of the student in partial errors and then addressed correction for student to self-repair. In different contexts such as form and accuracy or meaning and fluency, repair practice (eg. through gaze aversions) was reorganized according to the pedagogical focus. The findings support Seedhouse (1997)'s recognition that there is a strong dispreference for direct and negative feedback in form and accuracy contexts. Fagan (2015) reported that although the classroom context is contingent upon diverse interactional and instructional factors, there is a systemic work in terms of repair.

Åhlund and Aronsson (2015) in Swedish L2 classrooms showed that correction in classroom is also a multiparty accomplishment involving peer corrections and chorus responses. Balancing between accuracy in linguistic form and fluency in conversations requires continuous effort and interactional abilities on the part of teacher.

It is apparent that language teachers give informed decisions dependent upon the pedagogical focus while initiating repair. For instance, Park (2014) found that teachers' third turn repeats in meaning and fluency context function as next turn repair initiator in teacher-fronted talk. Following third turn repeats, learners elaborate on their previous responses. However, in form and accuracy contexts, third turn repeats close the sequence.

Naturally all studies reviewed in this section in relation to turn taking, multi-modal aspects of teaching, code-switching and repair practices have direct or indirect implications for learning. However, some conversation analytic studies directly refer to teacher talk that inhibits or facilitates learning. The

next section will review studies that are directly linked to learning opportunities.

2.3.2.1 Learning Opportunities in Teacher Talk

This section will report on learning opportunities in teacher-fronted classroom discourse and generated by teacher talk. Learning opportunities are also examined out of language classrooms (Eskildsen, 2018) in peer to peer interactions in classrooms (Mori, 2004) in native and non-native speaker's exchanges (Brouwer, 2003; Kim, 2012) mostly through participants' word searches and repair initiations based on the idea that "L2 speakers' interactions in everyday encounters allow us to observe how the participants contingently generate learning opportunities while pursuing the activity at hand" (Kasper & Wagner, 2014, p. 195).

The most comprehensive and product oriented approach to teacher talk's facilitative role in interaction and learning comes from Walsh (2002, 2006). Based on his identification of classroom modes, Walsh argued that each mode has a specific pedagogic goal and employment of specific interactional features will lead to successful execution of modes. Interactional features refer to repair, confirmation checks, feedback and use of varied question types. He claimed that "a teacher's use of language may be mode convergent, where pedagogic goals and language use are congruent, facilitating learning opportunities, or mode divergent, where inconsistencies in pedagogic goals and interactional features hinder opportunities for learning" (Walsh, 2006, p. 92). Based on interactional competence, Walsh introduced *classroom interactional competence* framework having sub-competence areas such as *maximising interactional space* (through use of increased wait time, promoting extended learner turns, planning time) ; *shaping learner contributions* (seeking clarification, scaffolding, modelling and repairing learner input); *effective eliciting, interactional awareness* and *managing mode shifts* (Walsh, 2006). The basic idea underlying the competence framework is

that classroom interaction facilitates learning and teachers' use of mode-convergent language opens space for interaction. For teacher development and education purposes, Walsh designed SETT framework for language teachers to view their teaching recordings and evaluate their own language based on these competence areas mentioned above. Classroom data from different EFL contexts such as Chinese EFL classroom (Walsh & Li li, 2013), Chilean EFL setting (Cancino, 2015), Turkish EFL setting (Sert, 2015; Can-Daşkın, 2015) are provided and the findings support CIC framework.

Language teachers' use of language and interaction is still being explored and CIC_framework is expanding with contributions from many studies. For example, Sert's (2015) micro-analytic investigation of ESL and EFL language classrooms provides further insights into CIC. He suggested *successful management of claims / displays of insufficient knowledge, increased awareness of unwillingness to participate, effective use of gestures, and successful management of code-switching* as facilitative teaching actions for language teachers. Can-Daşkın (2015) in Turkish EFL university setting, demonstrated the use of blackboard to shape learner contributions contributing to CIC framework.

Along with facilitative actions, inhibiting actions are also presented in literature. When we go deeper into IRF exchange, the role of explicit positive assessment (EPA) in the third turn as inhibiting learning is extensively studied by Waring (2008) and Waring and Wong (2009). As teacher closes the third turn with a short positive assessment, learners in the classroom do not initiate next turns. To encourage learners to take turns, Waring and Wong (2009) suggested limited use of EPAs, production of EPAs with non-final intonation, "accept with less evaluative tokens, ask permission to move on, problematize correct responses, ask pursuit questions: why do you say that?, elicit peer contribution, use whole class feedback signs, recognise the potential negative impact of very good, engage in self-reflection" (pp.200-201). These actions

encourage learners to ask or continue interaction, thus promoting learner talk in the next turn.

Providing space for learning opportunities is also studied through learner initiatives. Because learners as active agents in classrooms, they show their willingness to participate and orientation to learning through initiating new sequences or post expansions (Jacknick , 2011) and getting the turn without being given to (Garton, 2012). In CA framework, participants' own orientations such as hand-rising, body posture, taking turns and talk bring evidence for learning opportunities. Waring (2011) proposed conversation analytic *learner initiative typology* based on initiating sequence and turn-taking actions. She reminded that not every learner initiative is beneficial since some have different directions from teachers' momentary agenda. Hence, "how to strike a delicate balance between advancing teacher agendas and promoting learner participation then becomes a crucial pedagogical puzzle for the practising teacher" (p. 215). Management of learner initiatives and responding to learners' questions is important in that sense. Waring, Reddington and Tadic (2016) analysed one teacher's competent management of learner initiated departures from the pedagogical focus of the moment.

Along with teacher talk and student initiations, the task organization in unfolding interaction can yield learning opportunities. Sert (2017) analysed pre-watching activity in EFL secondary school in Turkey and the activity itself promoted participation and teacher talk managed learner participation and generated learning opportunities.

As seen in the review above, in most CA studies, learners and teachers' skilled actions to manage inter-subjectivity through repairs, to maintain the pedagogical focus, to handle repair work are provided. Since the participants' own orientations are presented as evidence in an emic perspective, the analyst as an outsider to the interaction cannot point out phenomenon that participants do not orient to. While marking the learning opportunities

oriented by participants are relatively easy task, to mark a sequence as *a missed learning opportunity* means going beyond the boundaries of CA's emic perspective. However, there are some attempts to do that (Lazaraton, 2004, Li, 2013;).

In Li's (2013) study, the teacher was a Chinese speaker teaching Chinese in English to American undergraduate students. Li provided a single case in which a learner initiated a post expansion and the teacher did not provide any next turn; in other words the teacher skipped the question. According to Li (2013), this is a missed learning opportunity and he suggested "little boundary stretching in CA framework" is needed to mark missed learning opportunities.

As a teacher educator, Lazaraton (2004) provided one case of a pre-service non-native English speaking ESL teacher and concluded that although in unfolding classroom interaction, there is no orientation towards being non-nativeness, a teacher educator cannot ignore this fact. To understand and improve teaching and learning practices, Lazaraton (2004) concluded that CA could be used along with other introspective methods.

As it is stated below, CA is used to inform language teaching practices. In pure CA, the contextual information is irrelevant as long as participants do not orient to them through their talk. However, according to applied models of CA, one could use it for interventionist purposes (Kitzinger, 2011). There are repeated calls for CA informed teacher development education especially for pre-service teachers and novice teachers (Walsh, 2006; Seedhouse, 2010; Sert, 2015; Waring, 2016a). Waring (2016a) suggested that the area needs more studies focusing on both novice and expert teachers to compile knowledge for Interactional Competence for Teaching framework proposed by Hall (2014). She notes that:

Moreover, in their efforts to explicate the interactional competence for teaching (ICT), CA studies have not been particularly discriminatory in choosing the types of teachers to be studied. While we are not in shortage of CA studies of classroom discourse, few focus

specifically on experienced teachers and the development of novice teachers. Studies would typically report data from, for example, a classroom or a particular set of classrooms, without particular attention to the level of expertise brought in by the teachers. It is true that even without such a focus, we gain valuable insights into how various aspects of teaching are accomplished and accomplished with great ingenuity at times. Calibrating our lens to specifically capture the interactional development and enactment of teacher expertise, however, could yield greater dividend for strengthening the professional practices of language teaching. In order to garner truly useful feedback for language teacher education purposes, we are yet to build a strong and comprehensive knowledge base of how novice teacher develop over time and what expert teachers do and do well (Waring, 2016a, pp. 8-9).

Thus, both experienced and beginning EFL teachers' practices in diverse instructional settings should be exhibited to understand the complexity and contingency of teacher talk. With the help of these studies, future language teachers may be better equipped with to manage classroom interaction and in-service teachers can continuously reflect on their talk to improve ongoing practice. The final section will provide a short overview of literature on pre-service teacher practices.

2.3.2.1.1 Pre-service Teacher Talk

Conversation analytic studies of pre-service teacher talk are scarce. The existing literature mostly comes from ESOL settings in the US. For instance, Waring and Hruska (2011) studied one tutorial session between ESOL student teacher and a learner and analysed management of student engagement. Using the same data, they also analysed problematic directives given by the same student teacher. (Waring & Hruska, 2012). They showed that if the goals of the lesson are not stated clearly and conveyed to the learner, then misunderstandings are unavoidable. Similarly, Seedhouse (2008) asserts that establishment and maintenance of the pedagogical focus in classroom interaction is a challenging task for student teachers. When the teacher and the learners are not in the same path, misunderstandings frequently occur.

In EFL setting in Japan, Hosoda and Aline (2010) presented a more comprehensive study involving two Japanese EFL teacher trainees over a 19 month period. The study both unearthed their identity development throughout the practicum and demonstrated development of interactional practices. In two areas, providing assessment and giving directives, two pre-service teachers' interactional competence was found to develop. It is significant that giving instructions is a complex task for candidate teachers. Balıkçı and Seferoğlu (2017) investigated one pre-service teacher's instruction giving practices over three months and unearthed the intricacies and complexities of it.

Responding to students' turns is another complex task for candidate teachers. Fagan's (2012) conversation analytic study of one novice teacher (pre-service native ESL teacher) suggested "glossing over" as a novice teacher practice in whole classroom interaction. He defines glossing over as "teacher either hurriedly or not at all addressing unexpected learner contributions as they arise in either teacher or learner- initiated sequences of talk" (p.113). In the study, this glossing over action was employed in response to *lack of relevant response to teacher initiation or a perceived incorrect response*.

In Turkey in EFL practicum setting, so far two conversation analytic MA theses have been written (Bozbıyık, 2017; Karadağ, 2017). Bozbıyık (2007) looked at 11 pre-service teachers' questioning practices in high school and pre-service teachers also evaluated their practices through a mobile app. Through self, peer and mentor evaluation, students teachers were able to ask more informed questions that promote learner contribution. Karadağ (2017), in young learner classroom, worked with 57 pre-service teachers and analysed their behavioural management skills and eleven different manoeuvres as action to manage classroom were found.

Still, the conversation analytic studies focusing on pre-service teacher talk are relatively scarce. This study, as mentioned before, takes the CA's approach to

classroom discourse into its center and describes how pre-service teacher talk shapes and is shaped by the interaction in classroom. Further expanding the scope laid down in this chapter, an investigation into missed teaching opportunities will be carried out. The next chapter describes the methodology for the study while detailing the aims and procedures as well.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will present the research methodology of the study. The research questions, the significance of the study and detailed information about the research setting will be provided. The data collection procedure will be described in the next section. The data analysis section involves a brief introduction to conversation analysis and its basic principles. Next, the application of the conversation analysis will be explained reporting on the previous approaches to the classroom research. The production of the transcripts and the analysis procedure will be explained in detail. Finally the validity and the reliability of the study will be addressed and a summary of the chapter will be provided.

3.2 Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this dissertation is to explore sequential and pedagogical organization of the pre-service English language teachers' talk in teacher-led classroom interaction in their practicum. The main aim of the study is to analyse the way pre-service English language teachers set their pedagogical focus in their first turn, maintain it throughout the ongoing sequence and end the sequence in their last turn in their talk during their teaching practice in the practicum component of a 4-year teaching degree program. In other words, the main focus is on teacher talk and its organization in teacher-fronted interaction. The way Pts involve students in their first turns and give feedback in the last turn is explored.

Since the momentary pedagogical focus of the teacher and the students lead the analysis, classroom interaction is divided into three broad categories centring on the teachers' pedagogical focus: *form and accuracy context* and *meaning context and fluency context*. This categorization draws on Seedhouse's (2004) preliminary work on interactional organization of foreign language classrooms since the data collected for the dissertation also reflected the same sub-contexts. As this study is a data driven study, the research questions were formed at the end of the analysis of data. To this end, the research questions below will be addressed.

1. What are the emergent contexts in Pt- led EFL classroom interaction in secondary and high school?

2. How do Pts establish and maintain their pedagogical foci when they focus on:

- form
- meaning
- fluency

- 2.1 What are the interactional and pedagogical resources to establish and maintain the pedagogical focus and thereby create teaching opportunities in the contexts?

3.2.1 Significance of the study

Conversation analysis as a research methodology strengthened its place in classroom research with numerous studies investigating the language use of language teachers in real time and unearthing language teachers' actions to improve learning. (For some of the examples: Waring, 2009; Lee, 2007; Walsh, 2002, Sert, 2015; Seedhouse, 2004; Markee, 2015; Kääntä, 2012). However, the micro-analytic investigations of pre-service language teachers' language use are rare. Fagan (2012) and Waring& Hruska (2011) studied one novice teacher's language use in different contexts. Waring and Hruska (2011) 's data came from the one-to-one tutoring sessions while Fagan (2012) collected the data from the one novice teacher working for an adult community English

programme. On the other hand, this study offers micro-analytic investigation of 16 different pre-service teachers' language use in 43 lessons. In this sense, as it offers a wider scope of investigation through data collected in various classrooms and pre-service teachers, it is a fruitful attempt to describe pre-service teacher-led talk in Turkish context.

The results and implications of this study are valuable for understanding pre-service language teachers' practice and they contribute to the growing knowledge of foreign language teaching and teacher education in Turkey. In this sense, this dissertation with 16 pre-service teachers in 43 lessons will give insights to the stakeholders to understand the sequential and pedagogical nature of foreign language classrooms led by pre-service teachers. There are repeated calls for CA integrated pre-service language teacher education (Sert, 2010, 2015), use of CA to educate trainee teachers (Seedhouse, 2008) and use of SETT in teacher education (Walsh, 2006). However, to integrate CA into practicum, it is important to analyse and describe pre-service teachers' real time practices in the classroom as a first step. With the micro-analytical description of the unfolding classroom interaction, one can design a CA informed program to introduce to the teacher education curricula to teach trainee teachers. Thus, it is hoped that the results of this study will provide feedback for teacher education programs to see the pre-service teachers' practices on real time and design the courses accordingly.

Lastly, this is the first micro-analytic study on *missed teaching opportunities* in Pt-led EFL classrooms. This is the first attempt to define missed teaching opportunities and use it within CA boundaries. There will be some suggestions to supplement CA with outsider expert judgements to operationalise missed teaching opportunities. These will be explained in methodology and conclusion chapters.

3.3 Participants, Research Context and Data Collection Procedures

3.3.1 Gaining Access to the Research Context and the Role of the Researcher

Prior to description of the research context and the participants, the role of the researcher should be clarified. The researcher was a full time research assistant at the department of foreign language education where the program was run. The research assistants were assigned to the courses based on their research interests. Thus, the researcher was assigned as a course assistant to the School Experience course. She helped the instructor of the course throughout the term, in each step of the course design and conduct. As the data collection procedure and the practicum course was inextricably intertwined, the researcher had the role of data collector and the course assistant at the same time. As an assistant to the course, she helped to prepare the course outline, organized the observation and teaching schedule of the students, checked Pts' and mentors' schedule to pair them up and collected pre-service teachers' lesson plans and gave feedback to them. As the researcher, she went to the classrooms with the pre-service teachers and acted as a non-participant observer. She only video recorded the lessons while pre-service teachers were doing their teaching practice.

Before the data collection procedure started, she applied to the ethics committee of the university to receive permission to collect the data. (Please see Appendix A for the official document). She also got the approval from Ministry of National Education (MONE, hereafter) to collect data from the high schools located in the district. (Please see Appendix B for the official document).

3.3.2 Practicum Context and the Participants

The participants, 16 pre-service teachers of English, were the senior students at the department of foreign language education in a state university. In order

to graduate from the program and be assigned to a state school or apply for a teaching position in private institutions, they needed to complete a 10- week practicum in the fall and spring semesters of the final academic year.

The data for this dissertation were collected from the pre-service teachers doing their practicum in the fall semester of the academic year 2015-2016. The name of the first practicum course was FLE 425 School Experience and it involved 10-week school visits (6 hours per week) and 14- week in-class lecture (1 hour per week) at the faculty.

In the academic catalogue, the course objectives are defined as follows:

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

- understand the complexity of teaching in a real classroom environment
- interpret the classroom events they observe in the light of educational theory
- practice their teaching skills in a real-life classroom context
- demonstrate a teacher stance
- evaluate their own performance in line with the feedback they receive from their students, peers, mentor teachers or supervisors

The practicum involved the cooperation among the faculty, the practice school and the MONE, so it is noteworthy to define their roles in this process. Pre-service teachers who were the participants of this study are the fourth year students at the department of the foreign language education. Six pre-service teachers are generally assigned to a mentor teacher in the practice school. The mentor teacher is an experienced English language teacher in the school and assigned as a mentor by the vice principal of the school. The mentor teachers welcome the pre-service teachers to their classes and let them observe them, assign teaching tasks regularly, give feedback to their teachings and grade their teaching performance.

The supervisor refers to the assistant professor at the faculty who offers the school experience course. The supervisors design the course and the observation tasks, give one hour lectures at the faculty; organize the

assignments to the school and grade the final teaching performance of the pre-service teachers. The assignment of the supervisors, the mentors and the practice schools were approved by Ministry of National Education.

Before the academic term began, the supervisor selected the schools and met the vice principal of the schools. Since the faculty of education was offering this course for a long time there were a number of state and private schools which had been in cooperation with the faculty for many years. The supervisor chose two of these state schools, one of which was a secondary school and the other one was a high school. Further information about the schools will be presented in the next sub-section.

When the academic term began, the supervisor opened two sections of School Experience course and 15 pre-service teachers registered for each section; in other words there were 30 pre-service teachers in total.

In the first week of the course, the course outline was distributed to the students and the practice schools were announced to the class. The pre-service teachers were asked for their choice related to the school they would go to. Thus, they could decide on the age and level of the students they were going to have the first teaching experience with. In addition, the schools had earlier announced the number of the pre-service teachers that they could work with. The secondary school could only have 6 pre-service teachers; so, 6 of the students chose to do their practicum in the secondary school and the rest of the students went to the high school. Then, the supervisor explained the aims of the course, the tasks and the teaching assignments.

The school visits involved 4 hours of observation and 2 hours of other duties assigned by the mentor such as grading quizzes, preparing materials. The observation tasks focused on different classroom contexts, transition between these contexts, teachers' questioning and use of wait time, error management and feedback, use of L1 and L2 and the management of classroom breakdowns.

After the pre-service teachers were informed about the course outline, they were invited for their voluntary participation in the research. They were asked to give permission to the researcher to video record their teaching practice and analyse them for the research purposes. It was underlined that the participation in the research would neither affect their grade nor add extra work to their course load. After this explanation, they were given participation consent forms and told to sign and bring the forms back to the following class if they would agree to participate. Actually, being video-recorded was not a new thing for the pre-service teachers. In their third year at the program, they had been video recorded in their micro teachings. Upon completing their teachings, they were given the video records of the micro teachings and required to write reflection on their teachings. Thus, they were used to teach in front of a video camera. The video-recording was also employed in the practicum course to give opportunity to the supervisor and the pre-service teacher to watch the teachings repeatedly to identify troubles and improve pre-service teachers' reflection and next teachings.

16 pre-service teachers gave permission to the researcher to use their teaching videos in the following class and they submitted their consent forms (Please see the appendix C for a sample consent form). In the following week, the pre-service teachers went to the school and met the mentor teachers. The following section will give information about the schools.

3.3.2.1 The schools

The supervisor of the practicum chose two different schools (one was a secondary and the other one was a high school) for pre-service teachers to do their practicum. In Turkey, in 2012 a new legislation on primary and secondary education called as 4+4+4 was introduced. First *4 year* refers to the first part of the primary education (*ilkokul*). The second *4 year* encompasses second half of the primary education (*ortaokul*). The secondary school in which part of the data was collected refers to *lower secondary school*. The last *4 year* refers to the *upper secondary school* or *high school* (*lise*) and most of the

data was collected from that school. Throughout the dissertation, the terms *secondary school* and *high school* will be used in order to refer to the schools.

Both schools had intensive English classes. In other words, the schools had enough English language teachers and several number of English classes for the pre-service teachers to do their practicum.

In the secondary school, two pre-service teachers were assigned to a mentor who had been teaching fifth graders. The fifth graders had foreign language intensive program involving 15 hours of English in a week in the class 5-B. The class 5-B had 20 students who were at the age of 11. The classroom had a smart board and computer and they were using a course prepared and sent to the state schools by MONE. Since, the school had a foreign language intensive program for fifth graders, they were using supplementary materials as well. The mentor teacher requested two pre-service teachers to design new materials. Thus, the pre-service teachers in 5B mostly designed their own materials. The students were seated in traditional rows and two students shared one desk. This seating arrangement also supported the teacher fronted classroom interaction since the teacher had the control of the class and the interaction. It was difficult to do group work in that type of seating arrangement.

It was difficult to determine students' proficiency level since some of the students in the class had a foreign language course for the first time; some of them were taking private English courses outside the school. The video recordings and the observations of the student teachers showed that the students were preparing for the TEOG exam (a national exam for selection and placement to the high schools), thus the program was designed to prepare students to solve multiple choice questions in that exam. The focus was on reading and vocabulary and the students and the teacher in the class were speaking in Turkish most of the time. As a result, the pre-service teachers (Pt 1 and Pt 2) used Turkish in their first teachings. The research assistant warned the two pre-service teachers about their extensive use of Turkish in the class

and reminded that they should have used English as much as possible. Since the research aims to explore pre-service teachers' teacher talk in English, the first lesson was excluded from the database. In the second lesson, these two pre-service teachers started to use English and minimised their use of Turkish.

The high school had a preparatory year in which the students had 20 hours of English in a week. In addition, the high school gave a placement test to determine newcomer students' proficiency level and grouped them accordingly every year to place them in the preparatory classes. The preparatory classes were organized in alphabetical order according to the test results. The first class was class A with the highest proficiency level and the last one class M with the lowest proficiency level, in total there were 11 different classes in the preparatory year at the time of the data collection. The pre-service teachers who agreed to be participants of this study went to the classes B, D, H and K. The results proficiency tests were not taken into consideration in the data analysis. However, it should be noted down that classes B and D were using the *Prime Time (2)* addressing for upper-intermediate learners of English. Classes H and K were using the *Prime Time (1)* written for pre-intermediate learners of English.

Similar to the secondary school, the seats were arranged in traditional rows in the high school. There were 30-35 students in each class and sometimes the pre-service teachers and the researcher had difficulty in finding a seat. Due to the seating arrangement and large number of students in the classrooms, pre-service teachers avoided group work and task based teaching. The classrooms had smart boards and the soft copy of the course book (*Prime Time 1* and *2*) was uploaded to the smart board. The pre-service teachers were using the smartboard mostly while the students were following the hard copies of the course book. The course book was strictly followed by the pre-service teachers but sometimes they brought supplementary materials to the class.

Unlike the secondary school, the four language skills were taught in the high school. The students were not required to sit for a proficiency test or any other

national exam. The school aimed to teach Basic English to the learners. In terms of language policy, the use of English in the classrooms was encouraged by the mentor teachers. Thus, the pre-service teachers in the high school used English most of the time.

Up to now, the practicum context and the people involved in this context are described to illuminate the research setting. It is important to report on the organization of the practicum and the context in which pre-service teachers perform their teaching tasks because these teaching tasks constitute the data for this dissertation. However, the conversation analysis as a research method takes the naturally occurring interaction as the data and does not look at the context. The conversation analysts claim that the interaction itself reveals the traces to understand the context and the interaction has the power to renew and reshape the context itself. However, the participants of this study come together in a foreign language classroom for a reason: to accomplish language learning and teaching task. Moreover, the pre-service teachers come to the school to do their practicum, to practice teaching for the first time in an official setting. This means that participants (the pre-service teachers and the students) orient to their institutional goals in their talks. Hence, the contextual information should be provided to the reader. Drew and Heritage (1992) listed the characteristics of the institutional talk:

- (1) Institutional talk is goal oriented in institutionally relevant ways;
- (2) it often involves 'special and particular constraints on 'allowable contributions to the business at hand'; and
- (3) it may be associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are peculiar to specific institutional contexts. (p.22)

To better analyse the data, the background information about the school and the practicum is critical to see the participants' orientations. Actually, the interaction itself also shows the participants' orientations. However, for instance, presentation of information will familiarize readers with the language policy of the secondary school and its exam-oriented program beforehand. This also shows "the special and particular constraints on

allowable contributions “that Drew and Heritage (1992) talked about. Similarly, Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) explain the CA’s consideration of context: “the aim of CA... is to explicate the structural organization of talk in interaction at this interface between context-free resources and their context sensitive applications”. (p. 360). Thus, contextual information was given here only to describe the research setting; however, the data came from the video recordings and the participants’ talk. The contextual information was included in the transcripts (representation of the data) if and only the participants’ organization of talk offered a sequential evidence of the orientation in that direction.

3.3.2.2 Teaching Tasks and the Data Collection Procedure

After having the permission of the group of pre-service teachers, the researcher was able to start the collection of the videos. The data source of this dissertation were the video recordings of pre-service teachers’ teaching tasks. The pre-service teachers were expected to execute four 20-minute teaching tasks throughout the term. With their partner pre-service teacher, they shared a 40-minute lesson to do the teaching tasks. As it can be seen in Table 3.1, among the 16 pre-service teachers who agreed to participate in the research, 2 of them chose to go to the primary school and the rest of them chose to go to the high school. In total, 43 lessons were video recorded.

Table 3.1: The number of lessons recorded in total

High School (Prep Class)	Primary School (5 th grade)
14 PTs	2 PTs
40 lessons	3 lessons
1120 minutes	120 minutes

In the fourth week of the term, the observation and the teaching phase of the practicum officially started. To execute their first teaching task, the Pts arranged their teaching schedule with their mentors and informed the

researcher about the class and the hour. For the next three teachings the procedure was the same.

Prior to the teachings, the Pts asked their mentors whether the allocated schedule was appropriate for the class and requested the mentors to assign them a topic / unit from the course book to teach. Then, they prepared their lesson plans and sent it via e-mail to the mentor and the course assistant (researcher). The course assistant and mentors at the school gave feedback on the structure and content of the plan. Generally, the teacher candidates revised their plans according to the feedback and implemented it in the class together.

On the teaching days, the researcher came to the school with two cameras (Sony HDR-CX 360), two tripods and an extension cord to charge the camera at the back of the class. The first camera (directed to the students) was placed on the right corner of the class near the smart board behind the teacher's desk. The second camera (directed to the pre-service teacher) was placed at the back of the class. The researcher sat at the back of the class and chose a seat in the middle row to control the video camera when necessary. There were generally three long rows in the classrooms of the high school. As two Pts shared one class hour (40 minutes) to teach, the researcher stopped recording when the first Pt finished and started recording when the second Pt started to teach. During the teachings, the researcher also observed the lesson and took extensive notes which might help her during the transcription process. Apart from the students, there was a mentor teacher in the classroom. Mentor teachers were responsible for grading the Pts' teachings using a rubric. The rubrics were prepared by the instructor and the research assistant of the course. The rubrics were also sent to the Pts before the teachings so that they knew the criteria according to which they would be evaluated. After the teachings, the Pts were given feedback about their teaching both by the mentor and the course assistant separately. After forty minutes, the researcher left the classroom but the Pts continued to observe the other

classes. In the break time, when the Pts asked the opinion of the researcher about their performance and the lesson, the researcher did a small talk – a kind of opinion exchange about their teachings. The Pts talked about their feelings about the lesson, the researcher shared her opinions and observations about the lesson based on her notes. She gave suggestions for improvement. The day after the teaching, the videos were recorded to a DVD and the DVD was given to the Pts as well.

All the teaching tasks were planned to be done in twenty minutes; however, for various reasons they could last longer or shorter than planned. No matter how short or long they were, the recording was done for forty minutes (one class hour). The Pts kept the time to make sure that each pair had the same time to do their teachings. Overall, all the candidates had the same time limit.

The lessons were recorded starting from November 2015 till mid-January 2016. It took three months to compile the dataset. The database is provided in Appendix D.

3.4 Data Analysis

This section will focus on the analysis of the data. It will explain the historical roots of Conversation Analysis and its basic underlying principles employed to analyse the naturally occurring talk. Next, the application of CA into classroom interaction will be explained. The transcription process and the data analysis will be described step by step. Finally, the reliability and validity of the research will be discussed.

3.4.1 Conversation Analysis

3.4.1.1 Principles of CA

Conversation analysis (henceforth CA) is a research methodology attempting to explain “people’s methods for producing orderly social interaction; it identifies these methods in the sequential organization of talk-in-interaction” (Drew and Heritage, 1992, p.189). *Talk-in- interaction* encompasses every

kind of talk such as the informal chat between friends in a dormitory or the consultation between the doctor and the patient in a hospital. Thus, talk-in-interaction is used to refer to all types of conversations. (ten Have, 2007). In those conversations, CA attempts to explore “*the interactional organization of the social activities.*” (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998, p.14). All in all, the focus is not on the language but the use of talk to accomplish particular social acts.

Harvey Sacks, a sociologist, was the initiator of the idea that “there is order at all points in talk-in-interaction”. Following his professor Erving Goffman who made “observations of people in interaction” and Harold Garfinkel who constructed *ethnomethodology* in which he studied common-sense reasoning and practical theorizing in everyday activities; Harvey Sacks came up with something new out to study every day activities of people in the early 1960’s. (ten Have, 2007).

The idea is that “what a doing, such as an utterance, means practically, the action it actually performs, depends on its sequential position. This was the ‘discovery’ that led to conversation analysis per se” (ten Have, 2007, p.6). Harvey Sacks studied a collection of telephone calls to a suicide prevention centre and recognized that in the majority of the calls, the callers and the person taking the call were following the similar pattern to interact. The way and the sequential position in which the interactors introduced themselves or initiated a request generate a recurring pattern.

Based on the analysis of collections, Harvey Sacks put forward the following propositions which becomes the underlying principles of CA later as listed by (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998, p.23): Firstly, “talk-in-interaction is systematically organized and deeply ordered”. This refers to the basic idea Sacks came up “there is order at all points talk-in-interaction”. As a result, the sequential position of each utterance has critical value for conversation analysts as Heritage (1984) put forward “no order of detail can be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental, or irrelevant”. (as cited in Seedhouse, 2004, p. 14). This principle makes the analysts create a very detailed transcription

system and employ line-by line micro analysis. The transcription system will be explained later.

Second, “the production of talk-in-interaction is methodic”. In the context of phone calls to the suicide prevention centre, the caller may avoid giving his name by saying “I can’t hear you” right after the agent announced his name. The caller’s move in that specific sequence - not announcing his name- becomes analysable as a method in that sense. (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998, p.20). The understanding of the methodic nature of talk requires analysts to consider utterances as actions situated in particular context to accomplish particular tasks. Seedhouse (2004) also adds that “contributions to the interaction are *context- shaped and context-renewing*”. (p. 14). Thus, the utterance “I can’t hear you” is uttered as an act to the previous turn and would shape the next turn of the participant. This is also closely related to the CA’s analysis method “next-turn proof procedure”. This means that one interlocutor’s turn in the ongoing interaction shows his/her understanding of the prior turn of the other interlocutor. (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). Thus, conversation analysts do not look at the one turn in isolation. Rather, they employ line-by-line analysis to understand the participants’ understanding of the turns and the management of the inter-subjectivity between the participants.

Thirdly, “the analysis of talk-in-interaction should be based on naturally occurring data”. That is to say, the data should not be the researcher-provoked, there should be no intervention by the researcher. This principle indeed distinguishes the conversation analysis from the speech act theory which also defines language use as actions to accomplish particular tasks. In speech act theory, rules are identified by invoking typical situations and people are asked to state what they would have said in those situations. Conversely, the conversation analysis looks at the interactions occurring in their natural settings. Moreover, Sacks (1984) specially underlines the fact that tape recorded naturally occurring conversations let the researcher study

the data again and again and gave the chance to show the data to the others. (as cited in Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998, p.18). This also increases the reliability of the method, which will be described later.

Finally, “analysis should not initially be constrained by prior theoretical assumptions”. In other words, the data analysis should be data driven and the interaction in that particular context should lead the researcher to reach conclusions. For instance, in the suicide call example, participants’ gender, race or social status are not relevant details if those are not oriented to by the participants themselves. Or, to claim that “I can’t hear you” is used to avoid giving the name of the caller, the analyst needs to have a sequential evidence in the interaction.

In the light of these principles, Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) pointed out that there are two core analytic questions in CA: What interactional business is being mediated or accomplished through the use of sequential pattern and how do participants demonstrate their active orientations to this business? (p.99). Seedhouse (2004) put it simply and stated that, “the essential question which we must ask at all stages of CA of data is “why that, in that way, right now?” (Seedhouse, 2004, p.16).

In order to answer these analytic questions, keeping the core principle that “there is order at all points in interaction” in mind; the conversation analysts focus on the turn-taking mechanism. Actually turn-taking practice of the participants in any conversation shows that it is strictly organized and ordered. To see efficiently running conversations, one does not need to be in a courtroom where the right to speak is given by a judge. Even in a very informal chat between friends, one can take the turn, hold it and other interlocutor listens to it until his /her friend finishes to speak. Turn – constructional unit (henceforth referred to as TCU which was defined by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974) refers to an utterance or talk (sentences, clauses or a single word) at a turn. Each TCU may project its ending with a pause or hinting and the next speaker recognizes the transition relevance

places (TRP, hereafter) and may get the turn. (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974).

In talk-in interaction, utterances come in pairs. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) explain this : “ given the recognisable production of a first pair part, on its first possible completion, its speaker should stop and a next speaker should start and produce a second pair part from the pair type the first is a recognisably a member of” (as cited in Hutchby and Wooffitt; 1998; p. 40). To illustrate, a party invitation between two friends might be given as an example. If a friend initiates a first pair part and makes an invitation, the next speaker has to accept or decline the invitation in the second pair part in this example. Questions-answers, greetings are all called *adjacency pairs* due to their sequential positions. However, every question in the first pair part does not necessarily project the answer in the next turn. There may be other pairs inserted and the adjacency pairs may be expanded, and thus, the second pair part may come later. (Sert, 2015). No matter how expanded an adjacency pair is, the action in the first pair part should be oriented to by the participant. The participant may accept the invitation (*preferred action*) or decline it which is *dispreferred* action in that context. (Sert, 2015).

The final mechanism that speakers activate in the conversation is *repair*. The repair refers to the treatment of trouble occurring in conversations (Seedhouse, 2004). The trouble may mean misunderstanding or hearing problem in everyday interaction. There are four types of repair: self-initiated self - repair, self-initiated other repair, other- initiated self repair and other initiated other repair. The repair organization shows that participants understand each other and prefer to maintain the progressivity of the talk. In that sense, repair mechanism shows the ways how the participants design their turns to maintain the mutual understanding and the continuation of the talk.

In the next sub-section, a brief history of foreign language classroom research will be given. Then, the application of CA in teacher fronted classroom

interaction will be explained following Seedhouse's (2004) pioneering book "The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective".

3.4.1.2 Classroom Discourse and Applied Conversation Analysis

Although it was first used in sociology as a research method to explore everyday interaction, CA is now being applied in many disciplines to explore different contexts such as psychotherapy, classrooms, courtrooms, news interviews (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013). With the advent of sociocultural theory (Lantolf, 1996), language learning is seen as both social and cognitive work and learning occurs as a result of interaction in social contexts (as cited in Mitchell, Myles & Marsden, 2013). Firth and Wagner's (1997) paper and Markee's (2005) work on CA-for-SLA introduced CA as a promising research method enabling researchers to track classroom learning (Gardner, 2013).

Allwright & Bailey (1991) point out that classroom is a crucible in which students bring their previous learning experiences, needs; teachers also bring their experiences, methods and curriculum; however, the crucial point is how these elements react and how this reaction or interaction affects learning. There are planned aspects of the lesson such as method, syllabus and atmosphere as input and in the classroom there is interaction that shapes this input. Thus, the classroom interaction should be explored to better understand the dynamics of learning.

By unearthing interactional architecture of L2 classrooms, Seedhouse (2004) strongly advocated the employment of conversation analysis and demonstrated the method's superiority comparing it to discourse analysis.

Seedhouse (2004) acknowledges the DA's triadic pattern (IRF) and its power to explain the classroom interaction. However, in order to show discourse analysis's weakness, he analyses the same interaction between student and teacher in a language class both with discourse analysis and conversation analysis. The two different analyses show that discourse analysis misses "the

dynamic, fluid, and locally managed on a turn-by-turn basis” characteristics of interaction (p.62). Seedhouse (2004) asserts that

Now the CA of Extract 2.2 does not dispute that extract consists of IRF/IRE cycles; the DA is certainly right to point this out. However, the point which is missed in the DA approach is that IRF /IRE cycles perform different interactional and pedagogical work according to the context in which they are operating (p.63).

Thus, the main difference between these two approaches is while DA attempts to fit the classroom discourse into a more standardized system, CA appreciates and welcomes the richness and complexity of the classroom (Seedhouse, 2004). There are many studies in foreign language classroom interaction (Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Hellerman, 2003; Lee, 2007; Waring, 2008, 2009; Zemel& Koschmann, 2010; Käätä, 2010) that acknowledge the IRF pattern in the classroom interaction and use the conversation analysis to explore the interaction between the triadic moves. Similarly, Sert (2011) in his PhD thesis, employed micro analytic study of CIK (claims of insufficient knowledge) of students in foreign language classrooms. He justified the use of CA as a research methodology stating that:

Since CA is obsessed with details in talk, I was able to see how pauses, stretching of sounds, pace of talk, intonation etc. could influence the co-construction of insufficient knowledge. Besides, the close analysis of visual aspects of talk like gaze directions, head movements, and face gestures enabled me to further understand the micro-details of the phenomenon being investigated. If I had used a Discourse Analytic methodology, I would have to code turns that stand for certain functions. This proves to be problematic in my research, since multiple actions can be performed within a turn-in-talk, as will be showed in the analysis chapter. (p.48)

In other words, the conversation analysis’s focus on details and especially embodied interaction distinguish it from the Discourse Analysis. (Please see the works of Käätä, 2014; Sert, & Jacknick, 2015; Belhiah, 2013; Eskildsen & Wagner, 2015).

The underlying idea of CA’s being a more appropriate tool for language classrooms is the role of language both for subject matter and the medium of

instruction in those classes. Seedhouse (2004) underlines the fact that “L2 teachers are doing very complex interactional work compared with “content” teachers and compared with professionals in other institutional settings” (p.66). In that sense, Seedhouse (2004) believes that CA is able to describe language teachers’ work better and furthermore “portray the reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction, whereas DA is not” (p.66).

3.4.1.3 Applying CA to investigate foreign language classrooms

This dissertation aims to unearth and portray sequential and pedagogical organization of PT talk in EFL classroom in practicum experience. Although CA as a research methodology put heavy emphasis on the emic perspective and focus only on participants’ own orientations to the unfolding interaction to reach micro-analytic descriptions, the analyst’s task becomes complicated if she has broader aims to inform and improve practice. In this sense, at first the main goal of the research is to describe PT-led teacher talk; however, when the data analysis is complete and the broader picture emerges, it is unavoidable for the researcher to have etic perspective and reach judgements on especially *missed teaching opportunities*.

Missed teaching opportunities are marked when;

- PT s do not show any orientation towards learners’ questions, word searches and CIKs and leave them unattended
- PTs echo students’ incorrect and inappropriate responses
- PTs initiate embedded repair as a response to incorrect answer but do not mark it as repair

Within CA’s emic perspective, the first action can be justified and operationalised as *missed teaching opportunity* on the part of teacher. Because participants’ own orientations (asking questions, seeking for words and CIKs) make response relevant in the next turn. As PTs do not orient and initiate

second pair part as a response to the first pair part, those sequences lead to missed teaching opportunities.

For the remaining two cases, that are Pts' own actions to manage learner contributions are considered and analysed as incompetent teacher actions that lead to missed teaching opportunities by the researcher. The researcher who have been assisting practicum courses for five years and observed all the teachings of Pts made outsider judgements and claimed those instances were missed teaching opportunities. To do that, broader institutional goals were taken into consideration.

Along with the learners' and teachers' own orientations, the institutional goals of language learning classrooms come into play in the analysis of the interaction to improve and inform the future practice. Referring to Kitzinger's (2011) applied CA study on call-takers, Li (2013) suggested that it is necessary for analysts to make outsider judgements.

That being said, Kitzinger conceded that in order to assist the call-takers in addressing their communicative concerns, CA analysts nevertheless needed to analyse the workers' talk and make judgments about effectiveness in communication. The criteria for such judgments, according to Kitzinger, were determined by the goals of the organizations for which the call-takers worked. She thus brought to light the dilemma of having to strike a balance between the need to stay within the theoretical and methodological confines of CA and the need to stretch the boundary in order for CA to be usefully applied. This was also the analytic quandary that I had to grapple with as I identified, described, and analysed the multiple missed learning opportunities in the excerpt. Nevertheless, I believe that in order for CA to be pedagogically useful, a little boundary stretching is necessary (Li, 2013, pp: 86).

Hence, "*the little boundary stretching*" was employed in the data analysis and interpretation to address the missed teaching opportunities as Li (2013) suggested. Sometimes the students and the teachers themselves orient to those momentary opportunities which can be perfectly documented within the boundaries of CA framework. However, even the learners and teachers do not mark it as an interactional trouble in their ongoing interaction and the

progressivity of the lesson is maintained; obvious missed teaching opportunities are oriented by the analyst and mentioned in the results.

3.4.1.4 Transcription, Building a Collection and Data Analysis

This subsection will explain the procedures of transcription of the data, collection of the instances and analysis of the data.

For the conversation analysts, the transcription has a great role in the data analysis. According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998); “transcription is considered as the representation of the data; while the tape itself is viewed as a reproduction of a determinate social event.” (p.74). Doing the transcription is seen as a first step in the data analysis. To do that, repeated listening to the recording by the analyst is required and the transcription is advised to be done by the analysts which will help the analyst to locate the recurring patterns and phenomena (Hutchby and Wooffitt; 1998). On the other hand, it is acknowledged that the transcription cannot represent or capture all the details of talk. There is no perfect transcription. In addition, the researcher’s agenda is reflected in the transcription. (Hutchby and Wooffitt; 1998).”Each transcription system has its own theoretical and methodological bias” (ten Have, 2007, p.32). For conversation analysts, to represent sequential unfolding of the interaction in line by line is critical. Thus, the transcription system is designed to show turns of talk and contribution of each interlocutor to the ongoing interaction. For this study, the video recordings were transcribed using the transcription system developed by Gail Jefferson (2004) which is commonly used in CA methodology (Hutchby and Wooffitt; 1998; ten Have, 2007; Sert, 2015). (Please see the Appendix L for the transcription conventions).

Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) state that for a conversation analyst, there are two major concerns in transcripts: reflection of “the dynamics of turn-taking (beginnings and endings of a turn, overlaps, gaps and pauses)” and “the characteristics of speech delivery (stress, enunciation, intonation and pitch)”.

In recent years, the visual aspect of talk-in-interaction (gaze, gesture, posture) is also reflected in the transcripts. (ten Have, 2007).

The rest of the section will present the data analysis procedure step by step. As each pre-service teacher did their teachings, their recordings from two different cameras were transferred to the computer and the DVDs in MPEG format. After all the teachings finished in the mid-January, 2016; the videos were uploaded to the software *Transana*. This software was designed to be used by conversation analysts. One can upload two video files showing the same class (e.g. two cameras positioned in different places to capture the interaction), synchronise them so that one can see the front and back of the class at the same time. On the same screen, one can write the transcript, view the videos and hear the sound. In the transcription screen, one can use some of the Jeffersonian symbols embedded (up, down arrows, degree signs). To mark the silences, users can add time codes in the transcription which is directly transferred to the video file. Thus, one can create video clips to build the collection. (Please see ten Have, 2007 for more information). By the help of those facilities the program offered, the researcher managed to save time and energy to a certain extent in the long transcription process which took ten months.

For each pre-service teacher, a new library was created and four teachings were added to the library. After the transcriptions of all the videos of one pre-service teacher were completed, the next library was created. At first, the rough transcriptions were made. That is, the researcher started with initial and less detailed transcription marking the beginnings and ends of each turn of the participants as far as she could hear. She added time codes to spot each participant's turn. Since in each classroom there were at least 30 students, it was difficult to identify each student's turn at first compared to the teacher's turns. She sometimes asked her colleagues to listen to the recording to check whether her hearing was right. She also used a noise cancelling headphone while she was listening to the recordings which helped her to hear well. In the

transcription process, she participated in three data sessions which were held by Human (Hacettepe University Micro Analytic Network) to share her data and discuss the transcription and analytic procedures. According to the comments and suggestions, she made changes and improved the transcripts.

In the transcription process, she took extensive notes for each teaching of each pre-service teacher. In this process, there was not a research question or a specific sequence she was searching for. This was what conversation analysts called “unmotivated looking” (ten Have, 2007). As it is stated above, the transcription process was the first step of the analysis and the research questions emerged after the completion of the basic transcriptions. Following the suggestion of Pomerantz and Fehr (1997, as cited in ten Have, 2007); first, the sequences were identified which the pre-service teachers initiated. The beginnings and endings of the sequences were located. The sequences were determined as Pomerantz and Fehr (1997) suggested:

For the start of a sequence, locate the turn in which one of the participants initiated an action and/or topic that was taken up and responded to by co participants. For the end of the sequence, follow through the interaction until you locate the place in which the participants were no longer specifically responding to the prior action and /or topic. (...) When looking at (or for) sequence openings and closings, treat them as product of negotiation. (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997:71; as cited in ten Have, 2007, pp.122)

Thus, the teachers’ and students’ actions and orientations to those actions were determining factor in locating the sequences. As a second step, the actions were characterized asking the question “what is this participant doing in this turn?” (ten Have, 2007; p. 123). The preliminary results showed that the teacher-led classroom interaction data was entirely compatible with Seedhouse’s (2004) the categorisation of contexts except for the task-based context. In other words, the teacher led classroom data involved form and accuracy, meaning and fluency and procedural contexts. Apparently, the pre-service teacher classroom discourse operated on *initiation- response- feedback* (IRF) pattern as other discourse analysis studies suggested. However, there

were pre-insertions or post-expansions to that triadic pattern to manage the organization of the talk.

After this step, the research question of this thesis emerged: the way the pre-service teachers set their pedagogical focus in their first turn and maintain it until their last turn in form and accuracy and meaning and fluency contexts. In addition, procedural contexts were also analysed to show the way the pre-service teachers' handle students' initiations and turn them into the triadic pattern. As a result, for each context, IRF patterns with their pre and post expansions were collected. The collections of sequences for each participant were built and the researcher moved onto the next step.

The third step was consideration of the "packaging" of the actions, how the participants produce their actions and design them according to their recipients. The fourth step was to identify the timing of the turns and employ the turn-by-turn analysis. This step involved the analysis of the sequences in terms of turn taking, preference and repair organization. When analytically significant, the multimodal actions (gaze, gestures) were added to the transcription.

In the result chapter, representative cases will be provided to present the organizational and pedagogical structure of teacher-led talk. The representative extracts are coded as follows: (Extract FF 1: Pt1_5B_TT: "George is going to the cinema with his friends") *FF* means focus on form, *1* stands for the number of the extract in the chapter, *PT1* stands for the participant pre-service teacher, *5B* stands for the class in the school and the reader can also understand the level of the school (secondary or high school), *TT* stands for the third teaching of the pre-service teacher. Lastly, a significant sentence or a word for the analysis was put in the quotation marks as a title for the extract.

The method used in the analysis was called single *case analysis* referring to the analysis of extended sequences of talk focusing on significant interactional

details in the production of particular sequences. (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Waring (2009) explains the single case analysis as follows:

In CA, analysts mainly work from a collection of instances to describe “a single phenomenon or a single domain of phenomenon” (Schegloff, 1987, p. 101). There is also what has been referred to as the “single case analysis” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998), as epitomized in Harvey Sack’s (1992) work. In single case analysis, “the resources of past work on a range of phenomena and organizational domains in talk-in-interaction are brought to bear on the analytic explication of a single fragment of talk” (Schegloff, 1987, p. 101). The purpose of a single case analysis, then, is not to discover a new practice, but to (a) showcase CA’s analytical potency in illuminating the intricacies of a single utterance, speech act, or episode (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Schegloff, 1987, 1988); (b) develop a richer understanding of an existing phenomenon within its extended local context (Macbeth, 1994; Maynard & Frankel, 2003; Raymond & Heritage, 2006); (c) create a starting point from which collections of a candidate phenomenon may be built (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998); and (d) uncover a particular aspect of interaction previously unnoticed by but important for professionals working within a specific (institutional) context (Maynard & Frankel, 2003; Mori, 2004; Schegloff, 1999). (p.801).

In other words, the single case analysis does not focus on one specific phenomenon in a classroom discourse such as *I don’t know’s* (Sert, 2011) or *referring to past learning events* (RPLE) (Can-Daşkın, 2017). Instead, it considers the talk as single case and aims to explore and describe the strategies and conversational devices to accomplish it. This study attempts to fulfil those purposes that Waring (2009) explained below by describing the way pre-service teachers establish their pedagogical focus in their first turns and maintain it until their last turns. Hence, it aims to shed light on the existing concept of IRF and the way it is activated and expanded in the practicum context. In addition, it attempts to uncover the pre-service teacher talk in teacher-led classroom discourse which is a specific institutional context so that one can have a richer understanding of this particular classroom interaction.

3.5 Validity and Reliability

Different research methodologies have different way of validating their analysis and ensuring reliability of the research. The conversation analysis as a social science research methodology has its own ways of ensuring the credibility and integrity of the results; that is the validity. In Seedhouse's (2004) words; "do the data prove what the researcher says they prove, are there alternative explanations?" (p.255). Hence, the data should reflect the researcher's claims.

CA takes its analytic power from consideration of the participant's perspective, which is the *emic* perspective. Namely, conversation analysts claim that participants' turns of talk show their actions and their orientations in the ongoing interaction. Thus, the analysts can achieve internal validity showing the sequential evidence of participants' own orientations in the unfolding talk. This is also called as next-turn proof procedure which refers to the fact that the one interlocutor's next turn can count as a proof of his /her understanding of the previous turn of the other interlocutor. For instance, the researcher named the teacher's actions or interactional devices only when the teacher and the students in the classroom oriented to those actions in the same way. An information seeking question was spotted as an information-seeking question only when the participants in the classroom took this question as an information -seeking question and answered it in that way.

The best example reflecting the emic perspective of CA in classroom interaction could be the *micro-level language policy-in process* (Amir and Musk, 2013). In that CA study, researchers could only point out language policing actions of teachers and students when they could bring out sequential evidence in the unfolding interaction. This shows that the language policing is not a static or fixed action, on the contrary, it is contingent and language policy may change in the interaction depending on the orientations of the teacher and students. Hence, one cannot claim that a particular foreign language class is *L2 only* class or vice a versa. The naturally occurring interaction in a

particular class should confirm the validity of this finding. This emic perspective also is defined as *relevancy of categorization* by Schegloff (as cited in Peräkylä, 1997). In studies of institutional setting, “there is the danger of importing institutional context to data.” (Peräkylä, 1997, p.213). For instance, in the previous example, the presupposition that foreign language classes are the places where the *L2 only* policy operates may be refuted with the naturally occurring interaction. Thus, Peräkylä, (1997) asserts that inherent organization of the talk may be better understood without referring to the institutional context. In this study, the background information about the schools and the practicum were only given to familiarise the readers with the pre-service English language teachers’ practicum context in a state university in Turkey. The data was not analysed considering the participants were the mere practicing novices or the data was not analysed in the light of pre-existing theories such as IRF pattern. Rather, line by line analysis was undertaken to describe the teacher led organization of the talk. The final step was to explain them with reference to the existing theories if they were compatible with each other.

However, to inform pre-service teacher education and improve teaching practice, as Kitzinger (2011) suggested the analyst’s outsider judgement becomes relevant. (Please see the section on Applying CA to research foreign language classrooms). In order to minimise the danger of importing institutional context to data Peräkylä (1997) mentioned; the analyst always considers the participants’ orientations first but her interpretation of the *emergent learning teaching opportunities* are also pointed out in the discussion.

Validity also refers to the generalisability of the findings beyond a specific research context. (Seedhouse, 2004). Drawing on previous research on L1 and L2 classroom discourse, Seedhouse (2004) claims that 5-10 lessons may provide generalizable data for the researchers. However, he (2004) notes down that “validity of a study is primarily related to the quality of the analysis

rather than the size of the database.” (p. 88). Thus, in conversation analytic framework, micro-analytic investigation of 16 pre-service teachers in 43 lessons in five different classrooms offers a large database. However, the quality of the analysis will better ensure the generalisability of the findings. In that sense, the detailed transcriptions and the micro-analysis of the teacher-led classroom interaction in the light of the conversation analysis principles will validate the results. In addition, reminding the small databases conversation analysts collect in institutional settings, Peräkylä (1997) claims that the analysis of each particular setting will tell the *possible* language use of participants. The CA results will be generalizable in the sense that they show the *possible* interactional competence of a participant *can* have although the analysis might not reflect some of the interactional devices that the participants use in different institutional settings.

Thus, 16 different pre-service teachers in 43 lessons provide a very comprehensive data and the preliminary analysis shows that in teacher-led classroom interaction, the pre-service teachers established the same sub-contexts as Seedhouse (2004) suggested. The results are in parallel with the previous studies undertaken in different L2 classrooms all over the world which shows the generalisability of the findings.

Reliability refers to the degree to which the finding is independent of accidental circumstances of the research. (Kirk and Miller, 1986; as cited in Peräkylä, 1997). Peräkylä (1997) in his commonly cited chapter on reliability and validity in CA, firstly acknowledges the value of tapes and the videos to increase the reliability of the CA. Especially compared to the field notes of the researcher in ethnography, the videos and tapes can be accessible to the public or other researchers. However, he underscores the fact that video or audio recordings of specific events may lead to loss of some aspects of social interaction such as “medium-and long-span temporal processes, ambulatory events and impact of texts and other non-conversational modalities of action”. (p. 204). Below Peräkylä (1997)’s suggestions to increase the reliability of the

CA research and the precautions taken to increase the current research's reliability will be explained.

Reminding that social organizations are organized in longer temporal spans, such as management of chronically ill patients in a hospital, Peräkylä (1997) claims that the longitudinal study design will be more reliable to describe the organization of verbal interaction to manage the particular tasks in particular settings. In this sense, this study is also a longitudinal study since the practicum and the data collection went hand in hand and took three months. When the practicum of the participants ended, the data collection ended too.

Ambulatory events referred to the people's movements around the research setting. They may regularly change their places so one stationary camera may not capture all the details. In a classroom setting, it is impossible that the teachers' and the students' actions can be captured by only one camera. Since this study aims to explore teacher-fronted classroom discourse; there was one camera that the researcher could control at the back of the classroom to capture teacher talk and movement. The other camera was fixed and it was put to record the whole class. Unfortunately, researcher could not use any voice recorder to record the students' talk or whispers among themselves since the focus was on teacher talk. However, two cameras could help to decipher the students' talk among themselves most of the time. If not, then that sequence was excluded from the analysis.

According to Peräkylä (1997), *texts and other non-conversational modalities of action* refer to the documentary realities, most of the time, the texts. Thus, he believes that the inclusion of those materials into analysis will increase the reliability of the research. Hence, in this study, when the participants oriented to the course books, handouts, smartboard or any material; those were included in the appendix section and in the transcript as a comment of the transcriber.

These limitations refer to the covering the interaction in the particular setting in maximum. To improve the reliability of the CA in its own field, *selection of what is recorded, how much to record, the technical quality of recordings and the adequacy of the transcripts* are the key aspects suggested by Peräkylä (1997). Below the way this dissertation addresses these aspects will be presented.

As mentioned below, the data collection procedure went hand in hand with the practicum process. Thus, the whole classes in which the pre-service teachers (who agreed to be recorded) taught were recorded. Only one lesson (Pt 1 and Pt 2's first teachings) in the secondary school were excluded from the database since it was all in Turkish. This large database also helped to spot the same phenomena in different pre-service teachers' teachings as well. The large database was also important since the CA was a data driven research methodology and the data itself guides the researcher to find a research question.

The technical quality of the recordings is also critical issue in reliability of the findings. The video cameras were high quality (Sony HDR-CX 360) and tripods were used to support them to capture the details. The camera at the back was controlled by the researcher so she could change the direction when she needed to do so. The places the camera was positioned were determined by the researcher and she was in the classroom during the recordings.

Finally, since the transcripts are the representation of the data, the quality of the transcription is equally important to ensure the reliability of the analysis. According to Peräkylä (1997), transcription is a skill and it takes training and practice to produce reliable transcriptions. The researcher regularly attended the data sessions held in HUMAN for three years. In data sessions, a group of researchers and students work together on a piece of data and check the reliability of the transcripts watching the raw video again and again. And then, they could analyse the sequence and share their findings. Hence, the

researcher could use these data sessions as a great opportunity to improve her transcription skills.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter reported on the methodology of the research. The conversation analysis as a research method has distinctive ways of analysing the naturally occurring interaction to explore human interaction and accomplishment of actions through talk. Thus, using micro analytic tools, this study attempts to explore the interactional organization of the pre-service teacher led classroom interaction. It basically analyses the sequence openings and closings of the pre-service teachers' and their accomplishment of their pedagogical focus. The analysis of institutional talk requires the information about the setting of the research context to better understand the environment. Thus, having stated the research questions of the study, the information about the setting and the participants were given. The procedure to access to the research setting and the data collection were explained step by step.

In the data analysis part, a brief introduction to the conversation analysis was provided and its application into classroom interaction was explained. And then the detailed procedure of the production of the transcripts were demonstrated. The data analysis was illustrated with reference to the basic principles of the conversation analysis. Finally, the reliability and validity issues were addressed.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of the sequential and pedagogical organization of the pre-service English teachers' talk in teacher fronted lessons executed under the supervision of their mentors and supervisors. The main aim of this dissertation is to unearth the ways pre-service teachers establish and maintain their pedagogical focus in classroom interaction. As a first step, the emergent contexts in Pt-led EFL classroom interaction in secondary and high schools will be identified. Adopting an emic and data driven perspective, this study unearths in-between contexts as well. Rather than rigid categories, the findings are presented in a continuum of contingent pedagogical and interactional foci. After description of the emerging contexts, Pts establishment and maintenance of the pedagogical foci will be explored as it is stated in the next research question. In parallel with this aim, the interactional and pedagogical resources to establish and maintain the pedagogical focus and thereby learning opportunities generated will be presented.

The contexts that emerged from Pt led EFL classroom interaction are *focus on form*, *focus on meaning* and *focus on fluency*. These are also the general headings of the result chapter. These contexts will be analysed with regards to:

- Establishment and maintenance of the pedagogical focus (setting the pedagogical agenda, engaging learners)

- Managing students contributions (responding to learners' initiations, questions, learners' claims of insufficient knowledge, learners' responses)
 - Teaching opportunities (Thorough managing students contributions)

In the first section, micro –analysis of establishment and maintenance of the *focus on form* will be presented. It refers to a context in which participants negotiate and appropriate the language structures and focus on the language form. It also involves student initiations related to task and the language itself. As a second section, *focus on meaning* in which participants discuss and negotiate the meaning will be presented. Focus on meaning involves negotiation of one word or a concept to reach a mutual agreement on the meaning.

Finally, *focus on fluency* context involves the participants' relatively longer contributions pertaining to their personal lives and creating a similar everyday conversation between the students and the teacher.

After describing the establishment and maintenance of the emerging contexts, the interactional and pedagogical resources used by the pre-service teachers will be analysed considering the emerging learning opportunities for each context. The discussion of the results will be presented drawing on the recent micro-analytic research on foreign language classrooms.

4.2 Focus on Form

This section will first describe the context *focus on form*. Next, the interactional and pedagogical resources that Pts use to establish and maintain their pedagogical focus in the teacher-led classroom interaction will be explored through representative instances. After each extract, brief discussion relating the findings to the recent literature will be presented. And then, the Pts' ways of managing students' contributions to maintain the focus will be

explored further. Lastly, a brief summary and discussion of focus on form will be provided.

The focus on *form* manifests itself in the classroom interaction through a strong orientation towards the language forms and correctness. In alignment with the PTs' momentary pedagogical focus, Pts initiate known-answer questions and employ repairs to ensure accuracy. It is also clear that the students also align themselves with the teacher's momentary focus. However, as the interaction unfolds, the participants' focus may change and divert from the focus on form. The diversions and the contingent nature of the classroom discourse will be explored in detail and displayed through moment-by-moment analysis of the segments. The name of the context is taken from Seedhouse's (2004) ground-breaking study on *the interactional architecture of classroom interaction*. Hence, the focus on form context in this study and Seedhouse's (2004) form and accuracy context are similar. They both point out the focus on form and accuracy of the language structures.

4.2.1 Establishment and Maintenance of the Pedagogical Focus

4.2.1.1 Maintaining the Focus

The first extract is taken from the Pt1's final teaching executed in 5B in the primary school. The students read a short text about the activities three friends did at the weekend. Then Pt1 drew a table on the board. In the first column, she wrote the names of the three friends in each cell. In the first row, she wrote the days (e.g. Saturday morning and Sunday evening). And then she began to show at least two different pictures of the characters and requested students to choose the relevant picture and say one activity the character was doing at the weekend. Before the sequence below, students chose the first picture (George is playing tennis on Saturday morning) and put the relevant picture on the relevant place. The extract shows the interaction between PT1 (T) and Betül (B) a student in the classroom who bid for the turn. Finally, Bilge

(BG) participated in the interaction. (Please see the methodology chapter for the title of the extracts pp.24).

Extract FF 1: Pt1_5B_TT: "George is going to the cinema with his friends "

- 1 T: ye::s what is he doing? after the tennis?
- 2 B: söyliyim mi?
shall i say
- 3 T: yes you can say
+she looks for the photos of two different activities, doesn't look at the class
- 4 T: what is he doing okay?
+ shows two different pictures
- 5 LL: ((most of the students including Betül raise their hands))
- 6 T: Betül?
- 7 B: ((stands up))
- 8 B: george is: (0.2) yo↑k saturda↑y
no
- 9 T: no:
+smiles
- 10 LL: ((unintelligible murmurs))
- 11 T: ON saturday (.) or:::?
- 12 (0.6)
- 13 B: >on saturday or< er:: >şey< go to the
14 cinema
15 (0.6)
- 16 T: he is::::?
- 17 B: >he is < (.) go to the cinema=

18 T: = going
 19 B: [go↑ing cinema
 20 T: [to the cinema
 21 T: with his ?
 + turns to the blackbord to stick the
 relevant photo on the table
 22 BG: °friends°=
 23 T: =friends
 24 T: ((sticks the photo in which George is at
 25 the cinema with his friends on the board))

In the first line, the Pt1 initiated a known answer question. As a response, Betül asked for the turn in Turkish which shows her willingness to take the turn and offer a candidate answer. Although the teacher accepted her request to take the turn (3), she did not look at the class and she was choosing the pictures to show the class. In line 4, she repeated her question demonstrating the pictures this time. It is apparent that most of the students wanted to take the turn to answer the question. The teacher gave the turn to Betül (6) successfully this time. In line 8, B began to say George's weekend activity; then she cut off her sentence, after two seconds of silence she initiated self-repair and attempted to construct her sentence differently. However, in line 9, the teacher gave direct negative evaluation and smiled at the class. Following this mitigated negative evaluation, an unintelligible murmur rose among the students (10). In line 11, the teacher uttered the preposition "on" with heavy emphasis before *saturday* and then said "or" in a questioning tone to elicit the right answer from the student. Thus, she both employed other initiated other repair and implied that there was one alternative and preferred answer. In the next turn, after 0.6 seconds of silence, Betül did not orient to the teacher's repair and elicitation move. She just echoed the teacher's turn. It is obvious

that she did not take teacher's turn as a question since she just echoed her utterance. In the same line, she uttered a correct answer according to text and said "*go to cinema*" (13-14). After 0.6 seconds of silence, in line 16, the teacher constructed Designedly Incomplete Utterance (hereafter DIU) (Koshik, 2002) to open space for Betül to complete the sentence which shows that Betül's answer was not a preferred one. In line 18, Betül merely parroted the DIU the teacher offered in non-questioning tone, which may show that this is still not an *uptake* for her. Then she repeated her previous answer (17). As a response, in line 18, the teacher supplied the part of the correct answer by saying *going*. In the next turn, Betül changed the form of her utterance and said "going cinema". At the same time, the teacher overlapped with Betül and added one more item to her previous repair phrase (20). However, it is not sequentially evident that the student took up this repair. In line 21, the teacher added the last phrase in the form of DIU to elicit the word "friends". Then she turned her back to the class and tried to stick the photo showing George at the cinema with his friends. Bilge completed the DIU silently (22) and the teacher confirmed her answer by repeating it while she was sticking the photo on the board (lines 23, 24 and 25).

This long sequence shows a frequent example of the repair organization of the teacher talk in the case of dispreferred answer from the student. The first five lines show teacher's preparation for the question and in the fourth line the teacher initiated the known-answer question. Then, the teacher chose one student among those who wanted to take the turn. After the turn-giving task was accomplished, in line 8, the student gave the response. After the first response, a long series of responses and re-initiations followed. In the first re-initiation, the teacher gave explicit negative assessment which is the way the teachers are claimed not to prefer that much. (Seedhouse, 1997, 2004). However, Pt_1 gave direct negative feedback but tried to mitigate her turn (Line 9) as evidenced by her smile. In line 11, she repaired Betül's turn and initiated a correction as a follow-up move. (Lee, 2007) .This initiation move resulted in learner's utterance "go to the cinema" in the next turn (13-14). The

teacher attempted to use DIUs (lines 16, 21) to navigate the discourse and direct the student's utterances. It is similar to the interactional resource Lee (2007) put forward as "parsing". She used DIUs to parse the sentence and attempted to elicit the parts of the sentence. As a result, the students gave the parts of the sentence rather than the full sentence "*George is going to the cinema with his friends.*" In the final turn, she herself did not utter the full form of the sentence. Rather she just stuck the photo on the board. Thus in the final evaluation move, she used the blackboard but on the board there was only a photo of George at the cinema with his friends. This may make the meaning accessible to the learners in the class; however, Betül and the rest of the class did not hear the full form of the sentence.

The micro analysis points out that the pre-service teachers establish their focus on form with a known-answer question (Mehan, 1979). When the students provide dispreferred answers, the PTs may give direct negative evaluation to the students and use DIUs as next turn repair initiators in the form and accuracy context to elicit the preferred responses. The use of DIUs helps the teachers to parse the sentence and elicit the preferred answers phrase by phrase. When they use DIUs, they automatically give the part of the correct answer as well. (Lines 20 and 25). The use of DIUs, and supplying the part of the correct answer help the teacher to negotiate and appropriate the form maintaining her pedagogical focus. Supporting CA for SLA, He (2004) claims that DIUs have the power of scaffolding learners and with the help of them "the teacher is able to create and present an opportunity for the students to partake in the formulation of the learning material, thereby assigning some authorship (and thus ownership) to the students" (He, 2004, p. 578). Walsh's (2006) Classroom Interactional Competence framework describes a competent teacher who shapes learner contributions by "helping learners to say what they mean by using the most appropriate language to do so." (p.9). Thus, it could be claimed that use of DIUs maintain students' participation, engage them and help them to practice the language.

On the other hand, Netz (2016) claims that use of DIUs may facilitate the participation of the students at first glance but it may be a superficial one which may not lead to internalisation and learning in the end. Netz (2016) presents that the contributions of the learners elicited through DIUs are mostly one –word and extensive use of them may inhibit student engagement especially when DIUs are not transparent for the learners. In the extract above, for the student B, the DIUs are not transparent. That is, she could not take them up (line 17) and build her sentence in the first place. She just merely repeated them which may imply that she did not internalise the structure. In the end she did not provide the full sentence as well.

Thus, although use of DIUs and supplying the part of the answer are the resources the PTs use to shape learner contributions in Walsh's terms (2006) and navigate the discourse, it is not sequentially evident that it leads to an immediate uptake on the part of the learners.

As it is seen in the extract, the last turn of the teacher which closed the sequence was only on content and the meaning of the text and it was not an oral evaluation. The candidate teacher used the board to close the sequence. Considering the final closing turn as a feedback and learning opportunity for the class, it is interesting to see the use of board in the final turn. The third turn was considered as a multifunctional turn performing many actions in classroom interaction (Hall, 2000; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Walsh, 2002; Hellerman, 2003; Lee, 2007; Park, 2014) and it may create learning opportunities or hinder them (Seedhouse, 1996; Walsh, 2002; Waring, 2008). Drawing on Walsh's classroom interactional competence framework, Can- Daşkın (2015) found out *the use of board* is a way to shape learner contributions in an English preparatory school in a Turkish state university. This is also parallel with Schwab's (2011) conceptualisation of the language classes which shows that the classroom interaction is a *multilogue* rather than a dialogue between a teacher and specific student. The participants in the classroom always address more than one person in the class, the other

members of the class who are listeners or bystanders are also the addressees even they are not involved in the interaction. In this sense, the board is an important resource to address the members of the classroom who are not involved in the ongoing interaction.

However, in Can-Daşkın (2015) data, the teachers use the board in accompany to their talk. Since the teachers addressed the whole class they wanted to make sure that the whole class saw the spelling of the word since the focus was on form. Thus, besides their explanation and elaboration, they used the board to make the target language form visible to the whole class. In PT's teachings the data reveal that they used the board in the closing turn without any elaboration. Thus, it is sequentially evident that the students did not hear the full sentence; they were only provided with the written form on the board.

This representative extract from young learner class showed that when PTs focus on form, they initiate a known-answer question. To elicit preferred responses from learners, they employ next turn repair initiators in the form of DIUs. The use of DIUs help teacher to parse the sentences and could be an interactional and pedagogical resource. However, in the last turn, PTs prefer to revoice students' previous turn without any elaboration. In cooperation with revoicing, the board is used in the third turn in IRF sequence. To sum up, use of DIUs and the board are the resources to maintain focus on form; however, in the last turn PTs echo the students' incomplete responses and do not make effective use of the last turn and provide the full sentence. This gives the impression that the last turn is not fully made use of, teaching opportunity is missed.

Similar to the young learners' classroom, in the high school, the DIUs are employed to maintain the form and accuracy context. In the next episode, Pt11 was explaining the meaning of the preposition "through" in the high school, Prep K. In the course book, there was the list of prepositions of movement such as *up, out of, under, through* (pleas see Appendix E) Drawing on embodied

resources, she explained the prepositions one by one. The last item on the list was *go through*.

Extract FF 2: Pt11_Prep K_FT_ "go through"

1 T: and then through (1.2)
+ finds a box and shows a box to
class
2 for example think of this as a tunnel
3 (0.4) do you know what a tunnel is?
4 s1: tünel
5 T: yes tünel (1.5) I am here with my car and I
6
+shows the box*¹
7 wanna go (0.5) here do you know what do I
+shows the box*²
8 do with my car?
9 (1.2)
10 s1: err
11 T: [to come here?]
12 s1: [your car] goes to[↑] (1.5) err
13 through(.) through[↑]
14 T: like
15 s2: I (.) go °I go°
16 T: close
17 s2 °through°
18 T: again I use to (0.7) I have to use a verb[↑]
19 (1.7) yes I go?
20 s1: yes I go through (.) to
21 T: close enough (0.6) I go through?
22 s1: the tünel
23 T: yes (.) I go through the?
24 s1: tünel

25 T: ↑tunnel (.)so what is through?
 26 (1.8)
 27 I go through the?
 28 s1: *tünel*
 29 T: so what is it?(0.7)in turkish?(1)what is
 30 <I go through?>
 31 LL: *içinden geçmek*
 32 T: okay

In the first line, PT 11 signalled the next item on the list and after 1.2 seconds of thinking time, she showed a small rectangular shaped box to the class. She found the box on the table and showed it to the class spontaneously and requested students to suppose that was a tunnel. After a brief silence, she initiated an insert expansion to the sequence and check whether they knew the word “*tunnel*”. As a response to this knowledge check question, s1 provided the Turkish equivalence of the word *tünel* , which is the cognate of *tunnel* in English. PT11 acknowledged and repeated this contribution to announce it to the class. Then she showed the box to the class again and pointed out the entrance and (*1) and exit (*2) of the imagined tunnel (5-7) asked her action in that context. It is clear that the Pt11 established a meaning context to visualise the preposition of the movement “through”. In line 10, after 1,2 seconds of silence, s1 uttered a hesitation marker implying she could take the turn. In the next line PT 11 overlapped with her and continued to ask her question. At the same time, s1 began her turn and in alignment with the teacher’s set up context she designed her turn (12-13). She first uttered *goes to in* rising intonation then she stopped for 1,5 seconds. It was a relatively long pause but everybody in the class oriented to this silence as intra turn silence due to the rising intonation pattern which implies that the speaker holds the turn. After a slight hesitation, S1 provided the preposition *through* twice (12-13). PT 11 acknowledged this contribution and said *like* (14) which functioned as a next turn repair initiator for the class members. This repair

initiator is multifunctional in the sense that it both signals the answer is not a preferred answer but it has a potential to be a preferred one. This repair initiation also signifies that the teacher was looking for a full answer which shows a momentary departure from meaning context and evolving into a different one: *focus on form*. This claim is proven in the next turns (15-16-17) considering the PT 11's orientations towards the students' contributions. S2 self selected herself and provided an answer (15). As a response, the Pt11 initiated repair similar to the one in line 14. In line 17, s2 continued his utterance provided the preposition but in a very quiet tone. It is highly probable that Pt11 did not hear this contribution since she initiated another repair and provided an explanation which also functioned as a repair initiator (Seedhouse, 2004). After 1, 7 seconds of a long collective silence in the classroom, she provided DIU this time (19). S1 self-selected herself and gave an answer (20). However, it was not the preferred one for the teacher. After one more attempt to initiate repair (21), s1 gave the preferred answer (22) which was oriented by the teacher's EPA. In line 23, the teacher repeated her question designed in the form of DIU and received the same answer (24). In the next line, Pt11 asked another question which was followed by a long collective silence (25- 26). And then, she provided DIU and s1 gave the word in Turkish this time. In line 29, the teacher initiated the same question again and asked the meaning. After 0, 7 seconds of silence, she repaired her own question and requested the meaning of the sentence in Turkish. This time, the whole classroom gave the answer in chorus. Finally, Pt11 said okay to end the sequence.

This sequence shows Pt11's attempt to combine meaning and form of a preposition "through". It was evident that by means of demonstration and embodied resources she first conveyed the meaning of the preposition, then employing DIUs and providing metalinguistic explanation she wanted to elicit the form. The use of gestures in explaining vocabulary (van Compernelle & Smotrova, 2017); gesture and talk combination in learning new prepositions (Eskildsen & Wagner, 2015) are frequently studied in recent literature and

found to be useful in many respects. Similarly, in this study, PTs use of gestures help them to maintain their pedagogical focus and facilitate their teaching practice. DIUs are pedagogical and interactional tools to navigate discourse and help learners to self-repair. In the last turn, L1 is used to check understanding of the class members and then PT is able to end the sequence.

Extract 3 demonstrates an example of focus on form along with a mode shift sequence (Walsh, 2006). The Pt4 in Prep B in her first teaching constructed a meaning context and initiated this question “I want you to play a guessing game” and wanted students to close their eyes and think about their mothers to guess about their current activities and actions. The language focus was present continuous tense. Since the teacher asked them an information seeking question, it can be claimed that the teacher candidate constructed a meaning context. The extract presents the question - answer sequence between the Pt4 and S3.

Extract FF 3: Pt4_Prep B_ FT: “my father is looking for a restaurant”

1 T: an↑d?
2 (0.8)
3 S3: my mum err (0.9)my father is looking for a
4 restaurant to the eat (.) my father is
5 lookinging
6 (0.6)
7 T: why he is (0.4) why is he looking for?
8 S3: because he is hungry
9 (0.2)
10 T: in a full sentence
+ opens her two hands to show the beginning
11 and end of a full sentence
12 S3: err (0.8) my father is looking for a
13 restaurant to the eat
14 T: to eat something

15 S3: to eat something
16 (0.4)
17 T: because?
18 S3: because he is hungry
19 (1)
20 ((s25 raises her hand))
21 T: you please?

The third extract starts after one of the student's answer. In line 1, Pt4 invited other students from the class to answer. After 0.8 seconds of silence; S3 wanted to take the turn and started to talk about her father's current action. Although the candidate teacher wanted students to talk about their mothers, this student talked about her father which demonstrated that the context is not as strict as focus on form. Between lines 3 and 5 the student gave the answer. It is evident that the student was practicing the present continuous tense and playing with the language. Following her response, the teacher initiated another information seeking question which performs as next turn repair initiator. She did not orient to the incorrect part of the answer which matched the pedagogical agenda of the context. In line 8, S3 oriented to the teacher's repair initiation. In line 10, Pt4 initiated another next turn repair initiator and uttered "in a full sentence". In addition, she used her two hands to visualise the beginning and end of a sentence and she opened them wide and facing each other so that its length indicated a full sentence. This repair initiator altered the mode and indicated that the momentary pedagogical focus of the teacher was on form. "In a Full sentence" expression was used by most of the candidate teachers to move into the *form and accuracy* context. In addition, Pt 4 used her hands to demonstrate the sentence along with this next turn repair initiator. The student oriented to this mode shift and constructed a full sentence. In line 14, the teacher directly repaired the student's problematic part of the sentence this time. This was also the clear indicator of the mode shift. In line 15, s3 echoed the teacher's response. After 0.4 seconds

of silence, the teacher initiated further repair by a DIU. It seems as if it is an information seeking question which the interaction back to the meaning and fluency context. However, it still reflects the PT 4's focus on elicitation of a full sentence. In line 18, the student gave a response and without any comment the teacher gave the turn to the other voluntary student to elicit her answer.

Although the teacher candidate initiated a mode shift and wanted the student to construct a full sentence, she herself as a teacher did not echo the full sentence and gave feedback only on the incorrect part. Without any elaboration, she moved back to the main mode. In this sense, the extract 3 only reflects Initiation- Response and re-initiation moves without any assessment or feedback. It seems that one second of silence (19) is oriented as a positive assessment by the learners so that the student s25 bid for the turn. This extract demonstrates quick decision making of PT and her way of responding to students' needs as Waring (2016) suggests "teachers should be responsible to the moment". Her request for full sentence which alters the context helps the learner to self-repair addressing the simultaneity of the moment. The follow-up questions maintain the pedagogical focus and keep the learner on track. Similar to the previous extracts, *the missing case of the last turn* is evident here. PTs passing the E move (in IRE- Initiation, Response, Evaluation) and moving on to the next speaker is the only evidence for learners that their answer is preferred.

The next extract comes from PT 14's first teaching in Prep K in the high school. Pt 14 initiated a task in which students worked in a group of four. The purpose of the task was to let students to practice *should / should not* structure. Thus, this extract is presented in *focus on form* section. Each group was given a problem such as "*my roommate in dormitory is noisy. I cannot study. What should I do?*" (This problem was assigned to group 3 and the extract below demonstrates group 3's interaction). After the group members read the problem, each of them was required to write a piece of advice using the structure *should* individually. The class learnt this structure just before this

lesson. And then each member read her/his advice aloud. Each member should write a different sentence in the group. If they wrote the same sentence or a similar sentence, they were told that they would lose points. That was the only rule the teacher specified. Other students in the class were told to listen to the sentences the group members produce in order to check the violation of the rule.

Extract FF 4: Pt14_Prep K_FT_ "talk your friend"

1 T: err time is up ↑(1) are you ready?
2 s13: yes
3 T: your answer please?
4 s13: you should talk your friend
5 T: >you should talk your frie::nd <
6 s14: you should don't care
7 T: you should (.) not don't care you
8 shouldn't care
9 s20: yanlış söyledi
she said it incorrectly
10 T: huh huh but I can accept it
11 s15: err <you should change your room(.)mate>
12 T: >you should change your roommate<
13 s16: you should go to the other room
14 T: >you should go to the other room< you
15 got four points

As it is stated above the group was the third group; so the teacher did not repeat the instruction. Instead she just warned the group members about the time limit and checked whether they were ready to read their sentences. In line 4, s13 read her sentence and the teacher re-echoed the sentence quickly. The second member of the group, s14 read her sentence (6). In the next line, the teacher (Pt14) repeated the first part of the sentence, after a micropause she initiated other initiated repair and uttered the sentence in an appropriate

grammatical form emphasising the word *shouldn't*. (8) In the following line, referring to s14's dispreferred answer (6), s20 from the other group voiced the ungrammaticality of the sentence to imply that the group must lose a point. The teacher oriented to his concern and said that she would accept the answer. In the following lines, the teacher re-echoed the students' answers as they read them quickly. Finally, she said they got four points as a final closing turn.

The activity – the *task as work plan* (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 93) was designed to let students practice the structure *should*. At first glance, the pedagogical focus could have been identified as form. However, the candidate teacher did not set a rule for students to produce grammatical sentences in the instruction. Thus, *task-in process* (Seedhouse, 2004, p.93) was shaped to practice *meaning* at first. She wanted students to produce sentences to give advice to the people having problems. However, she employed other initiated other repair (7-8) to correct s14's sentence, which shows the rapid change regarding pedagogical focus. The other initiated other repair is the clear indication of the focus on *form*. However, when a student pointed out the ungrammaticality of the sentence, PT 14 did not orient to his concern and gave one point for the incorrect answer. This proves that the PT 14 attempted to combine meaning and form at the same time (Seedhouse, 1997). The task in process led to focus on form and meaning at the same time. In addition, in line 4, s13's sentence lacks a preposition *to* (*talk to someone*). PT 14 did not orient to this grammatical mistake and echoed s13's utterance without any repair attempt. It is not sequentially clear whether the teacher passed up the repair to maintain the progressivity of the task or she herself did not notice the s13's mistake.

In the first group, one of the students also read his sentence *you should talk to your friend* to give advice to somebody witnessing his friend's cheating on the exam. In that group, PT 14 echoed this response as well. Thus, in the same task, PT 14 provided Explicit Positive Assessment (Waring, 2009) (hereafter

EPA) to both grammatical and ungrammatical sentence by repeating students' answers in a flat tone of voice. Park (2014) displays the roles of third turn repeats in different contexts in language classrooms. While in meaning and fluency contexts, repetition may function as a clarification request and help learners to elaborate on and extend their answers; in the form and accuracy contexts repeats function as the confirmation of the students' contribution and do not make any post-expansions relevant on the part of the student. As a result, teacher repetition functions as an assessment and gives the message that the answer is preferred and accepted. Thus, supporting Park's (2014) findings, the results show that the PTs' repetition in the third turn in form and accuracy contexts produce the triadic dialogue (IRE) and marking the third turn as a final evaluation move.

In conversation analytic framework, since the progressivity of the talk is maintained and the focus on form and accuracy is established through teacher's repair; teacher talk serves well to the purpose. Also it may be claimed that since the PTs' momentary agenda was to practice *should* and *should not*, it was on purpose not to repair s13's utterance. Still, the presence of the repair on form in lines 7-8 and students' task to monitor the group member's utterance give the evidence that the momentary focus is on form. In this sequence, PTs use of echo is evident to maintain the focus and give positive assessment in the last turn.

The existing literature do not support use of EPA or repetitions, even some present sequential evidence that they prevent emerging learning opportunities (Waring, 2008; Park, 2014). Waring (2008) showed that EPAs may prevent students asking further questions, Park (2014) demonstrated that revoicings in form and accuracy context do not lead to learning. It is clear that as PTs are providers of input in classroom interaction, learners mostly rely on teachers in this sense. Hence, design of the turns if they limited or mere echoes of previous turns naturally limit the teaching space.

4.2.1.1.1. Summary of Maintaining Focus in Focus on Form

Focus on form manifests itself in the unfolding classroom interaction with a known-answer question. To maintain the focus, next turn repair initiators are enacted in IRF sequence. One of the next turn repair initiator is DIU. To keep learners engaged and help learners to self-repair, DIUs are extensively used. They also navigate and parse the discourse and sentences (Extracts 1, 2 and 3). While maintaining learners' participation and help teachers to elicit partial answers from learners; their pedagogical value is controversial. They may lead to mere parroting on part of learners as seen in Extract 1.

Secondly, as a next turn repair initiator, *request for full sentence* is used. Request for full sentence is the mostly employed teacher initiated self repair action which clearly convey focus of the teacher to the class and help learners to self-repair (Extract 3). It is clear that the inter-subjectivity between PTs and learners is achieved and learners repair their previous utterance to produce complete sentences. This interactional resource will be further exemplified in next section. Finally, in extract 2, metalinguistic explanation is provided as a clue to let the learner reformulate his sentence.

In addition to next turn repair initiators which create space for learners to self-repair, PTs use other initiated other repair (OIORs) on form which is the clear evidence of the pedagogical focus (Extracts 1, 2, 3 and 4). PTs mostly provide part of the preferred sentence in those cases (Extract 1, 2 and 3). In the last example (Extract 4: talk your friend), PT provided direct negative evaluation and produced the full sentence herself.

These next turn repair initiators, or OIORs are the follow ups PTs use to navigate the discourse. In Evaluation turns, they do not provide the full sentence or even produce oral utterance. They use the board (Extract 1) to make meaning clear and complete the task. In some cases, (Extract 3 and 4), instead of the third turn, PTs select or participants self-select themselves to take the next turn to answer the same question orienting to the silence. Use of

EPAs and Teacher Echo is prevalent. In extract 2, Pt 11 provided EPA and the in the final extract, Pt 14 repeated the answers.

This sub-section presented a brief summary of maintaining focus on form. The next sub-section will present the managing students' contributions while focus is on form. In the end of focus on form section, a comprehensive discussion of focus on form will be provided.

4.2.1.2 Managing Students' Questions

In form and accuracy contexts, the students initiated task related or language related questions. This subsection will present those moments when the students take initiative and voice their questions. Those moments are significant and teachable moments since they show genuine interest and attention on the language form on the part of the student.

The first representative example of a student initiation related to the task. It comes from Pt 9's teaching in the high school in Prep D. Pt 9 was following the course book to do the listening and the speaking activity (please see Appendix F) The learners were expected to listen to the explanations about the public services and name the public service explained. On the left side of the page, there were eight incomplete sentences like "*deposit or withdraw some money?*" on the right side, the name and the picture of the public services were provided to the learners. The instruction in the course book was this: "listen and say: in which place can we?" There was one example available to the learners written in different colour: *We can deposit or withdraw some money at a bank.* Extract 2 demonstrates the interaction sequence between a student (S1) and the Pt 9 (T).

Extract FF 5: Pt9_Prep D_FT: I want you to match these sentences with places

- 1 T: now(0.6) you have these sentences here and I
want
- 2 you to match these sentences with the places

3 (5.2)

4 we can start with the post office

5 (0.9)

6 s1: + raises her hand

7 T: yeah

8 s1: bi şey de sorucam önce cümleyi mi söylüyoruz?
I will ask something () will we say the sentence

9 yoksa önce şeyi mi söylüyoruz ?
or the thing first?

10 T: we are gonna match them (0.8) doesn't matter

11 S1 ha tamam
ohh okay

12 (1.1)

13 deposit or withdraw some money(.)bank↑

14 T: no↑ I want you to use it in full sentence (0.6)

15 like err <we can borrow return books at a

16 library >

17 (2.4)

18 you can use it with can

19 (1.5)

20 s1: we can deposit or withdraw some money↓

21 (1.1)

22 T: at?

23 s1: at bank

24 T: yes

PT 9 signalled the emerging instruction sequence with a discourse marker “now” (1). Although the course book did not provide full sentences and the activity was kind of matching and completion activity; she designed her turn as if the activity was a mere matching activity. After her first initiation, she waited for 5.2 seconds for students to finish the task (3). Then, she signalled that it was time to start the activity and guided learners to start with the post

office ignoring the fact that the post office was the sixth item in the list (4). In the next line, s1 raised her hand to take the turn. The Pt9 gave the turn to her. In line 8, the student first initiated pre-positioned meta-statement (Linell et al, 2003 as cited in Duran, 2017) and asked a question about the task in Turkish. This initiation type matches the B type in Waring's (2011) typology. The student raised her hand to take the turn (6), however, her turn did not start a new sequence, and it was designed as a *pre-expansion* (Schegloff, 2007) to her response turn. It is apparent that she did not understand the task and did not know what to say first. Following this question, the teacher underlined the fact that it was a matching task (10). In line 11, the student uttered an acknowledgement token *ah tamam (oh okay)* first. Ignoring the teacher's instruction (line 4, *we can start with the post office*) she followed the order in the book and matched the bank and its explanation (13). Immediately, the teacher gave an explicit negative assessment and designed her turn as next turn repair initiator. She first said "*I want you to use it in full sentence*" and emphasised the pedagogical agenda of the moment. Then, she provided an example sentence slowly to make it accessible to the learners. After 2.4 seconds of silence, she provided the language structure as well (18). After 1, 5 seconds of long silence, s1 offered her candidate answer. Then 1, 1 seconds of silence followed and Pt9 initiated a kind of DIU "at" to elicit the rest of the sentence which worked perfectly as s1 gave the preferred answer in the following line (23). In the third turn, Pt9 gave an EPA and closed the sequence.

The information related to instruction in the lines 14-19 was new to the learners and S1 dispreferred answer (13) actually guided the Pt 9 to repair herself and redesign her instruction. In other words, the student's dispreferred answer helped the candidate teacher reformulate her instruction. It is apparent that there was a mismatch between instruction in the course book and the instruction of the teacher. That mismatch resulted in the student's opening up a pre-expansion before her answer (8) and giving an answer (13) which was dispreferred by the teacher (14).

Literature on pre-service teacher talk shows that giving clear instructions is a challenging task for Pts and it takes time to develop (Hosoda & Aline, 2010). If the instruction is understood by learners, the tasks can be completed smoothly without further insert expansions. If not, then students who take initiative mark the trouble source and initiate repair for Pt self-repair as in Extract 5. Thus, it could be claimed that Classroom Interactional Competence is not only needed for teachers, but students also need it to manage interaction for their emerging instructional needs. Language learners who are active agents in their learning process should be competent to manage the interaction by taking initiatives, asking questions and let the teacher know that instruction is not clear.

In this exhibit, the participants negotiated both the task and the form. The PTs used *request for full sentence* to make clear her pedagogical focus and initiate repair. She also employed DIU to elicit the preferred answer. In the third turn, Pt gave an EPA saying *yes* and closed the sequence. Similar to the extracts presented above, in this extract the closing turn was designed as an EPA. The complete sentence was not provided. It is clear that there is a strong tendency towards the progressivity of the activity, so Pt 9 moved to the next item on the list.

The students sometimes have questions related to the language form which show their clear focus on the language structures. The following exhibits below demonstrate a language related question initiated by the student.

This example was taken from Pt2's teaching in the primary school in 5-B. She showed pictures of people in pain to the class one by one to teach the names of the illnesses. The students were expected to say the name of the illness in a sentence such as *he has got a headache*. She initiated the sequence with the help of the material and asked the name of the illness. This sequence involves the Pt2 (T) and five students (S1, S2, S3, S4 and S5). This example is an example for questions related to language forms.

Extract FF 6: Pt2_5B_TT_ "why does it take the"

- 1 T: ↑lets look at this picture
+shows the picture to the class
- 2 s1: grip olmuş ingilizcesini de söyliyim mi?
he has the flu shall I say it in English?
- 3 T: this is my illnesses this is my illnesses as
4 you see↑
5 ((sticks the picture on the board))
- 6 S2: ingilizcesi nasıl?
how do we say it in English?
- 7 S3: fli
- 8 S4: hayır flii değil ki
no it is not fli
- 9 T: what is it ? please read it?
+shows the word
- 10 LL: flu ((in chorus))
- 11 T: he has got ?
- 12 S5: flu
- 13 T: ((sticks the word *flu* on the board))
- 14 T: °a flu ? (.) the flu°
+starts to write the full sentence looking at
the board
- 15 S5: a mı the mı?
a or the?
- 16 T: the flu
+continues writing the sentence on the board
- 17 S5 niye buna the geldi?
why does it take the?
- 18 T: ((T has just finished writing the sentence :
19 he has got the flu))
- 20 T: errr (1.1) this this is the (0.6) the flu(2.2)
+ looks at the class

21 lets look at this picture↑

In line 2, S1 made it clear that she knew the name of the illness and could say it in English. However, she designed her turn in the form of pre-positioned Meta statement (Duran, 2017) in Turkish. In line 3, the Pt2 did not orient to her bidding for the turn and she continued to give hints about the answer. In the beginning of the lesson, she expressed that she had a cold. In addition, the teacher uttered the word *illness* in the plural form which could be considered as incorrect input for the students. After she stuck the picture on the board, the class had a discussion about the word *flu* which ended with teacher's demonstration of the written form of the word. (9). In chorus, the students oriented to the teacher's initiation and read the word card. In line 11, the teacher initiated a DIU to elicit the target word "*flu*" again. When she turned to the board to stick the word under the picture, she first said "*a flu*" in a questioning tone then "*the flu*" in a soft and quiet tone. It could be claimed that the teacher was not sure about the article to use before the word *flu*. Since she uttered "*the flu*" in non- questioning tone in line 14 and started to write the sentence on the board, she might have decided that *the flu* was correct. While she was writing the sentence, s5 initiated a knowledge question "*a mı the mı*" –"a or the" ? in Turkish (15). This was a post-expansion to the teacher's closing turn since she was going to close the sequence by writing the full sentence on the board. This question design referred to the uncertainty of the teacher in the previous line (line 14). The Pt2 gave the answer in the following turn emphasising the "*the*" (16). When she finished writing and turned back to the students, s5 initiated another knowledge question in Turkish again which was another post-expansion: "*niye buna the geldi?* (why does it take "the"). She designed her question in the content (wh-) form (Hayano, 2013), which demonstrated that she was expecting an explanation from the teacher. This wh- question type is called as *challenge questions* by Koshik (2003). At that moment, the full sentence, *he has got the flu*, was on the board and available to the whole class. In line 20, as an answer to s5' content question,

she first uttered hesitation marker “*errr*” then re-echoed her turn and said “*this is the – the flu*” without an explanation. It could be claimed that this turn may not be a preferred answer for s5 since she designed her question in the content (wh-) form. The teacher closed this sequence with an introduction of a new picture and moved onto a new target word (illness). In other words, the teacher candidate did not orient to the students’ post-expansion and closed the turn.

Pt2, in this sequence, provided the answer (line 18) when a student initiated a question. When faced with a second question, she ignored it and closed the sequence which was a strategy used by the teachers as suggested by Watts et al (1997 as cited in Duran, 2017). These were the two resources the candidate teachers use according to the data: *provide the answer immediately* and *ignore the question*.

It is clear that Pt2 was uncertain about the answer of the question. Thus, she preferred to continue the lesson without any explanation at the expense of emerging teaching opportunity. This is one of the prevalent characteristic of PT talk in teacher-led EFL classroom. They mostly prefer the progressivity, provide short EPAs or echo of students’ previous turns and move into the next activity. It is argued that these strong preference for progressivity kill the emerging teaching opportunities.

Since CA for SLA approach operationalises learning as a socially observable practice which can be documented through the participants’ orientations, to document learning it is indispensable to display the participants’ orientations to it. As Eskildsen and Majlesi (2018) put forward:

Thus, learning is traced, in situ and in vivo, as participants’ displays of the recognition of, and orientations to, something as learnable through some “observable-reportable methods” (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1986, p. 183; Garfinkel, 1967, *passim*), which are inherently indexical and accountable practices. (p. 6).

In other words, the participants in the interaction mark something learnable or teachable (Eskildsen & Majlesi, 2018) through their interactional moves such as initiation repairs (confirmation checks, clarification requests), co-constructed word searches. In this sense, the *teachable* or *learnable* or *learning opportunity* should manifest itself in the unfolding interaction. Le (2013) discusses the CA's emic data driven perspective and the missed learning opportunity which may be claimed as "an analyst imposed category" :

By definition, a missed opportunity is an opportunity that does not materialize or one that arises but is not acted upon, and therefore it is in principle something that the participants cannot possibly orient to as relevant in the interaction. Indeed, the teacher and the students in this excerpt might not have realized that they had let some learning opportunities slip by (Le, 2013, pp. 85).

In Le's (2013) documentation of the Chinese as a foreign language classroom, one student's post expansion is discussed as a potential opportunity to teach on the part of the teacher. However, since the teacher did not orient to that post expansion for various reasons, she missed that opportunity. Thus, in this dissertation, the learning opportunity is operationalised as the participants' repair initiations such as clarification requests, word searches, or questions. If the PTs do not orient to those orientations, then it is considered as a missed teaching / learning opportunity. In this sense, ignoring the question is one the actions that led to missed teaching opportunities in PT teacher talk.

When the students take initiative and ask further questions, it is a valuable opportunity for the teacher to turn it into a teaching moment especially when they speak out of turn. (Garton, 2012). It is in the teacher's hands to react and shape the students' initiatives and contributions. While many good examples of turning teacher initiatives into learning opportunities in the literature (Hall, 1998; Waring, 2009; 2011; Garton, 2012; Walsh& Li, 2013; Sert, 2017); there are very few which shows the inability to facilitate those (Li, 2013). Fagan

(2012) proposed that novice teachers *glossed over* unexpected learner contributions, that is, “the teacher either hurriedly or not at all addressing unexpected learner contributions as they arise in either teacher- or learner-initiated sequences-of-talk” (Fagan, 2012, p.113). Similar to this finding, in PT led EFL classroom discourse, student teachers leave students’ questions unaddressed.

These examples given above also show the complex task of managing student contribution when teacher focus on form. It is evident that passing up the question is not the best option for PTs to create teaching opportunities. The implications for pre-service teacher education will be presented to inform and improve the practice.

The third resource and the most frequently used one to manage students’ questions is to invite peer repair. When confronted with a question, the pre-service teachers asked the question back to the class. This move restarts the IRF sequence and the teacher gains the control of the interaction back (Markee, 1995). In the following example, this pattern will be presented.

Extract 7 was taken from the Pt3’s teaching in the high school, Prep B. In that class, the students were practicing present simple tense. They first talked about the use of the tense. Then Pt3 wrote a number of questions on the board. The sequence below presents eliciting the answer to one of those questions. The question was “what do you wear at school or at home?” Yağmur came to the board to write her answer- *I wear Trouser at home*. This episode involves Pt3 (T), Yağmur (Y), and the students S1, S2 and S3.

Extract FF 7: Pt3_Prep B_FT: “what do you wear at school or at home?”

- 1 T: what was your name?
- 2 Y: yağmur
- 3 Y: ((writes the answer on the board “I wear Trouser

4 at home"))

5 T: okay look at your sentence(.)an:d think once

6 more

7 (1.8)

8 this is correct? (0.9)but I think there are

9 some

10 S1: bence yerleri farklı olmalı
I think it needs reordering

11 T: it doesn't matter

12 s2: sonunda s olacak
it takes s

13 Y: ((rewrites the word trousers))

14 T: capital

15 Y: ((changes the capital T with t))

16 s1: why?

17 T: trousers err (0.8) we use trousers

18 s2: s

19 T: yes plural form trousers thank you

20 s3: what is trousers?

21 T: what are trousers?(1)what do they mean?

22 (1.8)

23 is there anyone errr explain trousers to your

24 friend?

25 s1: it is trousers

26 ((shows his trousers))

27 T: it is?

28 s2: these [are

29 T: [these are trousers

30 s1: these are trousers

31 T: thank you and the last one↑

After Y wrote her answer on the board, the Pt3 employed a non-evaluatory repair initiator (Seedhouse, 2004) by saying *look at your sentence*, after a very short pause wanted the student to think once more (5-6). This turn could lead to teacher initiated-self repair of the student. After the teacher waited for 1.8 seconds, she used another next turn repair initiator and uttered a sentence in a questioning tone, and then provided a metalinguistic explanation without pointing out the misspelled word. This repair initiator created a discussion among the students (10) and helped Y to correct her sentence (13-15). This repair initiator performed as an act to involve other class members into this correction sequence emphasising the nature of classroom interaction as a *multilogue* (Schwab, 2011). In other words, it is sequentially evident that the interaction was not only between Y and the teacher. The use of the board which was an available and accessible resource for all the students also changed the participation framework and involved other students who were bystanders. In line 16, s1 -who said that the sentence needed reordering in the previous turn (10) - initiated a content question in wh- form which was a post expansion. The question design showed that the student was expecting an explanation from the teacher. In the following turn, the teacher did not provide an explanation, rather she uttered the target word emphasising the plurality of the word. She put emphasis on the rest of the word trousers (17). In the next line, s2 uttered “s” to indicate that trouser takes s. Then, the teacher gave explicit positive assessment to S2 and provided a metalinguistic term “plural form” and gave another EPA *thank you*, which might have functioned as a sequence closer (19). However, in line 21, a different student s3 launched into a new sequence with a question related to the meaning of the *target* word. Thus, this question opened another sequence which shifted the focus from *form* of the word to the *meaning*. In the next line, the Pt3 repaired student’s ungrammatical question emphasising plural form of the auxiliary verb in a questioning tone (21). By directly repairing and echoing the question, the teacher blocked the inverted IRF sequence, started the classic IRF pattern. This moment also shows the divergent focus the participants brought into the

classroom interaction. While the students requested the meaning of the word, the teacher repaired his question and shifted the focus to the form. This is also a great example for the characteristic of a language classroom Seedhouse (2004) describes. Since in language classrooms, the medium of the instruction and the content is the same; unfolding interaction also reflects this contingencies and the divergent foci the participants may have. In this sense, to manage these contingencies the teachers need to be equipped with interactional resources which will be discussed in implications section.

After one second of silence, she reformulated the same question and used “they” to refer to the *trousers* which emphasised the plurality of the word. After 1.8 seconds of silence, she turned s3’s question back onto the class directly referring to the other class members. S1 took the turn and showed his trousers to s3. However, s1’s turn demonstrated that s1 did not take up teacher’s repair. He still used subject pronoun *it* to refer to the trousers. It is clear that he knew the meaning of the word since he showed the trousers; however, he did not take up the form of the word. In line 27, the Pt3 uttered the incorrect part of the word in a questioning tone which was another repair technique according to Seedhouse (2004). Then, s2 uttered *these* and the teacher overlapped with S2’s turn and repaired S1’s incorrect utterance again by saying *these are trousers* . In line 25, s1 echoed the teacher. In the final turn, the teacher said *thank you* as an EPA closed the sequence.

In this sequence, there are two different questions (lines 16 and 20). Both of them are designed as *wh-* content questions. The latter one was initiated after the teacher closed the sequence. In other words, this question initiated a new sequence and designed as a first pair part which inverted the classic IRF sequence. The way the teacher managed those questions are significant. The first *wh-* content question was not oriented by the teacher, although the student question sought for an explanation, the teacher ignored it. The latter question (20) was attended by the teacher; she corrected the question and invited the other class members to answer it.

4.2.1.2.1 Summary of Managing Students' Questions in Focus on Form

The data revealed that students initiate new sequences or pre- and post-expansions to clarify the instructions and to express their knowledge gaps in focus on form as a contribution. It is apparent that students who took initiatives guided pre-service teachers to reformulate and clarify their instructions. In the fifth extract, the student initiated pre-expansion to check whether she understood the instruction well since the course book and the teacher gave different instructions. Her initiation helped PT to self-repair and reformulating the previous instruction they managed to maintain intersubjectivity and progressivity of the task. In this sequence, the learner clearly presented her interactional competence helping teacher to reformulate her instruction.

The knowledge questions in the data (Extracts 6 and 7) were initiated in the cases of knowledge gaps. The students designed their questions in the form of wh- content questions which made response relevant on the part of PTs. There are three ways that PTs manage students' contributions that are in the form of questions. The teacher candidates may ignore the question, may provide the answer or invite peer repair to get the answers from the volunteer class members. All of the ways are presented through representative extracts. They will be discussed in relation to teaching opportunities in the next sub-section.

4.2.2 General Summary of Focus on Form

This last sub-section summarises the findings of the micro-analysis on focus on form in teacher talk. Tables as summaries of the results will be provided along with the brief explanations.

Focus on form, similar to Seedhouse's (2004) identification form and accuracy context, referred to the PTs' pedagogical goal targeting accurate use of language structures. In the data, it manifested itself with known-answer question and teacher initiated teacher repairs to elicit accurate responses. This context was analysed in relation to establishing and maintaining focus

and managing students' questions. Each action also involved the third turn where language teachers are documented to perform many actions such as giving feedback, shaping learner contributions (Walsh, 2006). In this sense, teaching opportunities were analysed in relation to the enactment of this turn in pre-service teacher talk.

Initiated by known-answer questions and followed by next-turn repair initiations, focus on form mostly ended with an Explicit Positive Assessment (EPA) or PTs' echo of students' turn. Next turn repair initiations were DIUs, request for full sentence and metalinguistic explanations. The DIUs were the mostly employed interactional and instructional resource. Request for full sentence was also highlighted the PTs pedagogical focus and let learners initiate next turns. Embodied explanations while teaching prepositions to maintain the focus was employed. Concerning last turn, it was in the form of EPA and echo of students' previous turns. In some cases, PT's selection of next speaker announced the end of sequence, that is the third turn was missing. It is sequentially evident that PTs prefer progressivity of lesson or task over emerging teaching opportunities. Because they passed up the third turn or designed it as a minimal response.

Table 4.1: PTs interactional and pedagogical resources in focus on form

Context	Interactional and Pedagogical Resources		
	Maintaining Focus	Managing Students Questions	Evaluation Turn
Focus on Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known-answer Questions • Next Turn Repair Initiations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Request for full sentence ○ Metalinguistic Explanation ○ DIU • Other initiated other repair • Embodied explanation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inviting peer repair • Providing answer • Passing up question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit Positive Assessment • Teacher Echo • Selecting next speaker • Use of the board

As seen in Table 4.1 above, PTs' management of students' questions were also emergent and significant in the data. Since students' questions show orientations towards learning, PTs management of pre-sequences in task – related questions or knowledge questions represented valuable teaching opportunities. Micro-analytic investigation PT led classroom interaction demonstrated three ways: inviting peer repair, providing answer and passing up the question (Table 4.1 above) Passing up the questions were conceptualised as missing teaching opportunities.

Table 4.2 below provides brief summary of hindering and facilitating teacher actions in terms of teaching. As they were all mentioned after every extract, some of the resources PTs frequently employed hindered teaching space. These were extensive use of DIUs and teachers' echo of the previous turn of the learners. Leaving students' questions unaddressed and skipping third turn to continue the tasks are the other actions that hindered teaching opportunity. On the other hand, next turn repair initiators are of instructional value since they navigate the discourse and help learners to self-repair. Use of the board addressing all the members provide them with feedback. Embodied explanations help learners to visualise the prepositions of movement. Request for full sentence clearly indicates PTs focus and helps learners reformulate their previous utterances.

Table 4 2: Teacher actions hindering and opening space for teaching

	Hindering Teaching Space	Opening Space for Teaching
Focus on Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive use of DIUs, • Extensive use of Teacher Echo • Extensive use of EPAs • Passing up questions • Passing up evaluation turn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embodied explanation • Use of the board • Next Turn Repair Initiations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Request for full sentence ○ Metalinguistic explanation

4.3 Focus on Meaning

This main context will present the unfolding interaction when the participants' focus on meaning. While the *meaning and fluency context* (Seedhouse, 2004) is acknowledged by many conversation analytic studies (Kaanta, 2010; Schwab, 2011; Can-Doşkin, 2015; Sert, 2015; 2017) as a dual focus on meaning and fluency, the data revealed that the PTs constructed contexts in which they only negotiated and appropriated meaning of single words which does not incorporate *fluency* as a pedagogical goal. These single words or phrases were all available in coursebook and most of them were presented as target word of the unit. Hence, this section only documents the context in which participants create to negotiate the meaning of target words on teacher agenda. Unlike the organization in the focus on form section, focus on meaning presents 6 six representative extracts without any subcategories. Still, they are analysed according to the research questions: establishment and maintenance of pedagogical focus, the interactional and pedagogical resources to create teaching opportunities.

Focus on meaning manifests itself with the initiation of negotiatory question (Nassaji and Wells, 2000). Although the PT knew the meaning of the word they asked to the class, they designed their initiations to elicit predictions from the students. Thus, although they seem to be known-information questions, the initiations function to facilitate negotiation of meaning.

The first example below is taken from PT4's second teaching in Prep B in high school. In PT4's lesson plan, the objective for this segment was written as "listen for specific information". In the course book, there was a listening task followed by five yes/no questions to check for listening comprehension (Appendix G). The unit was on food and drinks and the teacher let students listen to the tape twice, then asked the questions in the book. The vignette below demonstrates the answer sequence of the fifth question of the task. The participants are T (PT4), and the students S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6 and S7. "

Extract FM 1: Pt4_PrepB_ST: "awkward"

1 T: and once chef jeff show the spanish chef how
2 to cook paella
3 ((reads the item from the smartboard))
+ s1 raises his hand
4 ((points to s1))
5 S1: yes
6 (0.4)
7 T: why? (.) why do you think so?
8 S1: err becau err in err in text (1) the: >girl
9 was sa[↑]y this<
10 (0.8)
11 T: £okay£ ((laughs))
12 ((laughter came from the class))
13 S1: err showed err yeah[↑] evet heh heh
14 T: okay why do you [think so ? why do you
15 think its awkward?
16 S2: +raises her hand
17 S3: [anladık
18 (1)
19 S4: °awkward? °
20 S5: °awkward? °
21 S2: + lowers her hand down
22 T: awkward err she said that err (0.9)
23 even err a spanish chef er >she showed
24 a spanish chef how to cook paella
+ looks at the smart board

25 and reads the item

26 why do you think it its awkward?<

27 (0.9) tu:haf

28 LL: ((unintelligible quiet murmur among
29 the students))

30 S6: °weird°
+ raises his head from the book
and looks at the T

31 ((he has been drawing sth on his
32 coursebook up to now))

33 T: °>do you have any idea? < °

34 S6: °weird°

35 S4: huuhh

36 S7: ((raises his hand))

37 T: yes

38 S7: because paella is an spanish food
+ stands up

39 T: yes

40 S7: and if a chef (.)spanish chef (.)don't
41 want err dont know to do it ↑

42 T: [it is aw-

43 S7: [it is awk-

44 S7: it is awkward

45 T: yes.

In the first line, Pt4 read the fifth question of the task from the smart board. The question was designed as yes/ no question so the students were expected to say yes if the information in the item was correct according to the tape. In

the third line, s1 raised his hand to take the turn. In the next line, the teacher gave the turn to him and s1 gave his answer saying yes (5). After 0.4 of silence, the teacher initiated an insert-expansion sequence delaying feedback and asked a pursuit question (Wong & Waring, 2009) which was a follow-up move. The pursuit question was designed to justify student's yes / no answer. In the previous four questions, Pt4 followed the similar path asking the pursuit question "why". In lines 8 and 9, s1 responded to the question. In line 11, the teacher said "okay" by laughing. The laughter came from the students in the class following the teacher's laughter. This shows that the teacher did not prefer s1's answer. As a result, in line 14, she asked her pursuit question again but this time she directed it to the whole class inviting peer repair. She also expanded her question and wanted students to explain the reason for awkwardness of the situation. S2 oriented to this peer repair invitation and raised her hand (16). Apparently, for s4 and s5 the word "awkward" was an unknown word (19, 20) and they repeated the word in a questioning tone. This word search led s2 to lower her hand and showed that she did not want to take the turn anymore. In line 21, Pt4 oriented to this word search and reformulated her question. After 0.9 seconds of silence, she provided the Turkish translation of the word to the class. In line 30, s6 uttered "weird" in a very quiet tone; that is the synonym of the word *awkward*. Actually the utterance was only hearable in the recording taken from the front camera, so it is highly probable that most of the students did not hear s6's contribution. It is also not clear whether Pt 4 heard S6's utterance. Actually, up to that point, s6 had been drawing something on his course book and seemed to be off task. However, it is sequentially evident that she did not orient to his contribution. Instead, she further continued to invite peer responses (33). In the next line, S4 uttered an acknowledgement token showing her understanding of the word clearly. But it is not clear whether she oriented to teacher's explanation or s6's repair. In the next line (36), S7 raised his hand to respond to the teacher's question and the teacher gave the turn to S7. S7 oriented to the teacher's wh question and started to explain the reason for being awkward

(40-43). In line 42, the teacher and S 7 overlapped and in line 44, S7 used the word “awkward” and ended his explanation. In line 45, the teacher gave an EPA by saying yes and closed the sequence.

At the first glance, this example demonstrates a mechanic question-answer sequence involving teacher asking the question in the book and expecting a correct answer from the class. It is apparent that the teacher was asking a *known-answer question*. Yet, although s1’s answer (5) was correct according to the listening in the book, the teacher candidate initiated a pursuit question by inserting expansion to the ongoing sequence delaying the feedback. It shows that the Pt4 focused on *meaning* here. Because she did not repair students’ ungrammatical utterances (lines 7, 8); students themselves initiated self-repair (lines 33-34). Pt4 only invited peer repair asking pursuit question which clearly opened up a *negotiation of meaning* sequence and learning space for the class. They negotiated an unknown word for the class members and Pt4 used students’ L1 as a resource to clarify the unknown word. However, one student knew the synonym of the word but Pt4 did not show orientation to the contribution. It is highly probable that the pre-service teacher and the class members did not hear his contribution. If the candidate oriented to his contribution and let other students hear the synonym, this could have enriched the teaching opportunity. Still, the teacher candidate kept asking the pursuit question and invited peer repair. At the end, she received a preferred answer and provided short EPA.

In this extract, focus on meaning was constructed via negotiary question and pursuit questions followed. Pt 4 delayed feedback and evaluation move and she provided follow up questions which generated teaching space for the word *awkward*.

In some cases, the teacher candidate avoids using Turkish and employed other resources to convey the meaning. This sequence is taken from Pt 7’s final teaching in Prep D in the high school. She was following the course book and the students had read a text on first people from England sailing to America.

(Appendix H). After reading the text, Pt 7's plan was to introduce fill in the blanks activity related to the text. To fill in the blanks, the students were given the vocabulary box to choose the words from. Pt 7 wanted to go over the words before the task to see whether the students remembered them since the words were taken from the reading text. T refers to Pt 7, B is Begüm and D is Deniz and S3 is an unidentified student.

Extract FM 2: Pt7_Prep D_FT: "settle down"

- 1 T: okay err do you remember all of them? if you
2 want me to remind you some of them↑
+ points to vocabulary box on the
smartboard
3 (0.7) °I can do this°
4 (2.3)
5 okay do you know the meaning of settle?
6 (1.4)
7 what does settle mean?
8 B: °kurmak falan mı? °
is it something like set up ?
9 T: yes begum?-
10 B: kurmak ? tarzi bişey değil mi?
isn't it something like set up ?
11 (2)
12 T: errrr similar but (1.8) this is not the exact
13 meaning do you have any guess? (0.7) have you
14 heard about it↑ before?
15 D: no
16 T: yes deniz?
17 D: ya ben no dedim
oh I said no
18 ((laughter from the class))
19 T: settle means to become used to living in a

20 new place↓
21 B: hıııı
22 T: it takes place in the reading text (0.5) it
23 says (1.5) pilgrims settled to where?
24 (3.4)
+ s3 raises her hand
25 T: you can find it (.) yes?
26 s3: err north america
27 T: yes pilgrims settled to north america so↑ they
28 become used to living in there. okay.

The teacher designed her question to check students' previous knowledge and opened the vocabulary box section on the smartboard (lines 1, 2). In the vocabulary box, there were nearly twenty words. After waiting for 2.3 seconds for students' reply, the teacher chose herself one of the words in the box and asked it to the class to check whether the students knew the word (5). After 1.4 seconds of silence in the class, the teacher repaired her own question and asked the meaning of *settle* directly this time (7). B offered a candidate answer in Turkish and designed her answer as a question. In line 9, the teacher probably did not hear s1's answer and gave the turn to her. In line 10, the student repeated her answer in a tag question form in Turkish. After 2 seconds of silence and hesitation Pt 7 showed her dispreference for the answer. She mitigated her negative evaluation (12) but she underlined the fact that student's answer was not the correct one in English. In the next line, she initiated peer repair and direct the same question to the class. However, D also claimed insufficient knowledge in line 17. Thus, Pt 7 provided the definition of the word in English. In the following line, B uttered an acknowledgement token to display her understanding. In line 22, Pt 7 used the reading text as a resource to make the meaning of the word *settle* clear. She provided a DIU for students to complete it (Line 23). After 3.4 seconds of silence, s3 completed

the DIU. In line 27, Pt7 gave EPA and provided the complete example sentence explaining the meaning of the word again.

This extract is another example of establishment of meaning sequence in teacher-led language classrooms. Unlike Pt 4, who made use of the native tongue of the learners to make the meaning clear (Extract 1), Pt 7 did not orient to the student's candidate answers in Turkish and made use of the reading text available to the class. When she received a dispreferred answer from one student, she invited peer repair from the class. It was the frequently employed strategy for the novice teachers to invite peer repair. However, it was apparent that the other students did not know the answer so the teacher provided the definition of the word first. Then, she used DIU and invited peer repair again. This time, she wanted to draw attention to the sentence in which the target word was used to make the meaning clearer. She designed her last turn as a paraphrase and moved onto the next item.

In focus on meaning, Pt's pedagogical aim is to check whether there are any unknown words for class members in the material that will be used in the next step in order to ease the task. In that sense, Pt 7 designed her initiation for whole class and was not able to select one speaker. Since no one volunteered and claimed insufficient knowledge, Pt 7 made a decision and selected one word. Apparently, this was a good decision, since the volunteer offered dispreferred answer in a dispreferred language for the teacher. To maintain the pedagogical agenda, Pt needed to initiate repair to handle the dispreferred answer and she did it other initiated self repair move using the preferred language. In other words, she employed implicit self-policing to repair dispreferred use of L1 and she said "similar but" to acknowledge the learner's response giving the message that this was not the preferred one. Thus, in one turn, she accomplished many actions. This is also similar to Fagan's (2015) findings on error correction in which expert teachers first acknowledge achievement of the learner, and then address the dispreferred part. The

follow-up turn design in “similar... but” accomplished more than one function in this sense.

The next extract is taken from Pt5's second teaching in Prep B in the high school. Pt5 in her lesson plan stated that it was a pre-reading stage of the lesson and the aim was to “introduce new vocabulary items and elicit their meaning from the students”. After introducing the vocabulary items, her plan was to introduce the reading text on food. She prepared a PowerPoint presentation to demonstrate the target words. In each slide, there was one target word with pictures to illustrate the word. The *salad dressing* was the second word on the PPT. There are PT5 (T) and five students (S1, S2, S3, S4 and S5) in the extract.

Extract FM 3: Pt5_Prep B_ST_“salad dressing”

1 T: and salad dressing?
+clicks on the sb, looks at the slide
2 ((on the slide the word was written along with
3 an illustrative image))
4 what can it be?
5 ((looks at the class))
6 S1: errr
7 (1)
8 T: [err let me-
+ she looks at the smart board, no eye
contact with sts
9 S2: [vinegar
10 LL: [unintelligible noise from the class]
11 ((sts might be offering candidate answers))
12 T: err >when er what we do after we prepare the
13 salad? < (0.7) what we add them?
14 ((she looks at the class))
15 LL: ((the noise continues))

16 S3: equipment -
 17 T: equipment what kind of equipments? for
 18 example?
 + looks at S3
 19 ((sts raise their hands and give answers at
 20 the same time))
 21 S4: sauce
 + raise his hand
 22 T: sauce yeah right
 23 S5: vinegar
 24 T: it is sauce for salad (0.4) it can be vinegar
 + counts with her
 fingers
 25 LL: lemon
 26 LL: lettuce
 27 T: lemon (.) salt (.) like that↓
 28 T: ((moves to the next vocabulary item))

In the first line, the teacher clicked on the smart board to move to the next slide illustrating the word “salad dressing.” At the same time she uttered the target word in a questioning tone (1). In line 4, she asked students to predict the meaning of the word which was designed as a negotiatory question. In the next line (6), s1 uttered a hesitation marker but did not provide an answer. After 1 second of collective silence (Lee, 2007) in the class, Pt 5 attempted to self-repair her initiation but she did not complete her repair. She looked at the slide and turned her back to the class (8) at the same time. As in the first target word “creamy”, the students started to shout out their answers without asking for the turn (10). Only S2’s candidate answer “vinegar” was hearable for the transcriber (9). Unfortunately, other students’ candidate answers were not intelligible and Pt5 also did not orient to their answers in the class. She was looking at the slide at that time. In lines 12 and 13, she repaired herself and

asked a different question. This question was designed to give a hint about the meaning of the word. She mentioned the salad preparation and she asked “what we add them” after we prepare the salad (12-13). Line 12 was uttered in hurried manner and faster than the surrounding talk. After this hinting attempt, the students probably uttered their candidate answers at the same time (15) but in such a crowded class with thirty five students it was very difficult to identify each student’s utterance for the transcriber. In line 16, S3 uttered the word “equipment” which was oriented by the teacher in the next line (17). The teacher echoed this response and initiated another question to get the student repair himself (17). She used the word *equipment* to acknowledge the student’s answer in her initiation. In other words, she used student’s contribution as a next turn repair initiator. She looked at s3 but as seen in line 18, the answer came from S4. He both raised his hand and uttered his candidate answer at the same time (19-20). In the next line, Pt 5 echoed the response and provided EPA which showed that it was a preferred answer (22). S5 also shouted her answer out (23). Pt5 first gave the definition of the word then after 0.4 seconds of silence, she acknowledged S5’s answer. She was counting the ingredients with her fingers; the students continued to shout their answers out (24-25-26). In the next line, Pt5 re-echoed the lemon and added a new item (salt) (27) and closed the sequence. Finally, she moved to the next vocabulary item.

In this sequence, the meaning of a word “salad dressing” is negotiated and taught. It is sequentially evident that S2 provided answer the teacher was looking for as a second pair part (9). However, Pt 5 did not orient to the answer since she oriented to s1’s hesitation marker (6) and the collective silence (7) as claims of insufficient knowledge and looked at the smartboard to repair her initiation. After that, the students supplied different candidate responses at the same time which was difficult for a teacher to select one of them and orient to in a crowded classroom. It is sequentially evident that if there had been a longer wait time, there would not have been overlap between the students and the teacher (8, 9 and 10). As a result, Pt 5 would have

received a preferred answer. Along with the wait time, since Pt 5 did not set the turn-taking rule; and thereby was not able to receive the answers one by one; she did not manage to address all the candidate answers.

When PTs address the questions to the whole class without selecting the next speaker or students do not raise their hands to self- select themselves; there are some interactional and pedagogical problems emerging. As seen in the lines 9, 10, 11; a number of students begin shouting their answers even when Pt is looking at the smartboard. Thus, the teacher cannot orient to those answers. In addition while S2's answer is appropriate, Pt 5 orients to the S3's answer *equipment* (16) which is an inappropriate answer and acknowledges it. This may give the message to the students that unacknowledged answers by the teacher are not preferred and incorrect. However, it is evident that the PTs cannot manage all the candidate answers coming from the classroom.

Seedhouse (2004) emphasised the fact that the core institutional goal of the language classrooms is: "the *teacher will teach the learners the L2*" (p.183). This fact cannot be disregarded while analysing the interactional work achieved in language classrooms. The participant's own orientations shape the context but the underlying reason for coming together in a classroom cannot be ignored in the conversation analysis. In other words the teacher's core role is to teach the language.

The dictionary definition of the word salad *dressing* is "a liquid mixture made from oil and vinegar, for putting on salads". (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English Online, 2018). In addition, Pt5's slides there was the picture of oil and vinegar bottles. Thus, Pt5's own example of *salt* (27) in the closing turn did not fit in this definition. Moreover, echoing s3's candidate answer *equipment* (17) and taking up this answer and asking a follow up question might not be acceptable in a language classroom for a language teacher. Since *equipment* in salad preparation context refers to the *tools* for making the salad; it is not related to the definition of the *salad dressing*. Echoing the student irrelevant and inappropriate response and reinforcing

the word “equipment” with a follow up question may not be an example of “misteaching”, but it is the example of the teacher’s inability to deal with the learner’s inappropriate contribution and a counter example of *shaping learner contributions* suggested by Walsh (2006, 2013) as part of *classroom interactional competence*.

However, it is interesting to see that reinforcing students’ inappropriate responses do not affect the maintenance of the classroom interaction and inter-subjectivity between the teacher and the students. Since the question (17) “what kind of equipments” elicited the answer the teacher was seeking for (21, 23, and 25); the inter-subjectivity is successfully maintained in the classroom and the teacher achieved her pedagogical goal. This could be because the meaning of the target word was also revealed to the learners with the help of pictures on the slide since all the students were following the power point presentation. Moreover, the teacher’s self-repair and second initiation (12) created a relevant context for the students which made them provide the preferred answer.

The next two episodes reflect the candidate teachers’ inability to deal with inappropriate answers in focus on meaning. They were taken from Pt11’s second teaching in the Prep F class in the high school. Pt 11’s aim was to let students complete the true false activity in the course book (Please see the Appendix I) According to the course book, the students were required to do the activity after they read the text. However, Pt11 and her partner (Pt12) modified the activity and wanted students to guess whether the statements were true or false before reading the text. The Pt 12 introduced the concepts first (Please see the second activity on the course book Appendix I) and then gave the instruction for the true false activity. Then, Pt11 continued to teach for the next twenty minutes. The extract below demonstrated the discussion of the fourth statement in the activity which says “*your resting heart rate is similar to your minimum heart rate*”. The episode involves T (Pt 11), Doğanay (S7) and 5 unidentified students (S1, S2, S3, S4, S5).

Extract FM 4: Pt11_Prep F_ST_ "heart rate"

1 T: and the fourth one↑(0.6) doğanay↑
+three sts raise hands except D
2 (2.8) ((T walks towards D, T smiles))
3 the fourth one ?
4 (0.8)
5 D: your resting heart rate is similar to your
/hiert/
6 minimum heart rate err (1) true
/hiert/
7 T: true. do you think that s correct?
8 s1: no
9 s2: false
10 s3: I agree with you
11 s4: >your resting heart rate is similar to your
/h3rt/
12 minimum heart rate< (0.4) resting err is
13 start?
/h3rt/
14 D: he bi bakalım da ondan sonra
lets see it first and then
15 T: no resting is (.) dinlenme (1.7) so you think
16 its [false?
17 s4: [yes o zaman [true
in this case
18 T: [true
+nods her head
19 s5: we should look at
20 T: °yes that's true°
+ click on the sb to see the correct answer
21 D: hurray

After having decided on the truth of the third statement in the activity, Pt 11 signalled the upcoming statement and three students raised their hands to answer the question. The teacher selected s7, who did not raise his hand. S7 was often off task in that lesson and it was apparent that Pt11 gave the turn to him although it was apparent that he did not volunteer to take the turn. In line 3, she re-initiated the question. After 0.8 seconds of silence, S7 started to read the statement. “*Resting heart rate*”, “*minimum heart rate*” were the concepts introduced in the first twenty minute of the class by Pt 12. These also constituted the target vocabulary items of the unit titled “fitness and exercise” (Appendix I). It was clear that s7 did not pronounce the word “heart” in a proper way. However, since Pt 11’s focus was on meaning, she did not address this inappropriate and unintelligible pronunciation. Yet, it would have been very difficult to understand S7’s utterance /hiert/ for the class and the teacher if the material had not been available to them. S7 after 1 second of silence, gave the answer “true”. Pt 11 echoed the student’s choice (true) first, then invited peer repair (7). She designed her repair initiation in the form of polar question “do you think that’s correct” which initiated a brief discussion among students (8-10) and it seems that some of them thought the statement was false. And then in line 11, s4 self-selected himself and read the statement hurriedly quickly (11-12). It is striking that s4 pronounced the same word in completely different way “/hɜrt/” which was not appropriate to the language norms but intelligible for the classroom members. After reading the sentence, S4 himself initiated repair and offered his understanding of the word “resting” as start and wanted to confirm his understanding. This question also showed that the classroom members were still in the negotiation of meaning sequence. In line 13 S7 said “he bi bakalım da ondan sonra” (*lets see it first and then -*) which implied that they needed to see the correct answer on the board first before embarking on a discussion. Pt 11 oriented to S4’s confirmation check and provided the word’s Turkish

equivalent. After 1, 7 seconds of long silence, Pt 11 wanted to check s4's understanding and they overlapped in the following line (16) and S4 confirmed that the sentence was true. In line 19, the teacher clicked on the smartboard to show that the sentence was true and closed the sequence.

The next exhibit displays a similar question- answer sequence recorded just 10 minutes after the *heart rate* extract in the same class. By then, they completed the true false activity, read the text and now moved to the matching activity. They were instructed to match the definitions with the concepts in the second activity. The fourth concept was the *heart rate*. For the previous three questions, the PT11 chose one student to read the text and then chose a different student to do the matching. The procedure was the same for the fourth question. This episode involves T (PT 11), İrem (s10), and Alptekin (s2).

Extract FM 5: Pt11_Prep F_ ST_heart rate

1 T: the fourth one↑
2 LL ((five sts raise their hands including irem))
3 T: irem?
4 S1: this is the number of(.)times er your heart
5 /h3rt/
beats
6 in a(.) minute↓ your resting heart rate is
your
/hiert/
7 minimum heart rate when you are relaxed and
/h3rt/
8 doing nothing↓ you are your maximum heart
/h3rt/
9 rate er is the top speed of your heart(.)
/h3rt/
10 when you are doing exercise↓

11 T: okay so what is the answer? (.) alptekin? what
12 is the answer? (.)for the fourth one?
13 S2: heart rate
/hɜrt/
14 T: heart rate.
/hɑ:rt/
15 T + clicks on the sb
16 T: yes correct

In the first line, Pt11 signalled that they moved onto the next question and as a response to that initiation, 5 students including s10 raised their hands for the turn. The teacher selected s10 and she began reading the fourth paragraph. The paragraph was the definition of heart rate; thus s10 had to utter that word for five times. As it is displayed in the extract, she read the word differently in lines 5 and 6. After she finished reading, the teacher herself selected the next speaker to do the matching. S2 provided the answer heart rate uttering the word heart as some of his classmates did (/hɜrt/) (13). It is sequentially clear that inappropriate pronunciation of the word *heart* did not lead to any trouble in understanding and the progressivity of the lesson was not disrupted. However, in the closing turn, for the first time in that lesson Pt 11 pronounced the word *heart* (14) to revoice the answer s2 provided and it was the appropriate pronunciation according to the language norms. Apparently, it was not the echo of s2's answer. She provided the appropriate pronunciation (/hɑ:rt/). It could have been claimed that it could function as an embedded repair. However, Pt 11 designed her turn as if it was the repetition of s2's answer with a flat intonation (14). In other words, Pt 11 did not problematize students' inappropriate and unsystematic pronunciation of the word. As a result, she did not design her next turn as other initiated other repair. It was apparent that she constructed a meaning sequence and did not address any linguistic mistakes. However, thanks to the unique characteristics of the language classrooms, the teacher candidate in her closing turn, provided the

correct pronunciation of the word even if she did not intend to do so. Still, the data did not yield further evidence of students' noticing this repair. It would not be a surprise if the teacher's closing third turn did not result in an uptake on the part of students, since the Pt 11 did not modify her closing third turn to take the advantage of emergent teaching opportunity.

Although the participants in the classroom did not problematize or mark it as a knowledge gap, emergent teaching opportunity marks itself clearly in the classroom interaction presented in Extract MEA 4 and 5. Only Pt 11 in the closing turn initiated an embedded repair but it is not sequentially evident that this embedded repair turned into a *teachable*. Since the focus on the meaning of the concept heart rate, the progressivity of the interaction was maintained and the teacher achieved her pedagogical focus. In other words, in conversation analytic sense, the participants achieved their focus through their talk and inter subjectivity was maintained.

However, in a bigger picture, when we think the language teaching business carried through interaction in the classroom, the teacher's third turn is claimed to perform many pedagogical and interactional functions (Hellerman, 2003; Lee, 2007). In this case, the third turn's valuable function is not fully fulfilled. As seen in the extracts, *heart rate* was a target vocabulary item in the unit and many students uttered it in different ways. Seedhouse (1997) asserts that when the language teachers only focus on *meaning and fluency* and "accept and praise every minimal, pidginized interlanguage learners produce" (p. 337), they provide this pidginized form of language as a model and input for the class. The *heart rate* example in the data also supports Seedhouse's (1997) claim in that students' pronunciation of the word *heart* many times and students' utterance turned out to be input for the other students. Seedhouse (1997) argues that teachers' acceptance in such cases may yield to fossilization in the end which already occurred in classroom Prep F.

The final example of meaning context involves eliciting students' knowledge on festivals. The example demonstrated below is from the segment of Pt7's

third teaching in the Prep D. The lesson was a reading focused lesson and the students read a text about the history of Thanksgiving in Pt7's teaching partner part. Then, Pt7 first introduced the unknown vocabulary to the students and did a fill-in the blanks activity to practice the words. Then, the next task was about a writing task in which students in groups were instructed to create an information box about a festival. The names of the festivals were assigned to the groups by the teacher. Before this writing task, Pt7 initiated a meaning context which aimed to serve to prepare students for the upcoming task.

Extract FM 6: Pt7_Prep D_TT:"ba'raat night"

1 T: err (2.5) okay guys err we have learnt about
2 one of the most important celebrations
3 of american people it is thanksgiving(0.9)
4 err do you know any other festivals around
the
5 world?(1.1) can you tell me the names?(2)
6 festivals names (2.8)do you remember
7 any of them? (1.7) there are a lot
8 of festivals (1.6)
9 D: ((raises her hand))
10 T: yes deniz
11 D: 23 nisan 19 mayıs
April 23 May 19
12 (1.4)
13 T: what is the English word for this (2.8)
14 (bayram)
15 (1.5)
16 D: I don't know
17 B: °kurban bayramı °
eid al adha ((sacrifice feast))
18 LL: ((laughter))

19 T: we can call it childrens day(.) yes simply
20 ()we can call it childrens day(2) any other
?
21 G: şey var
there is something
22 T: huh huh
23 G: yumurta şey
err egg
24 T: hımm what was it?
25 (0.5)
26 LL: easter
27 T: yes easter (.) yes thank you gözde
28 B: ramazan bayramı
29 LL: ((laughter))
30 T: how do we say it in English?
31 B: ramazan herhalde
ramadan probably
32 T: ramadan feast (1.4) yes berat
33 (5.4)
34 T: any other? festivals? (1.8)
35 s4: christmas
36 T: christmas yes
37 s4: new year
38 T: new year (1.4) halloween (.) maybe
39 (0.5)
40 B: kandil sayılıyor mu berat kandili?
does kandil count ? ba'raat night?
41 LL: ((laughter))
42 T: yes berat you may say
43 (1.1)
44 B: berat kandili var da beratın ingilizcesini
45 bilmiyorum

*there is ba'raat night but I don't know how
to say it in English*

46 (1.4)
47 T: I don't know(1.6) maybe you can search about
48 it (0.7) berat(.)okay err now we will write
49 an information box↑

Pt 7 initiated the context with a more controlled yes / no information seeking question after 1.1 seconds of silence she asked two further questions each accompanied by longer silences. After she finished her final question, she waited for 1.6 seconds (8) and then D self-selected herself to answer. Pt 7 used wait time and waited for students to self select themselves as next speaker. In line 11 D mentioned the Turkish national festivals in Turkish. After 1,4 seconds of silence, Pt 7 both reminded the language policy implicitly and asked for English translation. D claimed insufficient knowledge (13) and immediately after B suggested Turkish religious festival in line 17. This turn was not designed as an answer to the teacher as he uttered the festival in a mumble. However, his friends heard this and laughed at this response. In line 19, the teacher oriented to D's CIK (Sert & Jacknick, 2015) and provided the answer "children's day". This answer served as feedback and as a follow up Pt7 requested for more answers (20). In line 21, G self-selected herself to orient to the teacher's request. However, she did not say the name of the festival but she offered a related word for the festival. In line 24, Pt 7 oriented to this offer and directed it to the class. Hence, she invited other students in the class to help G to find the festival. Since she asked the question in past tense she might have referred to a past learning event (Can-Daşkın, 2017). However, the previous lessons did not involve a such learning event so the data did not reveal evidence for this claim. In line 26, the choral response came from the class. In the next line, the pre-service teacher gave explicit positive assessment and thanked G although she was not the one who gave the response.

In line 28, B self-selected himself as G did in the previous turn and offered another religious festival in Turkish and created a humorous atmosphere. Here, it should be noted down that B's name is Berat, which means a holy day for Muslims. Pt 7 used this answer to remind the language policy and as a teaching opportunity in the next line (30) by asking back it to the class. B oriented to the question but repeated ramazan again (31). In the next line, Pt 7 provided the answer and again gave the turn to B to continue. B did not take the turn, after a long silence (33), Pt 7 reinitiated her request. She waited for 1.8 seconds and two different festivals came from the students (35, 37). The teacher echoed the responses and added one more foreign festival after 1.4 seconds of wait time. In line 40, B finally took the turn and made it clear that he was unsure about his response. In the following line Pt 7 gave a go ahead response in English. Then in lines 44- 45 , s2 displayed CIK. After 1.4 of silence Pt 7 said that she also did not know the name of the day. However, in order to preserve her identity as the holder of the knowledge, she advised B to search about it later. In the final turn, she closed this sequence and initiated task-oriented sequence.

This extract shows that students tend to answer in Turkish due to their own insufficient knowledge in the prep classes of the high school. They also violate the language policy set by the teacher using the question "how do we say it in English?" However, Pt 7 oriented to the insufficient knowledge claims by the students and the violation of language policy which turned them into a teaching opportunity. It is also notable that insufficient knowledge claims made it difficult to maintain the meaning context since the first initiation requires students express themselves freely. As a result, the teacher reminded the language policy and asked students to say the answer in English (13). In the following third turn, she herself gave the answer (19) that was a teaching moment. However, the database did not provide any other instances in the next teachings demonstrating that the teaching opportunity led to the learning. That is, the students were not observed to use the names of the festivals and days mentioned by the teacher in the next recorded teachings.

However, in Prep D the next recorded lessons were not about the festivals; thus this does not show that teacher's third turns (19, 32 and 38) did not lead to learning either.

It is clear that students' clear CIKs and questions show their genuine interest in participation in the classroom and learning. Thus, the candidate teacher oriented to the students' CIKs and turn them into teaching opportunities. The participants negotiate their personal meanings related to their culture and appropriate them with the help of the teacher. Employing information seeking questions inquiring students' knowledge on festivals repeatedly (1-8; 20; 34) and asking follow up questions (13, 24, 30) to initiate repair from students and reminding the language policy implicitly and using wait-time effectively (8, 15, 25, 33, 39 and 43) PT 7 successfully established and maintained her pedagogical focus and opened spaced for negotiation of the meaning and teaching opportunities. The use of interactional resources such as information seeking questions, wait time and follow-up moves exemplify the *Classroom Interactional Competence* (Walsh, 2006) in this negotiation of the meaning sequence.

4.3.1. Summary and Discussion of Focus on Meaning

Pre-service teachers established and maintained focus on *meaning* through elicitation of the target word or phrases' meanings. To achieve this, they used the coursebook or slides to initiate the elicitation move and support the meaning of the word at the same time. The meaning context is constructed in a freer environment which gives the message that students have space to manipulate and appropriate the meanings. The design of the questions such as "what can it be" (Ex: FM 3); pursuit questions "why do you think so?" (Ex: FM 1); "do you have any guess" (Ex: FM 2), "do you think that's correct?" (Ex: FM 4) imply that the learners are provided with the space to offer their candidate answers in a more uncontrolled discourse compared to focus on form. The use of wait time after the follow up questions also open the space for the

negotiation and facilitate the participation of the students; and thereby, the PTs manage to maintain the context.

In addition to the question design and wait time as interactional and pedagogical resource, the maintenance of the context involves the ability to manage learners' contributions, which are questions, CIKs, word searches and candidate answers. The data revealed that when the learners go into word search PTs use L1 (Ex: FM 1) or offer definition (Ex: FM 2) which maintain the inter-subjectivity and convey the meaning. Students' claims of insufficient knowledge as represented in Extract FM 6, are successfully oriented and they are scaffolded to contribute to the ongoing interaction.

In extracts 3, 4 and 5; it is apparent that PTs are not able make full use of teaching opportunities. In salad dressing example, managing student contributions becomes complex and complicated since a number students self-selected themselves as next speakers and shouted their answers out at the same time. Pt5 was not able to orient to all the answers and then took up one inappropriate answer (equipment) considering the target word negotiated (salad dressing) and embedded it into her next follow up question. In other words, she echoed the inappropriate response from the learner and used it as a follow up. In heart rate example, learners who take the turn pronounced the target phrase in completely different ways. Pt 11 uttered the phrase in the last turn in embedded repair form without any elaboration. It is possible that no one in the class was able to orient it as a repair.

In both cases, Pts preferred progressivity of the task over teaching opportunities. In sequential unfolding of interaction, both instances represent participants' mutual achievement to negotiate and reach a conclusion about the meaning and form of the phrases. Since nor the teacher or the student orient to the inappropriate and irrelevant use of the word in the ongoing interaction, it could be represented as a successful co-constructed meaning context. However, considering instructional value, it could be argued that teaching space is limited.

Thus, it should be underlined that at some points the interaction between PTs and learners in the classroom is similar to the one called as English as a Lingua Franca context (Seidlhofer, 2005). In other words, the participants manage to interact with each other to achieve their momentary goals ignoring the broader institutional goals. It is similar to the interaction between L1 and L2 users in conversations for learning contexts documented by Kim and Kasper (2007). The participants also avoid repairs to maintain their conversation and inter-subjectivity is achieved which may result in missed learning opportunities. Hence, this dissertation as a comprehensive micro-analytic study on 16 Pts teaching in 43 lessons show that the applied CA should value and acknowledge analysts' etic perspective to better inform the practice.

It is actually well-documented in the studies on novice teachers that (Tsui, 2003, Fagan, 2012, Waring & Hruska, 2011) novice teachers are unsure about how to handle the multi dimensionality, immediacy and unpredictability of learners' contributions to the classroom interaction. Drawing from CA studies, Waring (2015) suggested a theory of teaching characterized by competence, complexity and contingency. Waring (2015) defines contingency as "being responsive to the moment; that is tuning into the simultaneous happenings of that moment and attending to such simultaneity to the best of one's abilities" (pp.133). This requires expertise in managing and carrying the interaction and monitoring the emerging learning opportunities simultaneously which can be considered as a very unrealistic expectation from the pre-service teachers in their practicum year.

Nonetheless, one needs to look at the pre-service teacher led interaction to understand its peculiarities and moment by moment unfolding nature to inform and improve the practice to reach expertise. All in all, this section reported on the interactional and pedagogical resources to establish and maintain meaning context and methodological concerns to analyse the teacher talk in classroom discourse.

Table 4.3: Interactional and Pedagogical Resources in Focus on Meaning

Context	Interactional and Pedagogical Resources	
	Maintaining Focus	Evaluation Turn
Focus on Meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiatory Questions • Next Turn Repair Initiations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pursuit Questions ○ Use of L1 ○ Peer Repair • Use of visuals, materials • Teacher echo • Use of wait time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paraphrase • Embedded repair • EPA

Please see table 4.4 below for summary of interactional and pedagogical resources used in focus and meaning and their potential to hinder and facilitate teaching opportunities.

Table 4.4: Teacher Actions hindering and opening space for teaching

	Hindering Teaching Space	Opening Space for Teaching
Focus on Meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embedded repair • Teacher echo of inappropriate answer • Turn-taking system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question Design (pursuit and negotiary questions) • Paraphrase • Use of wait time

4.4 Focus on Fluency:

The final context emerged from PT led classroom interaction is focus *on fluency*. This section displays the representative samples of the teaching episodes similar to *conversational teaching* van Lier (1988) suggested. They can also be called routine inquiries to greet students in the beginning of the class as Waring (2013) studied. The first six examples were recorded in the very beginning of the class. Thus, they were implemented as warm up or social chat just before the class. Still, PTs initiated questions related to topic of this day (e.g. activities, festivals). The last three examples were initiated as a post-activity to the reading texts on the coursebook.

Since 40-minute-class time is shared by two candidate teachers; in other words one pair teaches the first twenty minute, the second pair teaches the last twenty minute, some candidate teachers did not have the chance of starting the class. Some had to continue teaching when their partner finished his/her planned activities. The data revealed there were five instances in which candidate teachers began their classes with the questions like “how are you”, “how was your weekend” or “do you have a plan for the weekend” designed as *information seeking question* and open space for interaction. Extract FLU 1 is taken from Pt 16’s teaching and this is the only time that he made the introduction. In the other teaching tasks, his partner Pt15 had the first twenty minutes to teach the class.

The main focus of Pt16 and Pt 15’s class was reading. In the remaining part of the lesson Pt 16 gave a number of pictures to the students and asked them to reorder those pictures as he read the story aloud. So the introduction in the extract was used to greet students and ask about their weekend plans since both of the pre-service teachers did their four teaching tasks in the last hour of the school on Friday before the weekend holiday. S1, S2 and S4 participated in the interaction.

Extract FLU 1:Pt16_Prep K_ST: “any activities”

- 1 T: okay class (.) how: are you today ?
- 2 LL: fine thanks and you:::
- 3 T: any ac↑tivities anythings you do↓(.)
- 4 interesting (.)any tra:vel? any plan?
- 5 S1: no:::
- 6 S2: ((shakes her head))
- 7 T: for the weekend?
+looks at S1
- 8 S1: no:::
- 9 T: no:::(1.5)for example i want to i am planning

to
 10 go istanbul (.) fo::r saturday (.) do you have
 11 any plans?
 12 (2.4)
 13 S4: ((laughs)) (work)
 +shakes her head
 14 T: no okay (0.6) so do you like stories?
 15 LL: ye::::s
 16 T: do you read stories? okay today we will read
 17 a story

Line 1 and 2 show very familiar example of the way the pre-service teacher and the students greeted each other in the classroom. However, in line 3 PT16 did not answer the students' question, instead he directed a second question. This question was a polar question which may elicit *yes* or *no* answer. Only two students answered this question in the class (5 and 6) and PT 16 elaborated on his question and added the time "for the weekend" (line 7) which helped him to establish his momentary focus. In line 8, s1 repeated her previous answer which was a minimal response. In fluency context, the goal is to enable learners to express themselves in longer turns so in line 9, the pre-service teacher echoed S1 answer and waited for 1.5 seconds. Then he talked about his own plan which was used as an example and model for the students to take up and to talk about their own plans. The way the teacher directed the discourse and started to talk about himself could be an interactional resource to give students wait time and pedagogical resource to provide students with a language model.

This resource is frequently used in other pre-service teachers' classrooms when the students do not answer the question. However, the example did not encourage student participation since the class was silent for 2.4 seconds. In line 13 s4's laughter broke the silence and she probably said *work*

((transcriber note)) and Pt16 said okay to finish the sequence and moved into the main activity of the class.

The laughter and the student smiles in classroom indicate lack of knowledge or unwillingness to participate. (Sert and Jacknick, 2015) It is apparent that Pt 16 was not able to maintain his focus and enable student participation so he decided to end the meaning and fluency context. It may be claimed that Pt 16 was not insistent on his focus or he might have preferred to keep the inquiry short to move onto the lesson. He probably preferred progressivity of the lesson and moved to the reading part. In the following extracts, interactions involving more participation will be presented.

In Pt 9's case, the similar interactional and pedagogical resource was used to encourage student participation. However, she managed to move to her main pedagogical goal using herself as a resource. She started the class twice during the term and below is the transcript of her first lesson with a meaning and fluency context in the high school Prep D. The lesson was a reading lesson and the topic was importance of food for the body as Pt 9 indicated in her lesson plan.

Extract FLU 2:Pt9_Prep D_FT: "antrenman"

- 1 T: hi everyone how are you?
2 (0.9)
3 LL: <fi::ne thanks and you::> £1 am (also) fine £
4 T: how was your week? what did you do? (0.8)
5 this week did you have exams?(1)did you go
6 cinema or somewhere?
7 LL: ((inaudible murmur in Turkish))
8 s1: sınavımız var mıydı?
did we have an exam?
9 T: didnt you do something?

10 s2: vardı vardı

yes yes

11 T: yes anybody? (3.6) you didnt do anything (1.2)

12 you just studied? (1.4) all: week(4.6) then (.)

13 i am gonna talk about myself if you dont talk

14 (0.7) err i started to do pilates

(,pə'la:ti:z/)

15 this week (0.4) do you know what pilates means?

16 ((writes it on board))

17 (2.2)

18 do you know the exercise which can be done with

19 a ball(.)you

+as if she is holding one

20 know ebru şallı right?

21 LL: ((laughter))

22 s3: haa pilates

23 T: she does a lot (1.1) er i started to do pilates

24 to be healthy and fit (1.1) err i like sports

25 to be healthy(0.7) do you do anything to be

26 more healthier

27 (1.2)

28 °guys? ° (1.1) do you do any sport?

29 s4: ((raises his hand))

30 T: yes

31 s4: err i play basketball (0.8) (yani)

32 ((stands up)) (you know)

33 (1)

34 T: are you in the school team?

35 (0.7)

36 s4: no °atıl° °atıl° fatıldım£ ((laughs))

fire fire I got fired

37 LL: ((laughter))

38 s4: 1: (.) got fired

39 (0.7)

40 T: why? ((laughs))

41 (1.4)

42 s4: errr: 1 didnt came to >°antreman neydi?°<

what was training?

43 ((asks the question to s5))

44 s5: £antreman£

training

45 +opens his hands

46 s6: £antreman£

training

47 LL: ((laughter))

48 T: ((nods her head)) okay

Beginning from the fourth line, Pt 9 established fluency context directing a series of *information seeking questions* to the students. In line 4, her first two questions were designed as a content question. After 0.8 seconds of silence, she began to elaborate on the questions and asked two polar questions pausing for 1 second in between. However, no one wanted to ask for the turn to answer the questions. In line 11, Pt 9 used herself as a resource as Pt 16 did in the Extract 6 and started to talk about her own week. In line 14, she referred to pilates and in line 15 she initiated knowledge check question to check whether the students knew about the exercise. Her question was designed in polar question format. During 2.2 seconds of wait time, nobody in the class again oriented to teacher's check. In line 16 Pt 9 wrote the word "pilates" on the board which was a learning space for all the learners in the class. In line 18 she first explained the exercise along with her body language

and talked about a very famous person associated with pilates to make the concept accessible to the students. A loud laughter came from students (21) and S3 uttered an acknowledgement token following the Turkish pronunciation of the word (22). It is apparent that the class understood the word pilates after the explanation and the familiar example. Between lines 23 and 26, Pt 9 re-established her focus and connected to the main topic “*health*”. As soon as she asked the question “do you do any sport?” (28) s4 raised his hand and gave his answer. After one second of silence, Pt 9 asked another information seeking question (34) which obviously opens space for an interaction in the following lines. In line with the goal of the fluency context, Pt 9 did not initiate any repair when s4 used Turkish and in the line 36 s4 himself did self-initiated self-repair which perfectly suits the pedagogical goal of this specific context. To maintain the interaction, she asked “why” and waited for 1.4 seconds for s4 to get the turn. In line 40, s4 uttered a grammatically incorrect sentence “i did not came to” and asked for the English equivalent of *antreman* to his desk mate s5. His desk mate said “*antreman*” opening his hands to mean that it is the same in English. In line 48, the pre-service nodded her hand and said “okay” to close the sequence.

This sequence shows that Pt 9 successfully established fluency focus and maintained its focus with series of information seeking questions (Lines 28, 34, 40) that helped to open interactional space for the learner. In addition, she used wait time to get learner response (lines 35, 41). She did not focus on the form (lines 38 *got fired*, line 42 *did not came to*) and correct the students’ grammatical mistakes. The teacher’s use of examples from her own life to increase participation and the use of information seeking questions accompanied by wait time apparently open the space for interaction. She employed different types of questions (polar, content) but her own account helped her to get students’ talk. Unlike Pt 16, she initiated and elaborated on her story and she could involve the learners. However, the teacher’s closing third turn (line 48) did not turn this interaction into a teaching and learning opportunity. The interaction between lines 42 and 46 demonstrates that s5

and s6 helped their friend s4 saying that he could use *antrenman*. It is apparent that they thought *antrenman* is an English word which is actually a Turkish word originated from the French “*entrainement*”. Pt 9 did not address this knowledge gap or did not orient to s4’s word search to fill the knowledge gap in her third turn.

It could be argued that the teacher creates a fluency context here and avoids doing repair in order to provide space for extended learner turns. However, this practice collides with the understanding of social SLA which maintains that learning occurs in and through interaction (Ellis, 2010). While Pt 9 was successful in establishing the context and created space for interaction, in the third turn she failed to make use of this context as an opportunity to show the knowledge gap and teach word “*training*” to the class especially when the participants themselves mark it as learnable. Thus, she was not able to give appropriate feedback in the third turn and scaffold learners which are the actions suggested by Walsh (2006) in SETT.

Moreover, Walsh (2006) suggests that managing side sequences and shifts are the indicators of Classroom Interactional Competence. Thus, a competent teacher is expected to move smoothly from the fluency to the form and accuracy context when needed. Here in line 42, student’s question indicated that there was a lack of knowledge and the following lines demonstrated that s5 and s6 did not know the appropriate word “*training*”. Although the students did not directly ask the word to the pre-service teacher, it was sequentially evident that they did not know the word. Thus, if Pt 9 could have shifted the mode and introduced the word to the class, it would have been a learning opportunity for the learners.

The next extract is taken from the final teaching of Pt 12 in the Prep H. As she stated in her lesson plan, her pedagogical aim was “to foster students speaking skills”. “T tries to warm students up by asking them what they did on the weekend. T elaborates by asking more questions such as “did you do any

sports? How often do you do sports? What kind of sports? Why? Do you like doing sports?" Pt 12 started her final teaching with the same question "how was your weekend?" As it is obvious from her lesson plan, she expected students to talk about the sports they played at the weekend. Before this extract, four different students answered her questions and this was the last student before moving onto the next question about sport activities. Different from what she expected, in this extract S1 told her that her mobile phone broke down. Since this was the fluency context, in line 17, she said okay to S1 to go on talking about her weekend.

Extract FLU 3:Pt12_Prep H_TT_ "technician"

1 T: okay↑
 2 (0.6)
 3 S1: err [and
 4 T: [so what did you do?=
 5 S1: = we: (1.4) take him (.)take it (0.5)to:
 (0.9)
 6 T: [nods her head]
 7 S1: [((laughs for 1.5 seconds))
 8 T: [((smiles))
 9 S1: £tamirci£
technician
 10 (0.9)
 11 T: £o:kay£ ((she looks up))
 12 (0.3)
 13 S1: and we wait the (0.4) one days (1.0) i am
 14 bored (0.3) one day↓
 15 (0.9)
 16 T: okay you didn't do anything?
 17 (1.0)
 18 S1: i:: did (1.6) ya i play hih hih £laptop£
 hih

19 hih (0.5)
20 T: ((smiles)) ʔokayʔ

After 0.6 seconds of silence, s1 started with a hesitation marker and Pt 12 asked her a follow up question to understand what she did after her mobile phone broke down (4). In line 5, she started to narrate; she did self-initiate a self-repair by replacing *him* with *it*. In line with the pedagogical purpose of the segment, the PT 12 provided no correction and only nodded her head to approve self-repair (6). In the line 7, S1 indicated a trouble by laughing. S1 started laughing and the pre-service teacher simultaneously smiled for 1.5 seconds. It is apparent that S1 was in word search sequence to complete her utterance. The student could not continue her talk and it is clear that intersubjectivity and the progressivity of the talk was not maintained (Kitzinger, 2013). Then, in line 9 the turn was taken by S1 and she resorted to Turkish. Use of the smiley voice indicated that she problematized her use of L1 (9). After nearly one second of silence, Pt 12 took the turn and she uttered “okay” in smiley voice too. And then she looked up, which may show she was also in word search sequence. In line 13, s1 took the turn and continued to talk about her weekend. It is clear that the teacher’s okay (11) maintained the progressivity of the student talk which was the pedagogical goal of the fluency context.

This extract shows that the student resorts to Turkish when there is an interactional trouble stemming from epistemic stance. Being aware of the language policy in the class, she marked it as a trouble by laughing. On the other hand, the teacher tried to resolve the interactional trouble by accepting the violation of the language policy in the class and uttering okay as a go ahead response. Thus, the teacher passed up the repair immediately as PT 9 did in the previous extract. Pt 12 also did not address the lack of knowledge in the extract and missed the opportunity to teach the word *technician*. It could be argued that the teacher creates fluency context here and avoids doing repair in

order to provide space for extended learner turns. As mentioned previously in Pt 9's case, passing up the repair means losing the teaching and learning opportunities in the class. Especially when students themselves indicate their lack of knowledge or mark it using some interactional resources, it is obvious that the teacher should orient to these clues and attempt to make use of these moments.

Moreover, it might be sequentially evident that the pre-service teacher is also in word search sequence as she looks up (11) which might be an indication of word search sequence. Goodwin & Goodwin (1986) showed that speakers "frequently gaze away from their recipients" (p.57) when they are involved in word search. In addition Goodwin & Goodwin (1986) refer to the psychologists who showed that speakers turn their head in different directions when engaged in word search. A number of conversation analytic studies in language classrooms (Greer, 2013; Mori, 2004) yielded similar results. Eye contact and gaze directions could be significant indicators of the word search in classroom contexts.

Along with word searches designed as a response to the information-seeking questions, students may offer unexpected and inappropriate candidate answers. Since Pts cannot predict the answers or there is no one correct answer as in the form and accuracy context; they cannot deal with the students' contributions. (Fagan, 2012) or shape them (Walsh, 2006). The following extract will demonstrate one representative instance.

The episode shows Pt 15'S (Pt 16's partner) first teaching. She greeted the class and, unlike Pt 16, she got response from the class. However, it is obvious that she cannot handle the unpredictable responses and even echoed the inappropriate response. In this extract, there were many students who contributed to this interaction. Those are Pt 15 (T) the teacher and the students, S1, S2, S3 and S4 as participants in this extract. It was the beginning of the class.

Extract FLU 4: Pt 15_Prep K_FT_one_ "teethache"

1 T: so↑(.) how are you this week?
+opens her arms

2 (1)

3 LL: baa:d

4 T: ((moves her head and hand to the right side of
5 the class))

6 S1: toothache

7 S2: examming

8 T: + points to gzd

9 T: bad? aa yes

10 S1: and /'tu:θeɪ/
11 LL: ((laughs))

12 S2: huh?

13 T: what?

14 S3: °teethache mi toothache mi? °
teethache or toothache

15 S1: teethache
/ti:θ eɪtʃ/
16 S2: teethache
/ti:θ eɪtʃ/
17 +points to her mouth

18 S1: stomachache yok
no

19 LL: ((laughs))

20 S2: /ti:θ eɪtʃ/
21 T: haaa (.) teeth ACHE you have teethache >thats
/eɪk/
22 really bad< i know err do you use anything()
23 pills?
24 S4: su
water

25 ((unintelligible talk in class))
 26 S1: err monday
 27 T: on monday ?
 28 S1: yes
 29 T: okay↓ please get well soon.

Pt 15 is the one of the candidate teachers who attempt to go into relatively longer routine inquires which are not necessarily relevant to the main aim of the lesson. Her question in the very beginning of the lesson (1) got a response from the whole class and S1 also said that he had a toothache (6). Pt 15 did not orient to S1's answer and also she did not orient to s2's answer (7). It might be because she could not hear all the answers as students self-selected themselves and took the turns in a row as in salad dressing example. Although at first s1 uttered the word correctly (6), in 9 his utterance was not intelligible enough for Pt 15 to understand. Thus, she asked for clarification in the next line (13) which prompted other students to think about s1's answer. S3 (13) initiated a repair in the form of a tag question. In the following, S1 and S2 took up the wrong word (*teethache*) and incorrect pronunciation (/tɪ:θ eɪtʃ/). The s2 used her body language to make a clarification (17). However, this other-repair *teethache* instead of *toothache* was not correct in grammatical sense. Interestingly, the pre-service teacher uttered a change of state token (haaa) to demonstrate her understanding and echoed the grammatically incorrect response twice but, correcting the pronunciation of the word *ache* (21). She uttered the grammatically incorrect word with emphasis addressing the whole class. In order to continue with the fluency context, she asked a further question (22-23) and got a response (24) from S4. In line 26, S1 participated in interaction and said *Monday*. Pt 15 initiated embedded correction and added the preposition echoing back the response to request for clarification. However, s1 only said yes and PT 15 closed the sequence in line 29.

In this extract, Pt 15 established the fluency context successfully and engaged students in the context. Since more than one student self-selected themselves to take the turn, the pre-service teacher could not pick one student to respond at first as it was obvious from her body language (4, 5). In the next line, she oriented to one student's answer who actually took initiative and repeated his answer for many times (6, 10). In line 14, the S3 asked a question about the word and initiated a similar word search sequence demonstrated in the extracts 2 and 3 in the fluency contexts. As in Pt 9's class (extract 2), students went into a collaborative guessing sequence and offered a non-existing word "teethache" pronounced incorrectly (eɪtʃ) and an alternative word (18) stomach *ache* which might have been introduced to the class together with the word *toothache*. In the third turn, Pt 15 could not handle the students' incorrect answers and she herself echoed the grammatically incorrect word only repairing the pronunciation error. Thus, it could be argued that she could not give appropriate feedback and even reinforced the incorrect word. Similarly, Fagan (2012) found out that for novice teachers it is a very complex and demanding task to deal with unexpected learner contributions. The last part of the extract is also significant. Although the Pt 15 initiated clarification requests to stimulate and elicit further talk; S1 and S2 uttered single words which could not turn into a genuine interaction. In the final turn, Pt 16 said okay to end the sequence and said get well soon which still maintained the fluency focus.

Extract 5 shows a more controlled fluency context compared to the previous ones. This was Pt 3's third teaching in the high school prep B. Pt 3 aimed to revise past tense and past continuous tense in the final teaching. In order not to introduce the topic directly and enable students be aware of the tense themselves, she initiated the context with an information- seeking question to create a context for students to use the target tenses. The interaction involves Pt 3 (T) , Alper (A) and 5 unidentified students.

Extract FLU 5 Pt3_Prep B_TT_ "earthquake"

1 T: err(0.5) what happened err how was your
2 weekend?
3 LL: ba::d
4 T: what were you doing? (1.4) for example (.)
5 sunday night (1.1) what happened?
6 (2.4)
7 A: ((raises his hand))
8 T: ((points to Alper))
9 A: ı play computer games=
10 S2: =ı was sleeping
11 T: you were sleeping (1) what else?
12 (1.6)
13 T: ((points to the S3 who raised her hand))
14 S3: ı did homework
15 T: you did homework
16 ((t bent down))
17 S4: ı watched tv series
18 T: you watched tv series and did you feel the
19 earthquake?
20 S5: aa
21 LL: yes ((in chorus))
22 LL: no ((in chorus))
23 T: ı felt (.)ı felt (.) at that time ı was
24 drinking my coffee
25 S5: off
26 T: ı dropped my cup (.)and burnt my hand (.) but
27 now it is okay (1.4)what were you ()?
28 S5: ()
29 S6: ((raise her finger))
30 S5: poor you
31 T: thank you very much

32 T: ((gives turn to s6))
 33 s6: err my aunt and her husband came err to our
 34 house=
 35 T: =came to your house
 36 s6: and we were drinking tea
 37 T: you were drinking your tea
 38 S6: first my uncle felt (0.7) the [earthquake
 39 T: [earthquake
 40 (0.3)
 41 S6: and (1 also felt) 1 looked at the glasses
 and
 42 they were shaking
 43 (0.4)
 44 T: £they were shaking£ (.) it was frightening
 45 right?
 46 but it is over(.) today 1 have a man

To establish her focus, Pt 3 first asked a known-answer question *what happened* and then she repaired her own utterance and turned this question into an information seeking one (2). She was expecting students to talk about the earthquake; thus this context is more guided. However, until line 18, the students did not give the answer Pt 3 was waiting for. In line 4, she again changed the structure of her question and used present continuous tense (the target structure that she was expecting from the students) and tried to elicit the answer *earthquake*. A raised his hand but his answer was not related to the hidden agenda of the teacher. Hence, she did not orient to A's answer in present tense. She maintained the context and she only echoed the answers which were formulated in past continuous (11) and past tense (15, 17). In line 18, she asked the main question designed in yes/no form so the students answered in chorus. This response from the class is not surprising since polar questions (yes/no questions) elicit this kind of answer in most of the time

(Raymond, 2003). In line 23, she started to talk about her evening when she felt the earthquake. The Pt3 also used her own story both as a pedagogical and interactional resource as Pt 16 and Pt 9 did in their teachings (Extracts 1 and 2). S5 reacted to the story (30) which shows S5's listenership and s5 (34) responded to the teacher's story which made the interaction authentic and different from the IRF pattern in which teacher closed the sequence. Then in line 33, S6 started to talk about her own experience. In the third turns, Pt 3 echoed the student's story line by line (37, 39, and 44). S6's story was grammatically correct and suited to the main aim of the lesson. Pt 3 only echoed the answers and closed the turn without asking further questions (48).

When the fluency context is initiated for a preparation for the upcoming main activity, it is designed in a more controlled manner. It is evident that every information seeking question or known information question asked by the teacher is aimed to direct and control the classroom interaction. However, candidate teachers attempt to ask more controlled questions to establish the context. In order to prevent deviation from the agenda, they only oriented to the answers in preferred form and content. The narration of their own stories enables participation and engagement of the students into the interaction. Thus, it is one of the frequently employed actions by the candidate teachers to maintain the pedagogical focus. In addition, in line with Park (2014)'s findings Pts repetitions in the third turns (11, 15, 35, and 39) facilitated the participation and elicited longer turns in fluency context.

The next example comes from the young learners' classroom in 5B. Pt 2 in her third teaching attempted to introduce the words related to the illness and used her own story to initiate the context. Actually this could be a meaning context but the participants' orientations turned it into a fluency context. T refers to PT2, SE is Serdar and S1, S4 and S6 are unidentified students.

Extract FLU 6_Pt2_5B_TT: "illness"

1 T: hi class (.)how are you?
2 (0.8)
ll: °fine thanks and you°
3 T: actually ı am not fine as you see (0.8) err ı
4 am very very ill (0.9)
+takes a pocket of tissues
5 err do you know what is the meaning of ill?
6 s1: geçmiş olsun ne demek
what does get well soon mean?
7 (2.1)
8 T: what is it? (1.3) geçmiş olsun?
9 SE: ()
10 T: serdar?
11 (1)
12 SE: ıgeçmiş olsunı
13 LL: ((t and class laughs))
14 T: what is it in english?
15 (0.6)
16 SE: he in english? (0.8) what is: (0.9) err
neydi?
17 T: get well soon okay ?
18 S1: [get well soon
19 SE: [aa doğru
oh that's true
20 T: yes thank you (0.5) do you know what is the
21 meaning of ill(1.9) in turkish?
22 s1: ((raises her finger))

23 T: yes

24 s1: (hasta)

25 sE: geçmiş olsun
get well soon

26 T: yes lets write it let s write it on the board

27 ((writes ill=hasta on the board))

28 hasta (.) yess err ı think the weather is very

29 cold (1) and when you come to the school

30 and go outside (2) ı think you should wear
your

31 coat (2) and scarf err don't be ill okay? (.)

32 be careful (1.2) err is there anybody who is

33 ill in the class (1.2) is there anybody who is

34 ill? (0.9) in the class?

35 s1: kim hasta
who is ill

36 T: yes

37 ((s4 and s7 raise their hands))

38 (1.2)

39 T: you? you are ill? (1.3) err do you know what
is

40 the name of your illness?

41 S4: (ne)?
(what)

42 T: illness

43 S1: adı ne
what is its name

44 T: yes (0.9) what is the meaning of illness?

45 S4: ay pardon ben karıştırdım
*ay I am sorry I confused it with something
else*

46 T: illness ((writes "illness" on the board))

47 S4: illness mı yoksa?
is it illness or ?

48 T: the name of (.) your illness

49 S4: ha hastalığınının adı mı?
ohh is it the name of the illness?

50 T: yes ((writes hastalık on the board)) do you
51 know?

52 S4: yani sadece (.) nezle gibi (.) ingilizcesini
53 bilmiyorum
*you know it is something like cold but I
don't know how to say it in English*

54 T: do you know what is it in English?
55 ((looks at the whole class))

56 S6: ben hasta değilim başkası hasta söyleyebilir
57 miyim?
*I am not ill someone else is ill can I say
it?*

58 T: yes err (.) don't worry we will learn it
59 together today (0.6) we will learn(0.5)
60 illnesses today(.) okay?

It is sequentially evident that pre-service teachers use their own stories to establish the meaning and fluency context as Pt 2 did in the beginning of the extract (3, 4). After she said that she was ill and used other contextual clues

(4) she asked a knowledge check question to see whether students knew this word which could have initiated a meaning sequence. However, in line 6, it is evident that at least S1 oriented to the fluency context initiated by the teacher's story and wanted to participate in this interaction expressing her wish. However, she lacked the language resource to convey her message so she asked a counter question to the teacher and initiated a word search in Turkish. After 2.1 seconds of silence, the teacher directed this question to the class in English. Pt2 did not answer this question, instead she repeated s1's question in English and directed it to the class (8). With this action, she gained the control of the interaction (Markee, 2000, p.64), and set the language policy in an implicit way. In line 9, s2 uttered something unintelligible to the transcriber and the teacher selected s2 as the next speaker. He uttered "*gecmis olsun*" and all the class including the teacher laughed at him. In line 14, the teacher repeated her question and reminded the language policy implicitly. In line 16, s2 self-selected himself; however, he could not answer the question. Finally, the teacher herself gave the answer in the next line (17). In line 20, she repeated her previous question, but this time she wanted an answer in Turkish and a preferred response came without a delay (24). In the next lines, the teacher used the blackboard to make the word *ill* visible to everyone in the class. Then she continued her story and asked an information seeking question (32-33-34) designed in polar yes/ no question form. After 1.2 seconds of silence she repeated her question (38). S1 translated this question for the class (35) and the pre-service teacher displayed her acceptance in line 44. It is sequentially evident that after S1's translation, the rest of the class oriented to the teacher's question and two students who were ill raised their hands. In line 39, the teacher directed her question to those who raised their hands. However, her question was not grammatically correct "*do you know what is the name of your illness*" and most probably it was not a slip-of-tongue or a mistake as in line 5 where she asked a similar question formulated in the same way. However, s4 displayed non-understanding (41) and S1 translated the question for the students (41). Actually this extract is a good representative of

the other question answer sequences in this class (5-B, Table 1). Whenever the teacher asked a question in English, s1 translated the question into Turkish for the class even when the teacher selected someone else as a next speaker. Thus, s1 established her identity as a knower and helper in the class. The teacher's positive evaluations and remarks (36, 44) strengthened her role. After the teacher approved s1's translation, she checked whether the students knew the word *illness*. It is apparent that s4 did not know the word and the teacher used the blackboard to introduce the word to the class (46). The next lines (47, 48, 49, and 50) demonstrated the negotiation of meaning sequence between the teacher and S4. However, the teacher used English and the student used Turkish which was not appropriate considering the institutional context of a language classroom. In line 52, s4 claimed insufficient knowledge; however, the teacher asked the same question one more time to the class (54). S6 self-selected herself and asked for permission to say something. This turn shows S6's willingness to participate; however, the teacher did not orient to this turn and closed the sequence (58-60).

This long sequence shows that proficiency of the learners and the language policy implemented in the class directly affect the quality and the quantity of the interaction and learning. The teacher used knowledge check questions to understand students' knowledge (5, 21, and 39). However, it is obvious that the language itself is the problem for the learners. The candidate teacher attempted to make it accessible to the learners with the help of contextual clues which helped learners to understand the teacher's agenda. However, only one student could attempt to interact with the teacher as she was apparently more knowledgeable than the others. She also displayed her lack of knowledge to participate in the interaction.

In short, the candidate teacher managed to set up fluency focus without asking any information seeking question in the beginning. Although students were willing to participate in the interaction, their language proficiency level was not that high to carry on the interaction. Thus, the teacher needed to initiate

knowledge check and the students asked clarification questions in the next turns. At the end, the teacher could not maintain the context since the students could not understand teacher talk and did not have the knowledge of related vocabulary and resorted to Turkish. Hence, when the students use their native tongue, which is dispreferred by the teacher, the fluency focus cannot be maintained. However, it is obvious that students' orientation to the teacher's story and willingness to participate in the conversation (6) is crucial in setting up the fluency context.

The similar case is recorded in Pt 15's first teaching. Focus on fluency requires students to express themselves freely and students talked about their own immediate environment and local culture. In the following extract, due to lacking language resource, students resort to their L1.

Pt 15 and Pt 16's focus was on reading and writing in the first teaching. The students were going to read a text about festivals around the world and create a poster for a festival in groups. To prepare students for the reading text and initiate a brainstorming session; Pt15 established meaning focus which was similar to the one Extract MEA 6: Ba'raat Night. Thanks to the unfolding interaction enriched by participants' momentary foci, it turns into a fluency context. T refers to PT 15, PT 16 refers to her partner in the classroom. KA refers to Kaan. There are S2, S3, and S4 as unidentified students.

Extract FLU 7: PT 15_Prep K_FT: "pickle festival"

- 1 T: all right then (0.7)so after exams you are
2 going to rest(.)you are going to have fun
3 (0.8) but now we are going to talk about
4 something really really fun
5 (2.2)
6 a now I will write word on the board
7 [(writing festival on the board)]
8 S1: [festival ((in turkish))]
9 T: festival (1.3)so (1.1) what(0.8) what comes

(/ 'festiv(ə)l /)
 10 to your mind(.)when I say festival?(1.6)I
 11 want (0.5) words from you(0.2)like for
 12 example when I say festival (0.6) I think of
 13 music
 14 ((writes music on the board))
 15 S2: ((raises her hand))
 16 T: what do you think of?
 +turns to the students and points to s3
 17 S2: dance↑
 18 (0.7)
 19 T: dance (.) perfect
 20 ((writes dance on the board))
 21 KA: ((raises his hand))
 22 T: you (.) you what was your name?
 23 KA: err kaan
 24 T: kaan?
 25 KA: ingilizcesini bilmiyorum da (0.4) turşu
 26 geliyor aklıma
*ı don't know how to say it in English but
 pickle comes to my mind*
 27 LL: ((laughs))
 28 T: are you from çubuk?
 29 KA: no
 30 (0.9)
 31 T: do you know çubuk=
 32 KA: =[my (.) my mother
 33 T: [in çubuk there is a
 34 T: °pickle°
 35 ((turns to the blackboard to write the
 36 word))
 37 T: pickle mı ?

is it pickle?
 38 ((looks at her teaching partner, Pt 16))
 39 PT16 ((nods his head)) °pickle°
 40 T: ((writes pickle on the board))
 41 T: now in cubuk (0.4) do you know çubuk in
 42 Ankara?
 43 S3: yes ((raises her hand))
 44 S4: hocam memleket
teacher my hometown
 45 T: ohhh
 46 S3: benimki de benimki de
mine mine
 47 T: I have friend from çubuk I love çubuk (0.3)
 48 and once last year we went to çubuk turşu
 49 festivali
festival of pickles
 50 ((points to the board))
 51 S3: bu sene olmadı
it did not take place this year
 52 LL: ((laughter))
 53 T: I went last year↓
 54 S3: ((raises her hand)) concert and enjoyable
 55 show

In lines 1-5, Pt 15 did a pre-expansion to her instruction and attempted to motivate learners to participate. In line 6, she started to write a word on the board. Before she completed writing the key word on the board (7), s1 guessed the word and said it aloud in Turkish. Although it was uttered in Turkish, it shows that the teacher's use of board helped learners to participate in the context. In line 9, the teacher used embedded repair and uttered the word in English. Then, she directed the information seeking question in the

same line and stated what students were required to say (9-13). With this clear instruction, PT 15 established her focus and one-word response came from the class immediately which shows their involvement (17). In line 21, KA self-selected himself and raised his hand. The teacher approved his selection and asked his name at first. In line 25, KA started his turn with a CIK but oriented to teacher's question using the same structure as the teacher used in her question (t: *what comes to your mind* s: *turşu geliyor aklıma*). His initiative to speak and his turn showed that he understood the teacher's question and was willing to participate in the interaction. However, he violated the language policy. His answer made everyone laugh as in the previous extract. From the laughter (27), it is clear that most of the students know the local prickle festival in Çubuk. It is interesting that the things that belong to Turkish culture create a humorous atmosphere in the foreign language classroom. The pre-service teacher understood the relationship between prickle and the festival and asked a follow up question to KA (28) which maintained the interaction. This follow up information seeking question could be given as an example to what Waring (2015) described as *validating learner responses* and *responsive to the moment*. Unlike Pt 7 (Extract MEA 6: Ba'raat Night), she did not provide English word immediately; instead she maintained the interaction with an information seeking question (28). However, she oriented to student's CIK and gave the English word for *turşu* a few lines after. It is sequentially evident that she was not sure about her knowledge so she consulted her teaching partner (37). After Pt 16 showed his agreement, she wrote the word on the board (40) which could be marked as "teaching moment". In the next line, she addressed to the whole class and initiated an ESC (epistemic status check) to make sure that other students were following the interaction. The responses (43, 44, and 46) showed that some of them knew the festival. In line 47, Pt 15 initiated her story as a post expansion and S3 oriented to that story in Turkish (51). In the following line Pt 15 ended the interaction marking her last comment with a falling intonation (53).

The episode above also represented a co-constructed fluency context with the mutual orientations of the interlocutors. Pt 15 could seize the teaching opportunity and provide space for the learners to converse at the same time. She also used her own stories and information seeking questions to achieve the pedagogical purpose.

The next extract was taken from Pt 13's second teaching. She initiated fluency context as a post reading activity as she stated in her lesson plan. The students read a text about "mall of America" and answered the comprehension questions in the coursebook. And then, Pt 13 herself created a post reading activity and prepared a power point presentation showing three famous shopping malls around the world. Showing the photos of these different malls, she introduced these malls and talked about the things that make them special and popular. This presentation was also done to prepare students for the next writing task in which students themselves created their own shopping malls. Hence, focus on fluency sequence transcribed below both functioned as a post-reading and pre-writing activity. T is Pt 13, NS is Nisa and BL is Bilal.

Extract FLU 8: PT 13_ Prep H_ ST: "shopping mall"

1 T: so who can tell me which one is your (0.3)
2 which one did you like the most?
3 (0.6) and why why do you think?
4 ((two students raise their hands))
5 (3) which one? (0.9) >first one second
6 one third one?<
 +points to the pictures on the slide
7 (1) yes nisa
8 NS: err third one
9 T: yes ((points to first picture))
10 the aqua park one yes
11 NS: because I like swimming
12 T: yes you like swimming (1.4) okay it will be
13 fun right? (0.9) at the mall(0.8) when

14 you are shopping you can also enjoy the
15 aqua park(0.9)yes
16 (1.3)
17 yes bilal
18 BL: err
19 T: [what is your favourite?
20 BL: [first one
21 T: first one (0.3)skiing one?
22 (0.8)
23 BL: yes
24 (1.4)
25 T: do you like skiing?
26 BL: err
27 T: you like snow ?
28 BL: err (0.5) no ay şey I like s::now errr but
28 (0.6) err (0.4) ı:: (0.5) err ı: (1)
29 °nası diyim° (0.8)
 how can I say
30 hiç kaymadım (yani)
 I ve never skied (I mean)
31 (0.6)
32 T: you want to try it?
33 BL: yeah
34 T: it will be fun
35 BL: err [and-
36 T: [think about it for example in ankamall
37 (0.4)
38 ((stop looking at bilal and looks at the
39 other side of the class))
40 there is a skiing part(1.5) it would be very
41 fun right?(0.9)people go there enjo:y↓
42 (1.4)

Pt 13 initiated two information seeking questions in a row. She clarified the question pointing to each of the pictures (6). Two students volunteered to answer the questions. NS gave grammatically and pedagogically appropriate answer (8, 11) and in the next line, PT13 first echoed NS 's answer, after 1,4 seconds of silence, she elaborated on s1's answer (12-15). BL uttered his choice in line 20 and the teacher also initiated confirmation check (21) to make sure that they understood the same thing. After BL's confirmation (23) and waiting for 1, 4 seconds of silence, the PT 13 initiated a follow-up information seeking question (25). While BL was apparently thinking about his answer, in line 27 she asked a further question to elicit an answer from him. The following lines (28-31) showed that BL wanted to participate in the interaction; however, he did not know how to express himself in English. Then, he violated the language policy and expressed himself in his native tongue (30). In line 32, the teacher attempted to continue the interaction and asked a yes/no question without using the word BL had difficulty to find in the previous line (30). Thus, it may be claimed that the teacher could have designed her turn in order not to miss the opportunity to teach the verb "ski". However, she continued the interaction (32) and in the next line (35-36) the teacher and student overlapped. In line 36, the overlap resolved when the teacher continued to elaborate on BL's answer. Normally, the teachers are expected to use wait time to encourage student talk and the overlaps are avoided to open space for student turns in fluency context. In the closing turn, Pt 13 addressed the whole class and invited other students to continue with the context. The teacher candidate did not orient to the student's CIK and did not initiate a repair sequence. Rather, she preferred to elaborate on BL's answer and closed the interaction as shown in the next lines (36-43).

The final extract also shows a fluency focus initiated in Prep D in the high school. PT 6 was told to follow the course book by her mentor in her first

teaching. (APPENDIX J) In the course book, there was a short survey asking about “are you a good citizen”. There were nine items in the survey and each question was answered by a different student after s/he read it. In the following extract, S7 self-selected himself to answer the fifth question.

Extract FLU 9: Pt 6_ Prep D_FT: “good citizen”

1 T: fifth one? (0.8) yes
2 s7: I volunteer my time to help others eg
3 helping at a community centre or kids' club
4 a::
5 ((reads it from the text book))
6 T: al::ways? (0.7) then you go to community
7 centre
8 s7: ((nods his head))
9 T: what do you do?
10 (1.9)
11 s7: play games
12 (1.1)
13 T: then how would you help others? how do you
14 help? (0.8) playing games? by playing games?
15 s7: sometimes
16 T: hum
17 s7: I see errr little kid
18 T: yes
19 s7: err I got helped to (go on) information
20 (0.5)
21 T: okay yes then you are a good citizen (.)and
22 next one who wants to read?

The episode above also shows pre-service teachers did not continue initiating repair sequences when students uttered grammatically incorrect even unintelligible sentences when focus was on fluency. The first two lines are

examples of initiation and response turns. And then, Pt 6 did not give any feedback in the next line but asked a follow up question which opened space for the interaction (6-7). The next lines demonstrate a negotiation of meaning sequence since Pt 6 was trying to understand S7's activities in the community centre. As a result, she asked further questions (13-14) which gave s7 an opportunity to express himself more. In line 15, he attempted to clarify himself and in the next line the pre-service teacher showed that she was listening to him (16) and wanted him to go on speaking (18). In line 19, S7's utterance was ungrammatical and unintelligible. He most probably meant that he helped little kids to find information on the internet. However, the pre-service teacher in the next line (21) closed the negotiation of meaning sequence giving explicit positive feedback and moved onto the next item of the survey without any clarification.

4.4.1 Discussion of Focus on Fluency

The micro-analytic investigation of focus on fluency in teacher led EFL classrooms demonstrate that candidate teachers follow the same route while establishing and maintaining the focus. They use similar interactional and pedagogical resources to construct the context. No matter which language proficiency level the students have, students apparently have difficulties in contributing to the context. In a similar vein, PTs have difficulties in responding to students' word searches, incomplete utterances, grammatically incorrect responses and unwillingness to participate.

Focus on fluency in English as a foreign language classrooms can be discussed in three parts: the sequence in which candidate teachers set the context and involve learners, the following sequence in which learners contribute to the context and the final sequence in which the teacher closes the sequence.

In the first part, in establishing fluency context candidate teachers first have difficulties in involving learners as in Pt 16's case. The students may be unwilling to participate in the lesson (Extract FLU 1). The teachers use their

own stories both as an interactional and pedagogical resource to engage learners. These short narrations provide learners with a language model and time to think. In addition, use of board in the first turn may involve learners as it is obvious in Pt 15's case (Extract FLU 7). Before Pt 15 completed writing the key word "festival" on the board, the students already predicted the word themselves. It clearly shows their willingness to participate. In the extract 6, Pt 2 also used contextual clues (her pocket of tissues) to establish the meaning which made relevant for the students go into genuine conversation. Using these resources accompanied by information seeking questions and wait time, the students always self-select themselves. The pre-service teachers never pick those students who do not raise their hands. Hence, in fluency context, candidate teachers wait for students to self-select themselves for the next turns.

In the second turn in which students take turns to answer, the significance of the students' proficiency level is obvious. It definitely affects the quality and quantity of the interaction. In addition to being unwilling to participate (Extract FLU 1), if they cannot answer in English, they stop the interaction (Extract FLU 3, Extract FLU 6). As a consequence, the pre-service teachers cannot continue with the context. The students may provide ungrammatical (Extract FLU 4) or unintelligible answers (Extract FLU 9) or they frequently give answers in Turkish (except for the extracts FLU 5 and FLU 9). It is important for a teacher candidate to handle all these responses and shape it and give it back to the learner, which Walsh (2006) defined as "shaping learner contribution" in the Classroom Interactional Competence framework.

However, the data reveal that although the pre-service teachers open the space for interaction directing information seeking questions followed by wait time and use different resources to establish their pedagogical agenda, they fail to shape learner contributions and eventually miss the opportunities to teach in the third turn. Due to the nature of the fluency context, the students are freely expressing themselves and most of the time they need to seek for

the words to continue their turns (Extracts FLU 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7). Sometimes they clearly state that they don't know how to express themselves in English (Extracts FLU 6 and 7) These clear CIKs sometimes stem from the concepts that cannot be easily translated into English (e.g. pickle festival). However, the PTs cannot always contribute to these word searches and knowledge gaps and turn them into a learning opportunity for the student and the class in the third turn. In addition to the word search, the teachers do not orient to students' clear CIKs (Extracts 4, 6, and 8). In those extracts, students take initiative and clearly state that they do not know how to express their opinion in English. As we see in Pt 9 (Extract2: antrenman) and Pt 12 (Extract 3 technician) cases, students took initiative and asked for the unknown word or indicated their lack of knowledge with laughter. However, the teacher candidates cannot handle the students' unpredictable responses and help learners to find the appropriate word.

The reason for being unable to help to find correct word and address knowledge gaps could be the candidate teachers' incompetence to retrieve the word at that moment. In Pt 12's example (Extract 3: technician), averting her gaze and looking up can be evidence that she is also in word search and cannot help learners at that point. Furthermore, the candidate teachers may also echo and reinforce the ungrammatical answers (Extract 4: teethache) as Pt 15 did in her teaching. This shows the unpredictable nature of the students' answers and especially in the absence of turn taking rule, Pts may revoice students' inappropriate answers. When students raise their hands and take the floor, the data reveal that PTs manage them more successfully as seen in the meaning context as well (Extract FM 3 : salad dressing).

Moreover, students may give ungrammatical and unintelligible responses (Extract FLU 9: good citizen) and the candidate teacher may fail to paraphrase the learner's answer to make it clear for the class. Walsh (2006) claims that *reformulation* and *extension* are the interactional features that language teachers employ to scaffold their learners. Unfortunately, the candidate

teachers do not initiate any repair or reformulate the students' utterances that need clarification.

Kim and Kasper (2007) analysed conversations-for-learning contexts in which learners of English who don't share the same language or the native speakers of the target language come together to provide language practice for the learners. The results indicated that in those conversation clubs, the native speakers (which epistemically in K+ position) "used three methods that did not make the misunderstanding the main business of the interaction-repairing the problem en passant, initiating other repair in next turn instead, or passing up the repair immediately" (p.398). By doing that while the progressivity of talk is maintained and the idea of L2 users as competent conversationalist is not challenged; "any learning opportunities that might have arisen from addressing the trouble were also prevented." (p.398).

Similarly, the teacher candidates pass up the repair or any initiation of repair when students utter ungrammatical responses in fluency context. This avoidance of repairing learners could stem from the paradoxical situation Seedhouse (2004) explored in detail. Based on the humanistic and student centred language teaching and learning approaches, the teachers are educated to praise and give positive feedback to the learners, which is thought to encourage their participation in the interaction. Thus, students' participation and utterances are oriented to as preferred by the candidate teachers and they do not further elaborate on their contributions, which make them design their closing turns in the form of EPAs. This limits the further clarification requests, confirmation checks to facilitate and enrich the discussion.

Conversely, this avoidance of repair may block the learning opportunities for students and collide with the understanding that "learning *occurs in and through interaction*". (Ellis, 2010). Thus, the language teachers should make use of the fluency context to get extended student talk and turn the interaction into a learning event. In order to do this, they also need to move between the contexts (managing mode shifts, Walsh, 2006) as Walsh suggests this as a

component of Classroom Interactional Competence. Thus, when the teacher candidates are faced with student CIK or knowledge gaps, they need to alter the context and their pedagogical aim.

The table 4.5 below summarises the interactional and pedagogical resources used by pre-service teachers when they focus on fluency. Interactional and pedagogical resources are analysed in terms of maintaining the focus and evaluation turn. In maintaining the focus, question design and handling learner contributions are significant. In evaluation turn, pre-service teachers acknowledge students' contributions with EPA or give the turn to other students in the classroom.

Table 4.5: Interactional and Pedagogical Resources in Focus on Fluency

Context		Interactional and Pedagogical Resources	
		Maintaining Focus	Evaluation Turn
Focus on Fluency	on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information –seeking questions • Use of self-accounts/ self stories • Use of visuals, materials and Contextual Clues • Use of wait time • Passing up repair • Leave unaddressed learners' CIKs or word search • Teacher echo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge response & initiate EPA

Table 4.6 Teacher Actions hindering and opening space for teaching

		Hindering Teaching Space	Opening Space for Teaching
Focus on Fluency		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave unaddressed learners' CIKs or word search • Teacher echo of inappropriate answer / incorrect answer • Passing up the repair 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question Design (information seeking questions) • Use of self-accounts/ self stories • Use of visuals, materials and Contextual Clues • Use of wait time

The table below (Table 4.6) provides the summary of teacher actions in focus on fluency that hinder teaching space or open space for teaching.

The last table, table 4.7 below provides summary of the teacher actions in *focus on form*, *focus on meaning* and *focus on fluency*.

Table 4.7: Summary of the Teacher Actions

	Hindering Teaching Space	Opening Space for Teaching
Focus on Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive use of DIUs, Extensive use of Teacher Echo • Extensive use of EPAs • Passing up questions • Passing up evaluation turn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embodied explanation • Use of the board • Next Turn Repair Initiations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Request for full sentence ○ Metalinguistic explanation
Focus on Meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embedded repair • Teacher echo of inappropriate answer • Turn-taking system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question Design (pursuit and negotiary questions) • Paraphrase • Use of wait time
Focus on Fluency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave learners' CIKs or word search unaddressed • Teacher echo of inappropriate answer / incorrect answer • Passing up repair 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question Design (information seeking questions) • Use of self-accounts/ self stories • Use of visuals, materials and Contextual Clues • Use of wait time

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary of Findings and Discussion

The main aim of this dissertation is to unearth sequential organization of PT-led EFL classroom interaction in secondary and high schools in practicum setting via micro-analysis of PT talk. The first research question aimed to explore emergent context in PT-led classroom interaction. The results showed that pedagogical focus of the classroom members shaped and directed the interaction. *Focus on form*, *focus on meaning* and *focus on fluency* manifested themselves as sub-discourses. Focus on form refers to the PTs and thereby learners' orientation towards accuracy and grammaticality. Focus on meaning refers to negotiation of meaning of a single word or phrase. The context was created by PT or classroom members for number of reasons: PTs might want to introduce a vocabulary item, learners were doing the activities in coursebook or an unknown word popped up in the contingency of classroom interaction. Focus on fluency manifested itself a couple of ways. Most of the time, it was just the beginning of the class and PTs were asking questions to warm up the class, still the questions were related to the upcoming tasks. PT also initiated this context as a post-activity to follow the tasks in the coursebook.

The second research question points to the interactional and pedagogical resources used by PTs to establish and maintain these aforementioned contexts. Successful establishment and maintenance of pedagogical focus is considered to facilitate and open teaching space. In this sense, through

establishment and maintenance of pedagogical focus, teaching opportunities were analysed. In order to create teaching opportunities PTs use some interactional and pedagogical resources in and through their talk. It is found out that while some resources opened space for teaching, some of them helped PTs maintain progressivity of the lesson for the expense of teaching opportunities.

The findings indicate that in *focus on form* known-answer questions were used to set the focus. To manage students' contributions, PTs used request for full sentence, metalinguistic explanations and DIUs to let learners self-repair in the next turn. PTs also used teacher initiated teacher repair and gave directly negative assessment by mitigating it via embodied resources. Embodied explanations were provided by PTs. In focus on form, students asked questions related to the task or to consult teachers' knowledge. To address those questions, PTs provided answers, invited peer feedback or passed up the question. In the last turn, they used EPA, echo or the board. Skipping the last turn, they selected next speaker to continue the task.

Focus on meaning manifested itself with a negotiatory question. As next turn repair initiators, PTs used pursuit questions, use of L1 to make clarifications and invited peer repair. To convey the meaning, they used the coursebook and visuals they prepared. They echoed students' responses to address them and used wait time to elicit more response. In the last turn, they paraphrased the meaning of the word, they initiated embedded repair and EPA.

Focus on fluency was constructed via information-seeking questions. The most significant way of involving learners into this context was to use of self-accounts and self-stories. PTs' telling their own short self stories provided learners with linguistic and interactional resources and paved the way for their contribution. Contextual clues and wait time were the other resources to contribute to the ongoing interaction. However, their word searches and CIKs were not oriented by PTs. Incorrect usages were echoed by PTs in some instances. In the last turn, PTs acknowledged learners' responses via EPAs.

The overview of contexts and micro-analysis of PTs' resources to establish and maintain them show that PTs managed to establish their focus successfully and involved learners. To maintain their focus was challenging task for them. Because in order to maintain their focus through sequences of talk, they needed to respond to learners' contributions; which were grammatically incorrect answers, claims of insufficient knowledge, word searches, counter questions.

These all make next turn responses relevant for Pts. However, they mostly preferred progressivity of the ongoing tasks, they initiated minimal responses or EPAs to end the sequence and move forward.

Drawing on the theories of learning which conceptualise it as "consequences of participation and use" (van Lier, 2004) and language teachers' role in creating optimal environment necessary for learning to take place (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, as cited in Sert & Walsh, 2010); it is claimed that teaching opportunities and learning opportunities are closely related. Since this dissertation focuses on teacher talk, the main aim is to examine arising teaching opportunities in teacher talk; thereby their potential to lead learning opportunities. In this respect, Pre-service EFL teachers' talk in secondary and high schools in practicum was analysed with respect to their potential to hinder and /or open space for learning opportunities.

One of the main result of this micro-analysis of Pt talk is they are not fully able to manage learners' contribution and address contingency of classroom interaction. This incompetence manifests itself in three ways. First, Pts cannot address responses coming from class at the same time. They sometimes do not set turn taking rule in focus on meaning and fluency or they do not select speakers when focus is on meaning. Thus, they cannot hear learners' responses in classrooms which are crowded. Second, they regularly echo the turn of learners without any adjustment which may mean teacher's positive evaluation for class. They do not elaborate, reformulate or change intonation pattern. Sometimes they echo learners' inappropriate response or embed it in

their follow-up turns. Thirdly, Pts skip and pass up repair when necessary. It is acknowledged that language teachers initiate repair according to their pedagogical focus and they do not initiate repair in meaning and fluency context as they prefer progressivity (Seedhouse, 2004). However, when learners make it evident through their talk that they are having trouble (e.g. word search or questions), PT do not take action. They do not adjust their talk in order to address learners' contingent needs. That is to say, when focus is on fluency, they do not address word search and initiate repair. Or, in focus on form, they do not provide full grammatical sentence. In CA informed classroom interaction literature, a competent teacher is described as manager of interaction who is responsive to students' arising needs (Waring, 2016), who can make moment-to-moment informed decisions (van Lier, 1988), who can handle mode-shifts (Walsh, 2006) and address form and meaning at the same time (Seedhouse, 1998). In this sense, this is one of the important competence area for them to improve. It is clear that Pt s are beginning teachers and the practicum is the right place for them to learn the peculiarities of teaching.

Although data did not give evidence for extensive use of EPAs limiting learning opportunities, Waring (2008) demonstrated that they would give the message that there is no need to ask further questions. Hence, overuse of EPAs might give the same message to the learners in our case especially when PTs ignore and do not orient to the questions coming from learners. All in all, managing students' contributions is the competence are PTs need to improve. Addressing students' questions and word searches or initiating mode-shifts require being aware of contingency of classroom interaction. In that sense, implications for teacher education will be provided in the next section regarding this finding.

With regards to Pt s actions that open space for teaching, it is evident that they are successful in setting the scene and establish their focus. One of the significant result of this study is to use of self accounts / stories to establish

their focus on fluency. It is sequentially evident that use of short self-stories involve learners and provide them with linguistic and interactional resources. When PTs tell their short stories, learners show willingness to participate in ongoing interaction and want to respond to these stories. van Lier (1996) emphasised the role of story-telling:

...or any language use which plays with contingencies (story telling for example) can therefore be expected to be the most stimulating environment for learning. Conversational interaction naturally links the known to the new. It creates its own expectancies and its own context, and offer choices to the participants. In a conversation, we must continually make decisions on the basis of what other people mean. We therefore have to listen very carefully (Sacks et al. note that conversation provides an intrinsic motivation for listening 1974: 43), and we also have to take great care in constructing our contributions so that we can be understood (van Lier, 1996, p.171).

To sum up, initiation Pt s own short stories in first pair part (pilates at the weekend or talking about earthquake) definitely open space for interaction and thereby teaching opportunities.

The second finding is potential of “request for full sentence”. “In a full sentence please” is used by many PTs to remind that their focus is on form. Request for full sentence in the form of next turn repair initiator conveys the message immediately and help students self-repair their previous utterance. It could be an example of shaping learner utterances in Turkish EFL context. As learners utter part of the sentences, PTs request for full sentence help them reformulate and even expand on their sentence which is a good example of scaffolding.

Question design is also significant especially in follow up moves. Rather than the type of the questions (yes/ no; wh- or information-seeking, known-information); their informed use in appropriate sequence is helpful to maintain focus. As Nassaji and Wells (2000) put it clearly:

Certainly the choice of initiating question has an important influence on the way in which a sequence develops; questions that introduce issues as for negotiation are more likely than known information questions to elicit substantive student contributions and to encourage a variety of perspectives. However, the choice of follow up is even more important (p. 401)

This dissertation does not focus on question design specifically, however, varied use of questions accompanied with wait time give good results in terms of students' participation in fluency context.

5.2 Implications for Classroom Interactional Competence

This dissertation focused on pre-service teachers practices in their practicum experience. To complete their practicum, they did four teachings in three months which were observed and graded by their mentors and supervisors. These four teachings along with observation tasks and material preparation constituted first teaching experience for them in a real classroom setting. In this sense, they were learning to teach in the practicum. This study aimed to gain a better understanding of their current competence for teaching and insights into competence to be developed.

Walsh (2006) developed a framework for describing teacher competence, that is *Classroom Interactional Competence* displaying competence areas such as shaping learner contribution, opening interactional space, effective use of eliciting, effective use of mode-switching and interactional awareness. Sert (2015) introduced managing CIKs, increased awareness of unwillingness to participate, effective use of gestures and successful management of code-switching for CIC based on his data from different ESL and EFL classrooms.

This dissertation can expand on and enrich CIC framework based on EFL classroom interaction led by PTs. The data demonstrate that *use of short self-stories* to set the scene and involve learners in fluency context are employed successfully by PTs. Use of self-accounts and self-stories provide learners with linguistic and interactional resources and let them listen attentively. It

definitely opens space for interaction in the follow-up turns. Sequential unfolding of interaction demonstrate that use of short self accounts make response relevant on the part of learners and create *authentic* conversational exchange.

The second striking finding is *request for full sentence* in focus on form. This is an effective next turn repair initiator employed by PTs. It is used when learners give partial answers (e.g. go to cinema) or one word to complete fill in the blanks in coursebook. Initiation of request for full sentence clearly conveys PTs' momentary focus and shape learner utterances in the next turn.

To sum up, use of self-stories in first pair part in focus on fluency and use of request for full sentence in focus on form could be added to Classroom Interactional Competence framework as two potential competent teacher actions.

As this dissertation shows, teaching competence involves constant monitoring of emergent and learning opportunities for students in the classroom. When students go into word search or want to contribute to the ongoing interaction but claim insufficient knowledge, these are clear indicators of teaching opportunities for teacher but at the same time learning opportunity for students. Thus, a competent teacher should manage this teaching process considering learners' perspective and their benefit.

In terms of competence *to be developed* , managing students' word searches, questions, claims of insufficient knowledge are found. Managing students' incorrect and inappropriate answers are also part of the competence areas that need to be developed. In the next section, suggestions will be provided for improvement.

5.3 Implications for Teacher Education

This dissertation's main aim is to portray pre-service EFL teachers talk in practicum experience. In light of the study's findings, implications for teacher education and practicum will be provided here.

Implication for Teacher Education Courses

Teacher education programs prepare candidate teachers for their future professional lives in particular political, socio-cultural and educational contexts. Since every language classroom is unique; one of the tasks of the teacher education programs is to equip future teachers to handle these uniqueness and particularities emergent in the unfolding nature of the classroom interaction. CA's analytic power provides researchers with analytic tools to describe micro details of interaction paving the way for understanding of the macro picture of the classroom interaction. In other words, CA studies have potential to enrich language teacher education programs by micro-analytic description of the classroom discourse and documenting interactional resources that other teachers and students may possibly use in other classroom settings. In this sense, micro-analysis of 16 Pt s talk in teacher-led EFL classrooms in practicum presents interactional resources and missed teaching opportunities in one practicum context and these cases are highly possible to occur in other practicum contexts. Thus, the results are believed to provide insights for language teacher educators to explore interactional and pedagogical resources PTs use, missed teaching opportunities that they create in the interaction; thereby language teacher educators are provided with a micro-analytic view of teacher competence that is *developing* in real classroom setting. In this sense, the findings of this dissertation are believed to inform pre-service teacher education courses as explained below.

Role cards in micro-teachings

This section will provide suggestions for specifically ELT Methodology, Teaching English to Young Learners and Teaching Language Skills courses in

which student teachers learn teaching techniques and engage in micro-teaching sessions in class.

Particularly, the findings suggest that pre-service teachers need assistance to handle “the multi dimensionality, immediacy and unpredictability” (Tsui, 2003) of the learner contributions. In order to improve handling learner contributions and shaping them, instances occurring regularly in the data could be integrated to each and every methodology courses.

In those courses, student teachers in groups of two or three prepare a lesson plan on an assigned task. For micro-teaching sessions, besides group members that have micro-teaching task, the instructor can give other student-teachers role cards asking them to act as a student who:

- is talkative and ask questions that are not on the pedagogical agenda of the teacher
- is using Turkish all the time while answering questions
- is giving incorrect answers
- claims insufficient knowledge
- search for a specific word while giving answers and ask for help
- misunderstands an instruction and initiate clarification requests
- is not willing to participate in interaction
- or a group of students shout answers at the same time
- gives correct answers in terms of content but in a completely ungrammatical language

These role cards can be used in micro-teachings and the group members who perform micro-teachings are asked to manage these learners’ responses. The student roles are all observed in the data collected for this dissertation. These cases represent moments that PTs cannot handle student responses and skip repair. Thus, they can offer relevantly more realistic classroom experience for student teachers.

Awareness- raising

In lectures, instructors could emphasise interaction role in teaching practice and extra role of language teachers' talk in classrooms. Pre-service teachers should be aware of the fact that their use of language is significant in two ways compared to a math teacher. English is both subject and medium of instruction; thus the language they manage teaching process or routine inquires is also input for learners in the classroom.

Video clips of experienced or and novice teachers

Sample videos of experienced language teachers in real classroom could be incorporated in lectures. To the best my knowledge, there are not any videos for instructional purposes in Turkey but teacher educators can collect and build collections of practices. There is one collection of *Teacher Training DVD Series* (Carr, 2006) that could be used. To address needs of Turkish learners of English, teacher educators should build their own collections to use in methodology classes.

The video clips of specific moments out of the data collected for this dissertation were used in lectures by the researcher to facilitate discussion on specific teacher actions. The pre-service teachers found it thought- provoking and useful for their development. It is time-consuming to prepare short video clips showing critical moments from a large database, but they are very effective tools in class to create reflection and discussion atmosphere. Kleinknecht and Gröschner (2016) compared reflection with *video feedback* and *journal writing* practices of pre-service teachers and found out use of videos for reflection more useful and fostered noticing skills of pre-service teachers. Walsh and Mann (2015) proposed that videos offer data-led tools for reflection. Hence, video-use in teacher education programs should be facilitated.

Videos should be used within guided tasks especially in methodology courses. Since it would be their first time to observe a classroom for student teachers,

they need guidance. For each video clip, purpose and observable phenomena should be determined beforehand to guide pre-service teachers. The instructor can restart move forward or pause the video as discussion and reflection opportunities arise.

Videos could be used to observe teacher competences in action. Since CA research has now focused on multi-modal actions and teacher gestures in classroom research, gestures could be good starting point. Videos showing teacher repair, L1-L2 use in EFL classrooms, managing students' contributions (e.g. student's CIKs, word searches) should be observed and used as concrete tools to reflect.

Practicum

It is also a must that videos should be incorporated into practicum. PTs should be videotaped and they should be given guidelines how to observe themselves first. Otherwise, they may lose their focus in the details and may not know what to focus on. Guided observation tasks can help pre-service teachers. Normally, they have observation tasks to observe specific teaching practices of mentors (e.g. questioning, managing breakdowns, L1 / L2 use, wait time). The similar observation tasks could be prepared for self-reflection or pre-prepared tools such as SETT (Walsh, 2006) could be used. Since video-records are available for repeated viewing, self-reflection tasks can be assigned to pre-service teachers. They can choose critical moments (successful or unsuccessful moments), produce simple transcripts and write self-reflection on their talk using basic terminology (such as known-answer question, clarification request). These are all suggested by Walsh (2006) in SETT model, Sert (2015) in IMDAT model to be incorporated in practicum. The clips could be one or two minutes since it would take lots of time to transcribe videos. It is believed that even choosing critical moments in one-hour of teaching is a very fruitful task to develop self-reflection.

As this dissertation findings show, pre-service teachers should focus on managing student contributions and making use of third turn in their talk. In light of findings, specific tasks to improve responding to contingencies of classroom interaction should be developed. They could be immediate word searches, claims of insufficient knowledge or direct knowledge questions. As PTs observe these contingencies in their own teachings and mentor teachers' classrooms, they become more aware and prepare for further future cases.

5.4 Implications for Classroom Research

This dissertation aimed to unearth and portray sequential and pedagogical organization of Pt talk in EFL classroom in practicum experience. As it is data driven study, the analysis shaped research questions and *missed teaching opportunities* emerged as a phenomenon to investigate. This study is the first study to mark missed teaching opportunities in PT-led classroom interaction. Thus, it provides valuable contribution to conversation analytic studies of L2 classrooms.

Missed teaching opportunities are marked when;

-PT s do not show any orientation towards learners' questions, word searches and CIKs and leave them unattended

-PTs echo students' incorrect and inappropriate responses

-PTs initiate embedded repair as a response to incorrect answer but do not mark it as repair

While the first action is marked as missed teaching opportunity within CA's emic perspective, the remaining actions are decided by the researcher with an outsider point of view. CA claims that speakers are the first analysts of the interaction and they even do not use introspective data (e.g. stimulated recall) to supplement findings. For the analysis of data, the researcher's perspective and judgements were taken into consideration to determine Pt s' echo of

inappropriate answers and embedded repairs as missed teaching opportunities.

The Pt- led classroom interaction data revealed that although the teacher candidates co-construct and establish their pedagogical focus, the maintenance of the focus through addressing students' contributions is problematic and it won't be fully informative for pre-service teacher education if analysed within boundaries of the CA's emic perspective. In this sense, CA as research method to investigate classroom interaction should be reconsidered. Based on ethno methodological understanding, CA attempts to unearth speakers' own orientations and achievements in talk-in interaction through emic perspective. However, in a teacher education perspective, CA is a powerful tool for teachers and teacher educators to inform practice through micro analysis and reflection on teacher talk. Thus, as many others (Kitzinger, 2011 applying CA to train call-takers for better communication; Lazaraton & Ishihara, 2005 to improve self-reflection of L2 teacher) suggested, outsider perspective should supplement CA to inform practice. To conclude, this study can bring a new perspective and expand our understanding of classroom research focusing on missed teaching opportunities.

5.5 Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research

This section will provide readers with limitations of the study and recommendations for future research in Pt-led L2 classroom interaction. First of all, the participants of the study were assigned to two different schools and the secondary school could only host two Pt s as it was relatively smaller school. 2 PTs went to secondary and 14 Pt s went to high school. Thus, the comparison of high school and secondary school data was not possible. In addition, the first teachings of 2 PTs in secondary school was excluded from data since all the interaction was in Turkish.

In data collection process, two cameras were used to record classroom interaction. Since the focus on Pt talk, it did not lead to critical problems but it

was very difficult to hear and identify students' voices in very crowded classrooms. Thus, it could be better if microphones had been used as well.

Since one academic term lasts for 14 weeks, Pt s were able to teach for four times in practice schools in 14 weeks. In the second term, most of Pt s changed their practicum schools to observe different contexts or some of them participated in international exchange programs. Thus, the researcher was not able to record teaching practices of the same Pt s in the second academic term. It would definitely give a broader picture and it might give evidence of developmental pattern of interactional competence for teaching.

For future studies, more data in different settings (Pt s teaching in younger learners' class or tertiary levels) are needed to be collected to analyse pre-service EFL teachers' practices. As the teacher education program (TE programs) where the data were collected strongly support L2 use in classrooms, Pt s were warned about over-use of Turkish. In that sense, TE programs that have different policies could be studied to analyse teaching practices of Pts.

One or two pre-service teachers' one year in practicum could be tracked to analyse development of interactional competence over time. Conversation analysis focuses on good teaching practices but there is a need to document novice or beginning teachers' practices as well to see developing nature of competence for teaching.

REFERENCES

- Åhlund*, A. & Aronsson, K. (2015). Corrections as multiparty accomplishment in L2 classroom conversations. *Linguistics and Education*, 30, 66-80.
- Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Amir, A. & Musk, N. (2013). Language policing: micro-level language policy-in-process in the foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 4(2), 151-167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2013.783500>
- Antaki, C. (2011). Six kinds of applied conversation analysis. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied conversation analysis* (pp. 1-14). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Appel, J. 2007. Language teaching in performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 277-93.
- Aşık, A. & Kuru- Gönen, S. İ. (2016). Pre-service EFL teachers' reported perceptions of their development through SETT experience, *Classroom Discourse*, 7(2), 164-183, DOI: 10.1080/19463014.2016.1150865
- aus der Wieschen, M. & Sert, O. (2018): Divergent language choices and maintenance of intersubjectivity: the case of Danish EFL young learners, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2018.1447544
- Aydınlı, J., Ortaçtepe, D. (2018). A country in focus. Selected research in applied linguistics and English language teaching in Turkey: 2010-2016. *Language Teaching*, 51 (2), pp. 210-245 doi:10.1017/S0261444818000010
- Bağ, E.; Martı, L. & Bayyurt, Y. (2014). Gender and classroom interaction: examining a female and a male teacher's moves directed towards

female and male students in two EFL classrooms in Turkey. *Boğazici University Journal of Education*, 31 (1), 59-80.

Balıkçı, G., Seferoğlu, G. (2017). Conversation Analytic Look into an EFL class: Instruction Giving as a Collaborative Task Accomplished by the Teacher and the Students. Paper presented at AAAL 2017 Portland.

Belhiah, H. (2013). Using the hand to choreograph instruction: On the functional role of gesture in definition talk. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97 (2), 417-434.

Block, D. (2003). *Social turn in Second Language Acquisition*. Edinburg University Press

Bozbıyık, M. (2017). The Implementation of Veo In An English Language Education Context: A Focus On Teacher Questioning Practices. Unpublished Master Thesis Gazi University, Ankara

Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word Searches in NNS-NS Interaction: Opportunities for Language Learning?, *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 534-545.

Busher, H., Gündüz, M., Cakmak, M. & Lawson, T. (2015) Student teachers' views of practicums (teacher training placements) in Turkish and English contexts: a comparative study. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 45 (3), 445-466, DOI: 10.1080/03057925.2014.930659

Can-Daşkın, N. (2014). Shaping learner contributions in an EFL classroom: Implications for L2 Classroom Interactional Competence. *Classroom Discourse*, 6 (1),33-56. DOI: [10.1080/19463014.2014.911699](https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2014.911699)

Can-Daşkın, N. (2017). A conversation analytic investigation into L2 classroom interaction and informal formative assessment. *ELT Research Journal*, 6(1), 4-24.

Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford University Press: Oxford

- Cancino, M. (2015). Assessing Learning Opportunities in EFL Classroom Interaction: What can CA tell us? *RELC Journal: A Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 46 (2), 115-129.
- Carr, D. (ed.) (2006) Teacher Training DVD Series (set of 15 DVDs), International House, London.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cephe, P. T. (2009). An analysis of the impact of reflective teaching on the beliefs of teacher trainees. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 34 (152), 182-191.
- Doğançay-Aktuna, S.(1998). The Spread of English in Turkey and its Current Sociolinguistic Profile. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 19(1): 24-39.
- Doğançay-Aktuna, S & Kızıltepe, Z. (2005). English in Turkey. *World Englishes*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 253-265.
- Drew, P. and J. Heritage. (1992). Analysing talk at work: An introduction. In Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (Eds), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duran, D. (2017). *Student-initiated questions in English as a medium of instruction classrooms in a Turkish higher education setting*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University: Ankara
- EF English Proficiency Index. (2017). Retrieved from www.ef.com/epi
- Ellis, R. (2010). Theoretical pluralism in SLA: Is there a way forward?. In Seedhouse, P.; Walsh, S. and Jenks, C. (Eds), *Conceptualising Learning in Applied Linguistics*. (23- 52). Palgrave Macmillan: UK
- Eröz-Tuğa, B. (2013). Reflective feedback sessions using video recordings. *ELT Journal*, 67 (2), 175-183.

- Eskildsen, S. W. (2009). Constructing another language—Usage-based linguistics in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 30, 335–357.
- Eskildsen, S. W. & Wagner, J. (2015). Embodied L2 construction learning. *Language Learning*, 65 (2). 268–297.
- Eskildsen, S. W. & Majlesi, A. R. (2018). Learnables and teachables in second language talk: Advancing a social reconceptualization of central SLA tenets. Introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102, 3-10. doi:10.1111/modl.12462
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2018), 'We're Learning a Lot of New Words': Encountering New L2 Vocabulary Outside of Class. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102: 46-63. doi:10.1111/modl.12451
- Evans, V. & Dooley, J. (2012). *Prime Time 1*. Students Book. Express Publishing: Newbury
- Evans, V. & Dooley, J. (2012). *Prime Time 2*. Students Book. Express Publishing: Newbury
- Fagan, D.S. (2012). 'Dealing with' unexpected learner contributions in whole group activities: An examination of novice language teacher discursive practices. *Classroom Discourse*, 3 (2), 107-128.
- Fagan, D. S. (2015). Managing lang. error in real time : a micro analysis of teacher practices. *System*, 55, 74-85.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285– 300.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualised SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 800–818.

- Galaczi, E. & Taylor, L. (2018) Interactional competence: Conceptualisations, operationalisations, and outstanding questions, *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 15 (3), 219-236, DOI: 10.1080/15434303.2018.1453816
- Gardner, Rod. (2013). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers T. (Eds). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. (593-611). London: Blackwell.
- Garton, S. (2012) Speaking out of turn? Taking the initiative in teacher-fronted classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 3 (1), 29-45. DOI:10.1080/19463014.2012.666022.
- Greer, T. (2013). Word search sequences in bilingual interaction: Codeswitching and embodied orientation toward shifting participant constellations. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 57, 100- 117.
- Goodwin, C. & Goodwin, M. (1986). Gesture and co participation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, 62 (1/2), 51-75.
- Gürbüz, N. (2006). Differing perceptions of pre-service English teachers' strengths and weaknesses in the practicum: A case study in Turkey. *English Language Teacher Education and Development*, 9, 39-46.
- Hayano, K. (2013). Question design. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers T. (Eds). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. (395-415). London: Blackwell.
- Hall, J. K. (1998). Differential teacher attention to student utterances: the construction of different opportunities for learning in the IRF,' *Linguistics and Education*. 9/3, 287-311.
- Hall, J. K. (2000). Classroom interaction and language learning. In Hall, J. K. & Verplaetse, L. S. (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. (166-187). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*. 91(4), 511-526, 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00619

- Hall, J. K. & Hellerman, J. & Pekarek-Doehler, S. (2011). *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Multilingual Matters, Tonawanda.
- Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2017). Linguistics courses in pre-service foreign language teacher training programs and knowledge about language. *ELT Research Journal* 6(1), 45-68.
- Hayano, K. (2013). Question Design in Conversation. In Sidnell, J. and T. Stivers (Eds). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. (395-414). London: Blackwell.
- He, A. W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4), 568-582.
- Hellerman, J. (2003). The interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: Teacher repetition in feedback moves. *Language in Society*, 32(1), 79-104.
- Hellerman, John. (2007). The Development of Practices for Action in Classroom Dyadic Interaction: Focus on Task Openings. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 83-96.
- Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hosoda, Y. and Aline, D. (2010) Learning to be a teacher. Development of EFL teacher trainee interactional practices. *JALT Journal*, 32 (2), 119-148.
- Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge Polity Press
- Ianzi-Rolin, J. (2010). The Organization of delayed second language correction. *Language Teaching Research*. 14(2), 183-206
- Ingram, J. & Elliot, V. (2016). A critical analysis of the role of wait time in classroom interactions and the effects on student and teacher interactional behaviours, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(1), 37-53, DOI: 10.1080/0305764X.2015.1009365.

- Jacknick, C. (2011). "But this is writing": post-expansion in student-initiated sequences. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 5(1), 39-54.
- Johnson, M. (2004). *A philosophy of second language acquisition*. Yale Language Series: New York.
- Kääntä, L. (2010). *Teacher turn-allocation and repair practices in classroom interaction: A multi semiotic perspective*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Kääntä, L. (2012). Teachers' embodied allocations in instructional interaction, *Classroom Discourse*, 3(2), 166-186.
- Kääntä, L. (2014). From noticing to initiating correction: Students' epistemic displays in instructional interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 66, 86-105.
- Kääntä, L. & Kasper, G. (2018). Clarification requests as a method of pursuing understanding in CLIL physics lectures, *Classroom Discourse*, DOI: 10.1080/19463014.2018.1477608
- Karadag, O. (2017). *Behavioral classroom management manoeuvres of pre-service English language teachers in teaching young learners*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University. Muğla.
- Kasper, G. and Kim, Y. (2007). Handling sequentially inapposite responses. In Hua, Z., Seedhouse P., Wei L. & Cook V. (Eds). *Language learning and teaching as social interaction* (22-41). Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke
- Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). Conversation analysis as an approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 117-142). New York: Routledge.
- Kasper, G; Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* (2014), 34, 171-212.
- Kim, Y. (2012) Practices for initial recognitional reference and learning opportunities in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 709-729.

- Kleinknecht, M. & Gröschner, A. (2016). Fostering preservice teachers' noticing with structured video feedback: Results of an online- and video-based intervention study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 45-56.
- Kirkgoz, Y. (2007). English language teaching in Turkey: Policy changes and their implementations. *Sage Publications*, 38(2), 216-228. doi: 10.1177/0033688207079696
- Kitzinger, C. (2011). Working with childbirth helplines: The contributions and limitations of conversation analysis. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied conversation analysis* (98-118). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In Sidnell, J. & Stivers T. (Eds). *The Handbook of Conversation analysis* (pp. 229-257). London: Blackwell.
- Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on language and social interaction*, 35 (3), 277-309. DOI: 10.1207/S15327973RLSI3503_2
- Koshik, I. (2002b). A conversation analytic study of yes/no questions which convey reversed polarity assertions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(12), 1851-1877. doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00057-7
- Koshik, I. (2003). "Wh-questions used as challenges". *Discourse studies*, 5 (1), 51-77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456030050010301>
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1993). Maximizing learning potential in the communicative classroom. *ELT Journal*, 47, 12-21.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *Tesol Quarterly*, 33(3), 453-484.
- Lave, J. (1993). The practice of learning. In S. Chaiklin and J. Lave (eds.) *Understanding practice. Perspectives on activity and context* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Lazaraton, A. & Ishihara, N. (2005). Understanding second language teacher practice using microanalysis and self-Reflection: A collaborative case study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89,(4), 529-542.
- Lazaraton, A. (2004). Conversation analysis and the nonnative English speaking ESL teacher: a case study. In: Boxer D, Cohen A (eds). *Studying Speaking to Inform Second Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 49–57.
- Lee- Yo, A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of pragmatics*, 39 (1), 180-206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.11.003>
- Lee, Yo-An. (2010). Learning in the contingency of talk-in-interaction. *Text and Talk*, 30 (4), 403–422.
- Lee Yo-An & Takahashi, A. (2011). Lesson Plans and the Contingency of classroom interactions. *Hum Stud*. 34, 209–227
- Lee, Yo-An(2008). Yes–No Questions in the Third-Turn Position: Pedagogical Discourse Processes, *Discourse Processes*, 45:3, 237-262, DOI: 10.1080/01638530701739215.
- Legutke, M. K & Schocker-v. Ditfurth, M. (2009). School based experience. In A. Burns & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education*. (pp. 209-217). New York: Cambridge University Press
- Lemke, J.L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning and values*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Leowen, S. & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 51 (3), pp. 285-329 doi: 10.1017/S0261444818000125
- Li, H. (2013). Student initiatives and missed learning opportunities in an IRF sequence: A single case analysis. *L2 Journal*, 5, 68-92.

- Mann, S. & Walsh, S. (2015). Doing reflective practice. A data led way forward. *ELT Journal*; doi:10.1093/elt/ccv018.
- Margutti, P. (2010). On designedly incomplete utterances: What counts as learning for teachers and students in primary classroom interaction, *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43 (4), 315-345, DOI: 10.1080/08351813.2010.497629.
- Markee, N. P. (1995). Teachers' answers to students' questions: Problematizing the issue of making meaning. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 63-92.
- Markee, N. 2000. *Conversation Analysis*. New Jersey: Routledge
- Markee, N. & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: an introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 491-500.
- Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behaviour tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 29 (3), 404-427.
- Markee, N. & Seo, M. (2009). Learning talk analysis. *IRAL* 47, 37-63.
- Markee, N. (2015). Where does research on classroom discourse and interaction go from here? In Markee, N. (Ed). *The Handbook of classroom discourse and interaction*. (507-526). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Markee, N. & Kunitz, S. (2015). CA-for-SLA Studies of Classroom Interaction: Quo Vadis?. In Markee, N. (Ed). *The Handbook of classroom discourse and interaction*. (425-441). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons. Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mehan, H. (1979b). "What time is it Denise?" Asking known information questions in classroom discourse. *Theory Into Practice*, 18(4), (285-294). doi: 10.1080/00405847909542846

- Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 536–550. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-17-.x>
- Mortensen, K. (2008). Selecting next speaker in the second language classroom: How to find a willing next speaker in planned activities. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice*, p. 55-79.
- McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Lang. Soc.* 7, 183-213.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons. Social organization in the classroom.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Mitchell, R., Myles, F., Marsden, E. (2013). *Second language learning theories.* London: Routledge.
- Nassaji, H. and G. Wells. 2000. 'What's the use of "triadic dialogue"? An investigation of teacher–student interaction,' *Applied Linguistics*, 21 (3), 376–406.
- Netzt, H. (2016). Designedly incomplete utterances and student participation. *Linguistics and Education*. 33; 56-73.
- Nunan, D. (2005). *Classroom research.* In Hinkel, E. (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning.* (225-241) Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: New Jersey
- Özbakış & Işık-Güler, H. (2017). A micro-Analytic Study of EFL Learners' Co-Construction of Identities in Classroom Interaction. Paper presented at Interactional Competences and Second Language Practices in a Second Language. ICOLP-L2, University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland. 18-20 January
- Öztürk, G. (2016). An investigation on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. 12(2), 22-37.

- Park, J. (2014). The roles of third turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(2), 145-167.
- Peräkylä, A. (1997). Reliability and validity in research based on naturally occurring social interaction. In Silverman, D. (Ed.), *Qualitative research : theory, method, and practice* (283-304). London: Sage Publications
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/No interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 939-967.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- salad dressing. 2018. In Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English Online, Retrieved June, 21, 2018, from <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/salad-dressing>
- Savaş, P. (2012). Use of digital video recording in the preparation stage of pre-service foreign language teachers' micro-teachings. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and their Implications* 3.3, 107-116.
- Schwab, G. (2011). From dialogue to multilogue: A different view on participation in the English foreign-language classroom, *Classroom Discourse*, 2 (1), 3-19.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (1996). Learning talk: A study of the interactional organisation of the L2 classroom from a CA institutional discourse perspective. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of York: York.
- Seedhouse, P. (1997). Combining form and meaning. *ELT Journal*, 51(4), 336-344.
- Seedhouse, P. (1997). The case of the missing "no": the relationship between pedagogy and interaction. *Language Learning*, 47 (3), 547-543.

- Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The Interactional architecture of the language Classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation Analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 38, 165-187. doi:10.1017/S0261444805003010
- Seedhouse, P. (2007) On Ethnomethodological CA and “Linguistic CA”: A Reply to Hall. *The Modern Language Journal*. 91, (4), 527-533.
- Seedhouse, P. (2008). Learning to talk the talk: CA as a tool for induction of trainee teachers. In Garton, S. & Richards, K. (Eds), *Professional encounters in TESOL: Discourses of teachers in teaching* (42–57). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seferoglu, G. (2006). Teacher candidates’ reflections on some components of a pre-service English teacher education programme in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32, 369-378.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, 59 (4), 339–341. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci064>
- Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (2013). *The Handbook of conversation analysis*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell
- Seo , M. & Koshik, I. (2010). A conversation analytic study of gestures that engender repair in ESL conversational tutoring. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42 2219–2239
- Sert, O. (2010). A proposal for a CA-Integrated english language teacher education program in Turkey. *Asian EFL Journal (Special Issue on English Language Teacher Education and Development: Issues and Perspectives in Asia)*, 12(3), 62-97.
- Sert, O. (2011). A micro-analytic investigation of claims of insufficient knowledge in EAL classrooms. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Sert, O. (2013). Epistemic status check’ as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 45, 13-28.

- Sert, O., Balaman, U., Can Daşkın, N., Büyükgüzel, S., & Ergül, H. (2015). Konuşma Çözümlemesi Yöntemi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi, MEUDED*, 12(2), 1-43
- Sert, O. (2016). Sınıf İçi Etkileşim ve Yabancı Dil Öğretmeni Yetiştirme. (Ed.) Akcan, S. ve Bayyurt, Y. Türkiye'deki Yabancı Dil Eğitimi Üzerine Görüş ve Düşünceler (s.14-30). İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.
- Sert, O & Jacknick, C.M. (2015). Student smiles and the negotiation of epistemics in L2 classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 77, 97-112.
- Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Sert, O. (2017). Creating opportunities for L2 learning in a prediction activity. *System*, 70, 14- 25.
- Sinclair, J. M. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Spencer, D. (2011). *Gateway Students' Book*. Macmillian
- Şallı-Çopur, D. S. (2008). Teacher Effectiveness in Initial Years of Service: A Case Study on the Graduates of METU Language Education Program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey
- Üstünel, E. & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Codeswitching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 302-25.
- TEPAV & British Council. (2014). Türkiye'deki devlet okullarında İngilizce dilinin Öğretimine ilişkin ulusal ihtiyaç analizi. Ankara. Retrieved from <http://www.tepav.org.tr/upload/files/1399388519>
1.Turkiyedeki_Devlet_Okullarinda_Ingilizce_Dilinin_Ogrenimine_Iliskin_Ulusal_Ihtiyac_Analizi.pdf

- Tezgiden- Cakcak, Y. (2015). Preparing teacher candidates as passive technicians, reflective practitioners or transformative intellectuals?. Unpublished PhD Thesis. ODTÜ: ANKARA.
- TTKB, (2013) . Öğretim programları. [Online]: retrieved from <http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/program2.aspx?islem=1&kno=214>
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6,1, 3–23.
- Ustunel, E. & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now?. Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15 (3), 302-325.
- van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner. Ethnography and second language classroom*. Longman London:
- van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. Longman New York:.
- van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective*. Boston: Kluwer Academic
- ten Have, P. 2007. *Doing conversation analysis*. London: Sage.
- Tsui, A. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of second language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walsh S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. NewYork: Routledge
- Walsh S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Walsh, S. and Li, L. (2013), Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 247–266. doi:10.1111/ijal.12005

- Waring, Z. H. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, 576-594.
- Waring, H.Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback): A single case analysis. *Language Learning*, 59, 796–824.
- Waring, H. Z. (2011). Learner initiatives and learning opportunities in the language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 2(2), 201-218.
- Waring, H.Z. and B.L. Hruska (2011). Getting and keeping Nora on board: A novice elementary ESOL student teacher's practices for lesson engagement. *Linguistics and Education*, 22, 441–455.
- Waring H. Z. (2012) Yes-no questions that convey a critical stance in the language classroom, *Language and Education*, 26 (5), 451-469, DOI: 10.1080/09500782.2012.656651
- Waring, H. Z. (2013). "How was your weekend?" Developing the interactional competence in managing routine inquiries. *Language Awareness*, 22(1), 1-16.
- Waring, H. Z. (2013b). Managing Stacy: A case study of turn-taking in the language classroom. *System* 41, 841-851.
- Waring, H. Z. (2016a). Conversation analytic approaches to language and education. K. King et al. (eds.), *Research Methods in Language and Education, Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2016 DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02329-8_39-1.
- Waring, H. Z. (2016b). *Theorizing pedagogical interaction: Insights from conversation analysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Watanabe, A. (2017). Developing L2 interactional competence: increasing participation through self-selection in post-expansion sequences, *Classroom Discourse*, DOI: 10.1080/19463014.2017.1354310

- Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: a proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and the learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 37.
- Wong J., Waring, H. Z. (2009). 'Very good' as a teacher response. *ELT Journal* 63 (3), 195-203.
- van Compernelle, R. & Smotrova, T. (2017): Gesture, meaning, and thinking-for-teaching in unplanned vocabulary explanations, *Classroom Discourse*, DOI: 10.1080/19463014.2016.1275028
- Young, R. (1999). Sociolinguistic approaches to SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 19, 105-132
- Yücel, E , Dimici, K , Yıldız, B , Bümen, N . (2017). Son 15 Yılda Yayımlanan İlk ve Ortaöğretim İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programları Üzerine Bir Analiz. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 18 (2), 702-737. DOI: 10.12984/egeefd.305922
- Zemel A., Koschmann T. (2010). Pursuing a question: Reinitiating IRE sequences as a method of instruction. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 43, 475-488.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Ethics Committee Approval

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER



ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
Sayı: 28620816/336
www.usam.metu.edu.tr

03 EYLÜL 2015

Gönderilen: Prof. Dr. Gölge SEFEROĞLU

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi

Gönderen: Prof. Dr. Canan SÜMER

İnsan Araştırmaları Komisyonu Başkanı

İlgi: Etik Onayı

Danışmanlığını yapmış olduğunuz Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü Doktora öğrencisi Gözde BALIKÇI'nın "Öğretmen Adaylarında Sınıf İçi Etkileşimsel Yetinin Gelişimi" isimli araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Komisyonu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay 05.10.2015 -11.07.2016 tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Canan SÜMER

Uygulamalı Etik Araştırma Merkezi
İnsan Araştırmaları Komisyonu Başkanı

Appendix B: Permission from MoNE



T.C.
ANKARA VALİLİĞİ
Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü



Sayı : 14588481-605.99-E.10111114
Konu: Araştırma izni

09.10.2015

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİNE
(Öğrenci İşleri Daire Başkanlığı)

İlgi: a) MEB Yenilik ve Eğitim Teknolojileri Genel Müdürlüğünün 2012/13 nolu Genelgesi.
b) 17/09/2015 tarihli ve 9376 sayılı yazınız.

Üniversiteniz Doktora Öğrencisi Gözde BALIKÇI' nın "**Öğretmen adaylarında sınıf içi etkileşimsel yetinin gelişimi**" başlıklı tezi kapsamında çalışma yapma talebi Müdürlüğümüzce uygun görülmüş ve araştırmanın yapılacağı İlçe Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğüne bilgi verilmiştir.


Çalışmanın bitiminde bir örneğinin (cd ortamında) Müdürlüğümüz Strateji Geliştirme (1) Şubesine gönderilmesini arz ederim.

Ali GÜNGÖR
Müdür a.
Şube Müdürü

12-10-2015-14923

Güvenli Elektronik İmza ile
Aslı ile Aynıdır.

09.10.2015


Ali GÜNGÖR

Appendix C: Consent Form for Participants

ARAŞTIRMAYA GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU

Bu araştırma ODTÜ Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü araştırma görevlisi Gözde Balıkcı tarafından Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu danışmanlığındaki doktora tezi kapsamında yürütülmektedir. Bu form sizi araştırma koşulları hakkında bilgilendirmek için hazırlanmıştır.

Çalışmanın Amacı Nedir?

Çalışmanın amacı siz öğretmen adaylarının sınıf içi etkileşimsel yetilerinizi arttırmak ve mesleki gelişiminize olumlu yönde katkı sağlamaktır.

Bize Nasıl Yardımcı Olmanızı İsteyeceğiz?

Okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamaları kapsamında yaptığınız gözlemler ve sınıf içinde yaptığınız dersler, aktiviteler doktora tezi kapsamında incelenecektir. Sınıf içi dersleriniz kamera kaydına alınacaktır. Dönem sonunda ise ders ile ilintili en fazla 30 dk'lık **sözlü görüşme** yapılacaktır.

Katılımla ilgili bilmeniz gerekenler:

Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayalıdır. Herhangi bir yaptırıma veya cezaya maruz kalmadan çalışmaya katılmayı reddedebilir veya çalışmayı bırakabilirsiniz.

Araştırmaya katılanlardan toplanan veriler tamamen gizli tutulacak, veriler ve kimlik bilgileri herhangi bir şekilde eşleştirilmeyecektir. Katılımcıların isimleri bağımsız bir listede toplanacaktır. Ayrıca toplanan verilere sadece araştırmacılar ulaşabilecektir. Bu araştırmanın sonuçları bilimsel ve profesyonel yayınlarda veya eğitim amaçlı kullanılabilir, fakat katılımcıların kimliği gizli tutulacaktır.

Araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isterseniz:

Çalışmayla ilgili soru ve yorumlarınızı araştırmacıya balikci@metu.edu.tr adresinden iletebilirsiniz.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum.

(Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz).

İsim Soyad

Tarih

İmza

---/---/---

Appendix D: The Database

PTS	The School/ Class/ Prof. Level of the Sts	Unguided Teaching	1st Teaching	2nd Teaching	Final Teaching	
Çınar (1) & Süheyla (2)	Primary School 5B	excluded 6.11.15	3.12.15	24.12.15 (Ç.) 31.12.15 (S.)	14.01.16	120 mn
Arzu (3)& Ceyda (4)	High School Prep B B1	6.11.15	27.11.15	18.12.15	15.01.16	160 mn
Semra (5)	High school Prep B	9.11.15	23.11.15	14.12.15	14.01.16	80 mn
Çiçek (6)	High School Prep D Pre-Interme.	12.11.15	3.12.15	24.12.15	07.01.16	80 mn
Selvi (7)& Ceylan (8)	High School Prep D Pre-Interme.	16.11.15	14.12.15	28.12.15	11.01.16	160 mn
Necmiye (9)	High School Prep D	13.11.15 ?	4.12.15 Prep D	18.12.15 Prep D	18.01.16 Prep D	80 mn
Sara (10)	High School Prep H	4.11.15	2.12.15	16.12.15	06.01.16	80 mn
Nilüfer (11)& Leyla (12)	High School Prep H	3.11.15 (A.) 17.11.15 (B.) Prep H	08.12.2015 Prep H (ele)	22.12.2015 Prep F (ele)	05.01.16 Prep H	160 mn
Nermin (13)	High School Prep H	6.11.15	27.11.15	18.12.15	08.01.16	80 mn
Engin (14)	High School Prep K Intermediate	4.11.15	2.12.15	16.12.15	15.01.16	80 mn
Leylanur(15)& Mehmet (16)	High School Prep K	13.11.15	27.11.15	18.12.15	15.01.16	160 mn

Appendix E: Coursebook Page

1 straight on (✓) 2 turn left (X) 3 enter (X) 4 turn right (✓)
Go straight on.


Prepositions of movement

5 a) Listen and say. Find examples in the text.

up down along across into
out of over under through past

NOTE: go on foot BUT go by plane/train/bus/ car

b) Look at the pictures and write the correct preposition.
Listen and check.



Appendix F: Coursebook Page

1 i Curricular: Citizenship

Public services & facilities


1 Listen and say. In which place can we:

- deposit or withdraw some money?
- take up a new hobby?
- borrow or return books?
- buy a stamp?
- take someone who is ill?
- report a crime?
- check our car tyres?
- buy a train ticket?


We can deposit or withdraw some money at a bank.

2 Listen to the short dialogues (1-4). In which of the places (1-8) in Ex. 1 does each take place?


1 | 3




1 petrol station




2 train station




3 library




8 police station




7 bank



4 community centre



6 post office



5 hospital

Check these words

citizen, community, respect, obey laws, be involved, wait my turn, queue, in need, public transport, volunteer, obey signs, public place, report crimes, care for

Are you a Good Citizen?

We can't have great communities without great citizens. To be a good citizen, you must respect

Appendix G: Coursebook Page

2 Fill in the gaps in the recipe with verbs from Ex. 1.

🔊 Listen and check.

Note:

tbs = tablespoon tsp = teaspoon

Apple-Cinnamon Blini

1 large apple	1/2 tsp baking soda
1 tbs sugar	1/2 tsp salt
1 tsp cinnamon	1 egg
2 tbs butter	3/4 cup sour cream
1 cup flour	1/4 cup milk

• 1) Peel
the apple, then

2) slice it.

• 3) melt the butter in a
frying pan, then cook the apple slices in the butter
for 4 minutes.

• 4) mix the flour, salt,
baking soda, sugar and cinnamon
together in a large bowl.

• 5) Beat the egg with 1/2 cup
of the sour cream and the milk, then

6) Add it to the flour mixture.

• 7) Stir in the cooked
apple.

Put spoonfuls of the mixture into a hot
pan for a few



Listening

3 🎧 Listen to Frank talking about a TV programme and for questions 1 to 5 tick (✓) the correct box Yes or No.

- 1 Frank really enjoyed watching Chef Jeff last night.
- 2 Chef Jeff went to a restaurant that only serves steak.
- 3 Maria never eats meat.
- 4 Chef Jeff closed down the restaurant so they could clean it.
- 5 Once, Chef Jeff showed a Spanish chef how to cook paella.

	Yes	No
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

Speaking

Giving instructions

4 🗣️ Tell your partner how to make apple-cinnamon blinis. Use

Appendix H: Coursebook Page

3c Culture Corner

The Pilgrims - Sailing to a new life!

Check these words
Pilgrims, sail, newly-discovered, land, ship, captain, voyage, ill, settle, survive, native, hunt, crops, corn, celebrate, feast, harvest, celebration, tradition

Voyage to America
On September 6th 1620, 100 people sailed from England for a better life in North America, a newly-discovered land. They called this land 'the New World'. Their ship was called the *Mayflower* and its captain was Christopher Jones. Bad weather made the voyage very difficult and many people became ill. After 66 days, these first 'Pilgrims' finally saw land. They settled in an area where they started a new town, Plymouth.

Life in the New World
At first, life wasn't easy for the Pilgrims, and only about half of them survived their first winter. The Native Americans who lived there taught them how to fish and hunt and grow crops, such as corn.


Celebrating the First Harvest
In the fall of 1621, the Pilgrims had a big feast with all the foods from their first harvest. Every year after that, the people had a similar celebration, and this harvest feast soon became a very important American tradition called Thanksgiving.

Who were the Pilgrims? Decide which sentences are T (true) and which are F (false).

- 1 The Pilgrims sailed to North America from Spain.
- 2 They sailed on the *Mayflower*.
- 3 The journey took one year.
- 4 Many Pilgrims died during their first winter.

2 Use words from the **Check these words** box in the correct form to complete the summary. Then, explain

Appendix I: Coursebook Page



Fitness and exercise

Cross-curricular – Physical Education (PE)
Basic concepts

- 1 Look at the picture. What are the children doing? Do you have a similar class?
- 2 Work with a partner. Look at these concepts. They are all very important in PE. Do you know what the concepts are? Guess.

1 Aerobic exercise	3 Cool down	5 Warm up
2 Anaerobic exercise	4 Heart rate	
- 3 Read definitions of the concepts in 2 from a PE textbook. Match the concepts 1–5 with the definitions A–E on the right. Use a dictionary if necessary.
- 4 Read the definitions again. Are these statements *true* (T) or *false* (F)?

1 It is important to stretch before <i>and</i> after you do sport.	T/F
2 Jogging for 30 minutes is an anaerobic exercise.	T/F
3 If you cycle for 20 minutes at medium speed, your body has enough oxygen.	T/F
4 Your resting heart rate is similar to your minimum heart rate.	T/F
5 Running fast is a good way to warm up.	T/F

WORD BOOSTER

Match the words and definitions.

1 heart	a your heart makes sounds and movements
2 breathing	b the organ in your chest that pumps blood
3 stretching	c slowly, little by little
4 period	d how fast something is
5 beats	e the process of taking air in and then letting it out
6 speed	f making parts of your body as long as possible
7 gradually	g an amount of time

A We do this after physical exercise. The idea is to slow down our heart and our breathing. It also helps stop problems after exercise. A good way to do this is by running very slowly and gently. Then do gentle stretching.

B This means exercise with oxygen. The body has enough oxygen to do this type of activity for a long period. The exercise is gentle. An example of this type of exercise is swimming slowly for 30 minutes.

C This means exercise without oxygen. The body has not got enough oxygen to do this type of activity for a long period. An example of this type of exercise is running 100 metres as fast as possible.

D This is the number of times your heart beats in a minute. Your resting heart rate is your minimum heart rate when you are relaxed and doing nothing. Your maximum heart rate is the top speed of your heart when you are doing exercise.

E We do this before physical exercise. The idea is to make your muscles warm, to gradually make your heart go fast, and to make your muscles and joints flexible. Stretching and slow, gentle running can help.

i INSIDE INFORMATION

- PE classes in the UK are usually a mixture of practice and theory.
- Common sports in UK secondary schools are swimming, cricket, gymnastics, netball and athletics.
- Secondary students have 90 minutes of PE a week. Some students join after school sports clubs and play football, rugby and hockey.

Appendix J: Coursebook Page

We can deposit or withdraw some money at a bank.

2 Listen to the short dialogues (1-4). In which of the places (1-8) in Ex. 1 does each take place?

1 | 3

2 | 4

3 Read the dictionary entry. In your opinion, what makes a good/bad citizen? Do you think you are a good citizen? Do the quiz to find out.

citizen /ˈsɪtəzən/ (n)
person who lives in a particular city or town

petrol station

involved, wait my turn, queue, in need, public transport, volunteer, obey signs, public place, report crimes, care for

Are you a Good Citizen?

We can't have great communities without great citizens! To be a good citizen, you must respect and help others, obey rules and laws, and be involved in your community. So, is your community better because of you or worse?

	Always/ Nearly always	Sometimes	Rarely/ Never
	A	B	C
1 I wait for my turn in queues at the bank or post office.			
2 I return my library books and pay my bills on time.			
3 I am polite to staff in shops, banks, libraries, etc.			
4 I help people in need e.g. I give my seat to senior citizens on public transport.			
5 I volunteer my time to help others e.g. helping at a community centre or kids' club.			
6 I follow rules and obey signs in public places.			

Appendix K: Examples for Teacher Actions

	Hindering Teaching Space	Opening Space for Teaching
Focus on Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive use of DIUs (Ex: FF1, lines 16, 21, p.79.) • Extensive use of Teacher Echo (Ex: FF4, lines 5, p.119) • Passing up questions (Ex: FF6, line 17, p.100) • Passing up evaluation turn (Ex: FF1, line 24, p.81) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embodied explanation (Ex: FF2, lines 6,7, p.86) • Use of the board (Ex: FF1, lines 24-25, p. 81) • Next Turn Repair Initiations ○ Request for full sentence(Ex: F3,line 10, p.89) ○ Metalinguistic explanation (Ex: FF2,line 18 p.85)
Focus on Meaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embedded repair (Ex: FM5, line 14, p.127) • Teacher echo of inappropriate answer (Ex: FM3, line17, p.119) • Turn-taking system (Ex: FM3, lines10-15 , p. 119) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question Design ○ Pursuit question (Ex:FM1, line 7, p. 112) ○ Negotiary question (Ex:FM3, line4, p. 119) • Paraphrase (Ex. FM2, lines 27-28, p. 117) • Use of wait time (Ex. FM6, line8, p. 129)
Focus on Fluency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave learners' CIKs or word search unaddressed (Ex. FLU3, line7) • Teacher echo of inappropriate answer / incorrect answer (Ex. FLU4, line 21, p. 147) • Passing up repair (Ex. FLU9, line 21, p. 165) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information seeking questions (Ex. FLU7, line 28, p.159) • Use of self-accounts/ self stories (Ex. FLU 2, lines 12-24, p. 139-140) • Use of visuals, materials and Contextual Clues (Ex. FLU6, line 4, p. 152) • Use of wait time (Ex. FLU 5, line 6, p. 149)

Appendix L: The Jefferson Transcription System

The transcription system uses standard punctuation marks (comma, stop, question mark); however, in the system they mark intonation rather than syntax. Arrows are used for more extreme intonational contours and should be used sparingly. The system marks noticeable emphasis, volume shifts, and so on. A generally loud speaker should not be rendered in capitals throughout.

[]	Square brackets mark the start and end of overlapping speech. They are aligned to mark the precise position of overlap as in the example below.
↑↓	Vertical arrows precede marked pitch movement, over and above normal rhythms of speech. They are used for notable changes in pitch beyond those represented by stops, commas and question marks.
→	Side arrows are used to draw attention to features of talk that are relevant to the current analysis.
Under <u>l</u> ining	indicates emphasis; the extent of underlining within individual words locates emphasis and also indicates how heavy it is.
CAPITALS	mark speech that is hearably louder than surrounding speech. This is beyond the increase in volume that comes as a by product of emphasis.
°↑I know it,°	‘degree’ signs enclose hearably quieter speech.
that’s r*ight.	Asterisks precede a ‘squeaky’ vocal delivery.
(0.4)	Numbers in round brackets measure pauses in seconds (in this case, 4 tenths of a second). If they are not part of a particular speaker’s talk they should be on a new line. If in doubt use a new line.
(.)	A micropause, hearable but too short to measure.
((stoccato))	Additional comments from the transcriber, e.g. about features of context or delivery.

she wa::nted	Colons show degrees of elongation of the prior sound; the more colons, the more elongation.
hhh	Aspiration (out-breaths); proportionally as for colons.
.hhh	Inspiration (in-breaths); proportionally as for colons.
Yeh,	'Continuation' marker, speaker has not finished; marked by fall-rise or weak rising intonation, as when delivering a list.
y'know?	Question marks signal stronger, 'questioning' intonation, irrespective of grammar.
Yeh.	Full stops mark falling, stopping intonation ('final contour'), irrespective of grammar, and not necessarily followed by a pause.
bu-u-	hyphens mark a cut-off of the preceding sound.
>he said<	'greater than' and 'lesser than' signs enclose speeded-up talk. Occasionally they are used the other way round for slower talk.
solid.= =We had	'Equals' signs mark the immediate 'latching' of successive talk, whether of one or more speakers, with no interval.
heh heh	Voiced laughter. Can have other symbols added, such as underlinings, pitch movement, extra aspiration, etc.
sto(h)p i(h)t	Laughter within speech is signalled by h's in round brackets.

Appendix M: Vita

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: BALIKÇI, Gözde
Nationality: Turkish (TC)
Date and Place of Birth: 14.08.1987, Datça
e-mail: gozdebalikci2@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
PhD	Middle East Technical University English Language Teaching	2018
MA	Middle East Technical University English Language Teaching	2012
BA	Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University English Language Teaching	2009
High School	Muğla Anatolian High School,	2005

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
2018-2010	Middle East Technical University, Dept. of Foreign Language Education	Research Assistant
2010-2009	Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University Dept. of Foreign Language Education	Research Assistant

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced English (C2)

PUBLICATIONS

Rakıcıoğlu-Söylemez, A., Ölçü Dinçer, Z., Balıkçı, G., Taner, G and Akayoğlu, S. (2018). Professional learning with and from peers: Pre-service EFL teachers' collaborative lesson-planning reflections. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18 (1), pp. 392-415

Balıkçı, G. ; Daloğlu, A. (2016). Critical Reading Discourse of Pre Service English Teachers in Turkey. *TESL- EJ*, 20(1).

Akkuş, M., Balıkçı, G. (2015) *Critical Pedagogy and Language Teaching* In Betil Eröz Tuğa (Ed). Theoretical considerations in language education Implications for English Language Teaching. Ankara: Nüans Yayıncılık

CONFERENCE PAPERS

- Balıkçı, G. Seferoğlu, G. (2018). *Pre service Teachers' Management of Word Searches of Learners in Teacher Led EFL Classrooms*. Poster presentation presented at 5th International Conference on Conversation Analysis, Loughborough University, UK.
- Balıkçı, G. & Taner, G. (2017) Needs-based course design. Paper presentation at: *The European Conference on Educational Research*, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Balıkçı G., Seferoğlu G. (2017). Conversation Analytic Look into an EFL class: Instruction Giving as a Collaborative Task Accomplished by the Teacher and the Students. Paper Presented at AAAL 2017 Portland, USA
- Balıkçı G., Seferoğlu G. (2016). Teachers as reflective practitioners: CA-informed pedagogy in practicum, GlobELT, Antalya, Turkey
- Akayoğlu S., Rakıcioğlu Söylemez, A. Ölçü Dinçer Z., Taner, G. & Balıkçı, G. (2015). A Phenomenological study of an online peer mentoring experience on lesson planning. Paper presentation at: *ATEE 40th Annual Conference*. University of Glasgow, Scotland.
- Taner, G. & Balıkçı, G. (2013) Designing an oral communication course for ELT students. Paper presentation at: *13. Uluslararası Dil, Yazın ve Deyiş Bilim Sempozyumu*. Kafkas University, Kars.
- Balıkçı G., Karaman C. (2012). Competencies and Performance Indicators for Teachers of English in Turkey A Critical Content Analysis. Paper Presented at IIIrd International Conference on Critical Education. Ankara University, Ankara.

EDITORIAL & ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE

- Editorial Board Member** for *7th and 8th International METU Postgraduate Conference on Linguistics and Language Teaching: Selected Papers, 2013*. Gazi Kitabevi: Ankara.
- Organizing committee member** in *The 16th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics* September 18-21, 2012 – Ankara.
- Organizing committee member** in *The 8th International METU Postgraduate Conference on Linguistics and Language Teaching*. November 24-25, 2011 - Ankara.
- Assistant to organizing committee** in *The 6th International Symposium on Politeness: Corpus Approaches*. July 11-13, 2011 – Ankara.
- Assistant to organizing committee** in *24. Ulusal Dilbilim Kurultayı (The 24th National Linguistics Symposium)*. May 17-18, 2010 – Ankara.

Appendix N: Turkish Summary / Türkçe Özet

Giriş

İngilizce'nin ilkokuldan başlayarak tüm eğitim kademelerinde yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesi birçok açıdan (örn. İngilizce öğrenmeye başlama yaşı, ders saatleri v.b.) tartışılmalıdır. Liseden mezun olan bir öğrencinin 1000 saate yakın İngilizce dersi almış olmasına rağmen dil yeterliği açısından iyi olmadığı da birçok rapor tarafından öne sürülmüştür. (TEPAV, 2014; İngilizce Yeterlik Endeksi, 2017). TEPAV'ın Türkiye'deki devlet okullarında İngilizce öğretimine ilişkin ulusal ihtiyaç analizi okullarda İngilizce'nin bir iletişim aracı olarak öğretilmesinden ziyade ezbere ve gramere dayalı olarak öğretildiğini ortaya koymuştur. Sınıf içinde de dilin iletişim aracı olarak kullanılmadığı sonuçlardan biridir.

Türkiye'nin İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak konuşulduğu ve öğretildiği bir ülke olduğu gerçeğini göz önünde bulundurduğumuzda İngilizce öğretiminin yapıldığı sınıfların önemi bir kez daha anlaşılmaktadır. Zira öğrenciler bu dili çoğunlukla sadece sınıflarda duymakta ve sınıf içi iletişim vasıtasıyla öğrenmektedir. Bu nedenle sınıf içinde eğitim ve öğretim pratiklerinin nasıl gerçekleştiği, öğretmen ve öğrenci tarafından nasıl uygulandığı ve gerçek hayata yansımaları önem taşımaktadır. Öte yandan sınıf içi gözlemler ve araştırmalar öğrencilerin İngilizce'de niçin başarısız olduğu konusunda da önemli ipuçları verecektir.

Ancak ülkemizde sınıf bağlamı çalışmalarında mikro analitik çalışmaların eksikliği göze çarpmaktadır (Aydınlı & Ortaçtepe; 2018). Ülkemizde genelde sınıf içi araştırmalarda söylem analizi (discourse analysis) araştırma yöntemi olarak kullanılmaktadır. Söylem analizinde de önceden belirlenmiş kodlar analiz yapılırken kullanılır. Önceden belirlenmiş kodların sınıf içi etkileşiminin (classroom interaction) zenginliğini ve bağlama göre değişken doğasını yansıtmadığı birçokları tarafından savunulmuştur (Seedhouse, 2004). Bu bağlamda sosyal etkileşimin araştırma metodu olarak ortaya çıkan konuşma çözümlemesinin

(conversation analysis) kullandığı çözümsel yöntemlerin sınıf içi etkileşimsel yapıyı daha iyi açıklayacağı savunulmuştur.

Sınıf içi etkileşimin öğretmenler tarafından yönetildiği açık bir gerçektir. Öğretmenlerin kullandığı dilin ve kaynakların etkileşimin gidişatını iyi ya da kötü yönde yönlendireceği düşünülmektedir. Bu nedenle öğretmenin diline ve dili nasıl kullandığını temel alarak yabancı dil sınıflarındaki etkileşimi araştırmak için yapılacak mikro-analitik araştırmaların eğitim-öğretimin gerçek hayatta nasıl gerçekleştiğine dair gerçekçi bir tablo ortaya koyacağına inanılmaktadır.

Öğretmen adaylarının (pre-service teachers) üniversite eğitimlerinin son aşamasında aldıkları, profesyonel mesleğe geçişin ilk adımı olarak sayılacak okul deneyimi (school experience) dersi kapsamında uygulama okullarında işledikleri dersler onların mesleğe attıkları ilk adım olması bakımından önemlidir. Ayrıca okul deneyimi dersinin öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenliği öğrenmesi bakımından da önemli bir yeri vardır.

Bu bağlamda bu doktora tezi bir grup İngilizce Öğretmenliği bölümü son sınıf öğrencisinin okul deneyimi dersi kapsamında uygulama okullarında (orta okul ve lise) işledikleri derslerin etkileşimsel yapısını konuşma çözümlemesinin mikro-analitik yöntemleri ile ortaya koymayı amaçlamıştır. Hem öğretmen adaylarının sınıf içi konuşmalarının dizisel düzeni hem de bu dizisel düzen ile ilişkili olarak pedagojik düzeninin çözümlenmesi yapılacaktır. Sınıf içi söylemde dominant olan 3 basamaklı öğretmen başlatımı- yanıt- dönüt / değerlendirme düzeninde (IRF pattern) öğretmen adayının pedagojik (öğretimsel) hedefini nasıl ortaya koyduğu ve nasıl devam ettirdiği araştırılacaktır. Hedef koyma ve devam ettirme süreçlerinde kullandığı etkileşimsel kaynakların anlık öğretime olan etkisi araştırılacaktır. Bu çözümleme sonucunda öğretmen adayının etkileşim sırasında oluşan öğretme imkanlarını kullanma ve / veya kaçırma anları da kesitler halinde sunulup detaylı bir şekilde incelenecektir.

Öğretmen adaylarının okul deneyimi derslerinde işledikleri derslerin konuşma çözümlemesi ile incelenmesi bakımından bu doktora tezi Türkiye'deki az sayıdaki çalışmalardan biridir. Öğretmen adaylarının ders işlediği yabancı dil sınıflarında

kaçırılan öğretme fırsatları (missed teaching opportunities) da ilk kez çalışılan bir alandır. Bu bakımdan bu doktora tezinin yabancı dil öğretmeni yetiştirme alanına, sınıf içi söylemi çalışmalarına ve sınıf içi araştırma metodu olarak konuşma çözümlemesine katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Alan Taraması

Alan taraması kapsamında sınıf içi söylemde yapılan çalışmalar sözlü etkileşimin öğrenme ve öğretme sürecindeki yerini göstermiştir. Cazden (2001) “okulun en temel amacının iletişim yoluyla kazanıldığını” belirtmiştir. İngilizce’nin yabancı dil olarak okutulduğu sınıflarda İngilizce’nin hem dersin kendisi olması hem de dersin işlendiği dil olması sınıf içi etkileşimi karmaşık hale getirmektedir. Ayrıca öğrencilerin henüz yetersiz düzeyde olan dil becerileri de öğretmenin bu süreci daha da dikkatli yürütmesini gerektirir.

Sosyo-etkileşimsel Yaklaşım

Bu doktora tezi dil ve dil edinimi/ kullanımı bağlamında sosyo-etkileşimsel yaklaşımı benimsemiştir. Yabancı dil sınıflarında araştırma yaparken belirli bir dil edinimi yaklaşımı olması gereklidir. Bu farklı geleneklerin farklılaşma noktasını dile ve ikinci dil edinimine olan yaklaşımları oluşturur. Bu bağlamda sosyo-etkileşimsel yaklaşım Markee ve Kasper (2004)’in belirttiği gibi dili, karşılıklı birbirini tanıyan toplumsal ve sosyal olarak dilsel kaynakları paylaşan grupların işbirlikçi ve öznelarası başarısı olarak görürler. Öğrenmeyi ise dilin öğrenildiği ve kullanıldığı ortamlara katılım olarak tanımlarlar. Lave (1993) *öğrenme* yerine kültürel alt yapısı olan günlük ortamlara *katılmayı* kullanmıştır. Yabancı dil öğrenimi / edinimi kapsamında ise Firth and Wagner’in 1997 ve 2007 ‘deki çağrılarını ikinci dil edinimi çalışmalarının sosyal teorilere kayması gerektiği ve dilin günlük hayatta değişik bağlamlarda kullanımına bakılması gerektiği üzerine olmuştur. Dil *ediniminden* (language acquisition) ziyade dil *kullanımı* (language use) üzerine yoğunlaşan sosyo-etkileşimsel yaklaşım *etkileşimsel yeti* nin (Young, 1999) dil kullanımındaki önemini vurgulamıştır. Kısaca sosyo-etkileşimsel yaklaşıma göre katılımcılar etkileşime girerek ve etkileşim içinde yeni bir dili öğrenirler. Dil de bu durumda bu katılımı ve etkileşimi sürdürmek için kullanılan

bir kaynak ve eylemdir. Dil öğreniminde öğrencilerin kendilerinin ders içi pratiklere *öğrenebilir* (learnable) olarak yönelimlerinden ve tanımlamalarından öğrenmelerinin takip edilebileceği öne sürülmüştür (Eskildsen ve Majlesi, 2018). Bu bağlamda ikinci dil ediniminde konuşma çözümlemesinin kullanımı bir ivme kazanmıştır. Sosyoloji alanında Sacks ve Schegloff'un çalışmalarından ortaya çıkan konuşma çözümlemesi yöntemi konuşmanın dizisel düzeni ortaya çıkarmak için insanlar arasındaki doğal gelişen etkileşimi analiz eder. Temel amaç, insanların konuşmalarını nasıl düzenlediklerini anlamak ve öznelarasılığı (intersubjectivity) sağlama yollarını keşfetmektir. Bunu yapmak için herhangi bir etkileşimin dizisel düzeni (sequential organization), yeğleme düzeni (preference organization) ve onarım düzeni (repair organization) ortaya çıkarılır. Konuşma çözümlemesi, etkileşimi düzenli ve kuralları olan konuşan kişilerin anlık eylemlerine göre değişen ve o anki duruma göre düzenlenen (situated) pratik olarak görür. Etkileşim bir önceki söz sırasında yapılan katkılardan etkilenir ve bir sonrakinde ortaya çıkacak katkıyı da etkiler. Konuşmacının her söz sırası bir önceki söz sırasını nasıl anlamlandırdığının da bir kanıtıdır. Konuşma çözümlemesine çalışmanın yöntemi kısmında daha geniş yer verilecektir. Şimdi konuşma çözümlemesi yönteminin öğrenmeye karşı bakış açısına yer verilecektir.

Konuşma Çözümlemesi ve İkinci Dil Edinimi

İlk başlarda konuşma çözümlemesi sınıf içi etkileşimi herhangi bir sosyal ortamdaki etkileşim olarak görüp sınıf içi etkileşimin etkileşimsel düzenini mikro analitik yöntemler ile ortaya koymayı hedef edinmiştir. Örneğin McHoul'un (1978) söz sırası alma eyleminin dizisel düzenini çıkardığı çalışma bu yaklaşımın ilk ve en önemli örneklerinden biridir. Bu tip budun yöntembilim (ethnomethodology) çalışmalarının öğrenme ile ilgili herhangi bir iddiası ya da ulaştığı sonuç bulunmamaktadır. Katılımcıların içeriden bakış açısını (emic perspective) temele alarak sınıf içi doğal olarak gelişen etkileşimin dizisel düzenini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamışlardır.

Daha sonra konuşma çözümlemesi yönteminin öğrenme eylemlerini takip etmedeki potansiyeli keşfedilmiştir. Hellerman (2008) katılımcıların zaman içinde gelişen etkileşimsel eylemlerini kanıt göstererek konuşma çözümlemesi yöntemiyle

öğrenmeyi belgelemiştir. Genelde bunu katılımcıların zaman içinde gelişen onarım eylemlerini göstererek yapmıştır. Watanabe (2007) öğrencilerin konuşmalarında art-genişletme (post-expansion) yaparak etkileşimsel yetilerini geliştirdiğini bulmuştur. Hauser (2010) birebir yapılan kurslarda öğrencinin dilde olumsuzlama (L2 negation) yapmayı öğrendiğini uzun süreli çalışmasında göstermiştir. Eskildsen ve Wagner (2015) öğrencilerin vücut dillerinin el kol hareketlerinin belirli edatların (prepositions) öğrenimine nasıl eşlik ettiği ve bu edatların zaman içinde öğrenildiğine konuşma çözümlemesi yoluyla kanıt getirmişlerdir. Sınıf içinde günlük rutin konuşmalara öğrencilerin yabancı dilde cevap verme ve etkileşimsel yetilerinin de zaman içi gelişmesi çalışılan alanlar arasındadır (Waring, 2013).

Etkileşimsel yetinin gelişiminin yanı sıra İkinci Dil Ediniminde Konuşma Çözümlemesi (Conversation Analysis for Second Language Acquisition) de Markee 'nin (2008) iddia ettiği üzere konuşucuların ikinci dili nasıl öğrendiklerini takip etmeyi ve belgelemeyi amaçlar. Konuşma çözümlemesi doğal olarak konuşmada gelişen etkileşim içinde (talk-in interaction) konuşucuların belirli sosyal eylemleri gerçekleştirmek için (örneğin yeni bir dili öğrenmek) birbirlerinin iletişimsel eylemlerini nasıl analiz ettiklerini ve anlamlandırdıklarını ortaya koyar. Diğer bir deyişle, konuşma çözümlemesi konuşucuların gözle görülebilir ve kanıt getirilebilir yönelimlerini ve davranışlarını doğal olarak gelişen etkileşim içinde ortaya koymayı ve bu davranışlar içerisinde öğrenme pratiklerini de belgelemeyi amaçlar. *İkinci Dil Ediniminde Konuşma Çözümlemesi* için göze görülebilir öğrenme davranışları: onarım düzeni, epistemik durumunun değiştiğini belirten alındılma işareti kullanımı (changes of epistemic state displayed through acknowledgement token e.g. oh), bir dilden diğerine yapılan çeviri, ve gönüllü olarak yeni bir bilgiyi kullanmaya yönelme gibi ve yeni bilgiyi kullanmadır. (Markee ve Seo; 2009).

Sıradaki bölümde öğretmen yönlendirmeli sınıf içi etkileşim alanında konuşma çözümlemesi yoluyla yapılmış araştırmalardan bahsedilecektir.

Öğretmen Yönlendirmeli Sınıf İçi Etkileşim

Öğretmen yönlendirmeli sınıf içi etkileşim (teacher led classroom interaction) öğretmen başlatımlı etkileşimleri kapsar. Görev temelli aktiviteler (task-based) ya da grup içi çalışmalar bu sınıf içi söylemin dışında kalır. Sert (2015) sınıf içi söylemi şöyle tanımlar: yabancı dil sınıfları , öğretmen ve öğrencilerin bir araya gelip dilin kullanırken ve kullanmalarının sonucu olarak beraber oluşturdukları yeni bilgi ve anlamların temsil edildiği sosyo-etkileşimsel pratiklerin oluşturduğu bir söylemdir. Bu söylemi daha iyi anlayabilmek için onun temel özellikleri aşağıda sıralanacaktır:

- 3 basamaklı öğretmen başlatımı- yanıt- dönüt / değerlendirme düzeni (Initiation- Response Evaluation/ Follow-up)
- durumsallık (contingency)
- pedagoji ve etkileşim arasındaki dönüşlü ilişki (reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction) ve
- sınıf içi etkileşime katılım yapısı (participation framework)

Üç basamaklı düzen söylem analizi çalışmalarıyla sınıf içi etkileşim çalışmalarında bulunmuş bir düzendir (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Bu düzende öğretmen bir soru sorar, öğrenci yanıt verir ve en son dizide öğretmen cevabı değerlendirir ve bir geri dönüt verir ya da takip eden başka bir soru sorar.

Durumsallık ise sınıf içi etkileşimde dizisel düzenin doğal akışını ifade eder. Öğretmenin başlatımı önceki söz sırasından etkilenmiştir ve bir sonraki söz sırasını da etkileyecektir. Bir sonraki söz sırası kendisinden önceki söz sırasına göre tasarlanacak ve dizisel eylem (sequential action) ortaya konacaktır. Van Lier (1996) sınıf içi etkileşimin doğasını oluşturan durumsallığın sosyal etkileşimin çeşitliliğinin ve zenginliğinin kapılarını ve aynı zamanda öğrencinin öğrenme potansiyelinin kapılarını açtığını belirtmiştir. Ayrıca van Lier (1996) ve diğer sınıf içi etkileşim çalışan bilim insanları (Walsh, 2006; Lee, 2010, Waring, 2016) öğretmeyi “anlık etkileşimsel kararlar alma süreci” olarak tanımlamışlardır. Bu da sınıf içi etkileşimin durumlara bağlı olarak anlık olarak değişebileceğinin altını çizen bir tanım olmuştur.

Pedagoji ve etkileşim arasındaki dönüşlü ilişkiyi Seedhouse (2004) ortaya koymuştur. Seedhouse'a göre özellikle yabancı dil sınıflarında dilin hem öğretilecek akademik konu olması hem de etkileşimin gerçekleştiği araç olması sebebiyle sınıf içi söylem karmaşık yapıdadır. Seedhouse (2004) anlık pedagojik hedefler çeşitlendikçe açığa çıkan etkileşim de çeşitlenir; aynı şekilde sınıf içi etkileşimin planlanan öğretimsel hedefleri sınıf içi yansımalarını farklılaştıran bir rolü de olduğunun altını çizer. (Seedhouse, 2005, s. 172). Bu bağlamda Seedhouse (2004) sınıf içi etkileşiminde *yapı ve doğruluk* (form and accuracy) , *anlam ve akıcılık* (meaning and fluency), yönetsel (procedural) ve görev odaklı (task-oriented) adlı mikro bağlamların olduğunu savunmuştur. Her bağlamların kendine özgü yeğleme, onarım ve dizisel düzeni vardır.

Sınıf içi etkileşimde katılım yapısı ise Schwab (2011) tarafından “multilogue” olarak tanımlanmıştır. Yani öğretmen ya da bir öğrenci her zaman sınıf içinde birden çok kişiye hitap eder. Her zaman aktif olarak katılmasalar da sınıftaki diğer üyeler de etkileşimin bir parçasıdır. Bu nedenle çoklu katılım yapısı öğretmen yönlendirmeli sınıflarda dahi hakimdir.

Sınıf içi etkileşimde öğretmenin etkileşimsel kaynaklarını ve dili kullanımına yönelik çalışmalar ise genelde öğretmenin söz sırası dağılımını nasıl yaptığı ve istekli öğrencileri nasıl seçtiği (Mortensen, 2008); çok-kipli kaynakları (multi-modality) nasıl kullandığı (Seo ve Koshik, 2010); iki dil arası geçişleri yapmaları (code-switching) (Üstünel ve Seedhouse, 2005); soru tasarımları (Mehan, 1979); ve onarım (Fagan, 2015) üzerine odaklanmıştır.

Öğretmenlerin çeşitli etkileşimsel kaynakları kullanarak öğrenmeyi kolaylaştırdıkları ve öğrenme fırsatı yarattıkları kaynaklar Walsh (2006) tarafından kapsamlı bir şekilde tartışılmıştır. Walsh'a (2006) göre eğer öğretmen dili o anki pedagojik hedeflere uygun ve etkileşimin gerektirdiği şekilde kullanırsa öğrenmeyi kolaylaştırır, aksi hallerde ise öğrenmeye ket vurmuş olur. Walsh (2006) özellikle öğretmenler için *sınıf içi etkileşimsel yeti* (SEY) (classroom interactional competence) yi ortaya atmıştır. Sert (2016) SEY in iddia ettiği öğrenmeyi kolaylaştırıcı eylemleri şöyle sıralamıştır: “SEY'e göre (a) etkileşimsel alanı

genişletme; (b) öğrenci katılımlarını şekillendirme (örneğin yapısal destek, modelleme, ya da onarım ile); (c) etkili öğrenci katılımı alma (eliciting); (d) öğretim bireydili (bir öğretmenin konuşma alışkanlıkları); ve (e) etkileşimsel farkındalıktır. Tüm bu özellikler doğru mikro bağlamda ve örtüşen pedagojik hedef ile kullanıldığında öğrenme kolaylaşmış olur.” (Sert, 2016, s. 30)

Öğrenmeyi kolaylaştırıcı etkileşimsel kaynakların yanında, öğretmenlerin öğrenme fırsatlarını değerlendiremedikleri durumlar da sınıf içi araştırmalarda mikro analitik yöntemlerle araştırılmıştır. Waring ve Wong (2009) son dizide öğretmenin açık olumlu değerlendirmelerin (Explicit Positive Assessment, EPA) aslında öğrencilerin sormak istedikleri soruları sormayı engellediğini ortaya koymuştur. *Çok iyi* (very good) gibi değerlendirmeler öğrencinin art-genişletme (post-expansion) yapmasını engellemiştir.

Li (2013) ise Çince'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği bir sınıfta öğrencilerin sorularını es geçerek cevaplamadığı böylece kaçırılmış bir öğrenme fırsatına neden olduğunu konuşma çözümlemesinin mikro-analitik yöntemleri ile göstermiştir.

Yukarıda sözü geçen çalışmalar genelde deneyimli öğretmenlerin sınıfında yapılan çalışmalardır. Öğretmen adayı olarak adlandırılan ve henüz stajını yapan hizmet öncesi öğretmenler ile ilgili Türkiye’de mikroanalitik düzeyde sınıf içi etkileşim çalışmaları henüz yeni yeni başlamıştır (Bozbıyık, 2017; Karadağ, 2017). Yurt dışında ise durum pek farklı değildir. Fagan (2012) deneyimsiz öğretmenlerin öğrenci katkılarını şekillendiremediğini bulmuştur.

Yöntem

Bu bölümde doktora tezinin amacı, araştırma soruları, araştırmanın önemi ve alana katkısı anlatılacaktır. Daha sonra araştırmanın katılımcıları, verinin toplandığı okullar veri toplama süreci ve yöntemleri açıklanacaktır. Veri analizi kısmında ise konuşma çözümlemesi yöntemi kısa bir şekilde özetlenecek ve veri analizinde takip edilen yol açıklanacaktır. Araştırmanın geçerlik ve güvenilirliğinin sağlanma yolları ile bölüm bitirilecektir.

Bu doktora tezinin genel amacı hizmet öncesi İngilizce öğretmenlerinin yönlendirdikleri sınıf içi etkileşimin dizisel ve pedagojik düzenini ortaya çıkarmaktır. Öğretmen adaylarının staj kapsamlarında işledikleri derslerde pedagojik hedeflerini ilk dizide ortaya koyma ve çeşitli etkileşimsel kaynaklarla takip eden söz sıralarında devam ettirme ve son söz sırasında değerlendirme ile sonlandırma yolları konuşma çözümlemesi yoluyla incelenecektir. Diğer bir deyişle bu çalışmanın odak noktası hizmet öncesi İngilizce öğretmenlerinin kendilerinin yönlendirdikleri ve staj kapsamında işledikleri derslerin dizisel ve pedagojik düzenini ortaya çıkarmaktır.

Bu çalışmanın araştırma soruları veri analiz edildikçe ortaya çıkmıştır. Öğretmen ve öğrencilerin anlık öğretimsel hedeflerinin değiştirdiği ve zenginleştirdiği etkileşimsel yapı 3 büyük alt bağlam ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bunlar öğretmen ve öğrencilerin odaklandığı noktaları temel alarak şöyle olmuştur: : odak noktasının *yapı ve doğruluk* olduğu bağlam, odak noktasının *anlam olduğu* bağlam ve odağın *akıcılık* olduğu bağlam. Bu bağlamlar bulunduktan sonra araştırma soruları yeniden şekillenmiştir. Aşağıda bu doktora tezinin araştırma soruları verilmiştir:

Araştırma Soruları

1. Öğretmen adaylarının yönlendirdiği İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği sınıflarda sınıf içi etkileşim sonucu çıkan bağlamlar nelerdir?

2. Öğretmen adayları;

- yapı ve doğruluğa

-anlama

-akıcılığa

odaklandıklarında öğretim hedeflerini nasıl koyup sürdürüyorlar?

2.1 Öğretim hedeflerini koyup sürdürmek için hangi etkileşimsel kaynakları kullanıyorlar ve bunun sonucu olarak öğretme fırsatlarını nasıl yaratıyorlar?

Çalışmanın Alana Katkısı

Konuşma çözümlemesi, dil öğretmenlerinin dil kullanımını gerçek zamanlı olarak araştıran ve dil öğretmenlerinin öğrenmeyi iyileştirme çabalarını ortaya koyan çok sayıda çalışma ile sınıf araştırmalarındaki yerini güçlendirdi.(Bazı örnekler için: Waring, 2009; Lee, 2007; Walsh, 2002, Sert, 2015; Seedhouse, 2004; Markee, 2015; Kääntä, 2012) Ancak hizmet öncesi öğretmenlerin diğer bir deyişle öğretmen adaylarının dil kullanımını araştıran araştırma sayısı halen yeterli değildir. Bu bakımdan bu doktora tezi 16 öğretmen adayının 43 farklı derste dil kullanımını mikro-analitik yöntemlerle incelemektedir. Bu kadar farklı derste ve kalabalık bir grup öğretmen adayını incelemesi bakımından bu tezin alana yapacağı katkı açıktır.

Bu çalışmanın sonuçları ve sonuçları, hizmet öncesi dil öğretmenlerinin uygulamalarını anlamak için değerlidir ve Türkiye'deki yabancı dil öğretimi ve öğretmen eğitimi hakkındaki bilgi birikimine katkıda bulunacağına inanılmaktadır.

Bu bağlamda, 16 öğretmen adayının 43 farklı dersinin video kayıtları öğretmen adaylarının yönlendirdiği yabancı dil sınıflarının dizisel ve pedagojik düzenini gösterecek ve bu sonuçlar ışığında eğitimle ilgili paydaşlara bilgi verilecektir.

Konuşma çözümlemesinden öğretmen eğitiminde faydalanmak ve öğretmenlerin öz değerlendirmesinde kullanmak için sürekli tekrarlanan çağrılar vardır (Sert, 2010, 2015; Seedhouse, 2008; Walsh, 2006)

Ancak, konuşma çözümlemesini öğretmen eğitimine dahil etmek için, öğretmen adaylarının gerçek zamanlı uygulamalarını sınıfta ilk adım olarak analiz etmek ve tanımlamak önemlidir.Öncelikle doğal akan sınıf içi etkileşimde öğretmen adaylarını dil kullanım durumuna bakarak gelecekteki öğretmenleri eğitmek amacıyla konuşma çözümlemesinden faydalanılan bir müfredat oluşturulabilir.

Bu nedenle, bu çalışmanın sonuçlarının öğretmen eğitim programlarının öğretmen adaylarının uygulamalarını gerçek zamanlı olarak görmesini ve dersleri buna göre tasarlamasını sağlayacak bir geri bildirim sağlayacağı umulmaktadır.

Son olarak, bu doktora tezi öğretmen adaylarının yönlendirdiği yabancı dil sınıflarında *kaçırılan öğretim fırsatları* üzerine yapılan ilk mikro-analitik çalışmadır. Bu, kaçırılan öğretim fırsatlarını tanımlamak ve konuşma çözümlemesi sınırları içinde kullanmak için yapılan ilk girişimdir. Kaçırılmış öğretim fırsatlarını bulabilmek konuşma çözümlemesini uzman tavsiyeleriyle destekleyecek bazı öneriler olacaktır. Bunlar bir sonraki bölümlerde açıklanacaktır.

Araştırma Alanı, Katılımcılar ve Veri Toplama Süreci

Bu araştırma bir devlet üniversitesinin eğitim fakültesi yabancı diller eğitimi bölümündeki bir grup son sınıf İngilizce öğretmeni ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmacı İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının stajları kapsamında aldıkları okul deneyimi dersinde görevli araştırma görevlisi olup dersin her aşamasında öğrenciler ile birlikte ders gözlemleri yapmış, fakülte'deki derslerde tartışmalara katılmış ve öğretmen adaylarının derslerini gözlemlemiş ve video kamera aracılığıyla kaydetmiştir. Araştırmacı herhangi bir şekilde öğretmen adaylarına not vermemiş ve değerlendirme yapmamıştır. Araştırmacı veri toplama sürecinden önce Milli Eğitim Bakanlığının ilgili bölümüne başvurup belirli okullarda veri toplama iznini almıştır.

Katılımcılar bir devlet üniversitesinin yabancı diller eğitimi bölümündeki son sınıf öğrencileridir. Üniversiteden mezun olmak ve devlet ya da özel okullarda öğretmenlik yapabilmek için 2014-2015 güz yarıyılında 10 haftalık staj dersini (okul deneyimi) Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın izin verdiği ve fakültenin işbirliği yaptığı bir okulda tamamlamak zorundadırlar. Bu dersin amacı adından da anlaşılacağı üzere öğretmen adaylarına sınıf ortamını göstermek, sınıf içi gerçekleşen öğrenme pratiklerini fakültede öğrenilen eğitim teorileri ile açıklayabilmek, ders işlemek, öğretmen kimliği edinmek ve son olarak kendi öğretmenlik performansını öğrencilerinden, diğer öğretmen adayı arkadaşlarından, mentörlerinden ve de fakülte'deki öğretim elemanından aldığı geri dönütlerle değerlendirebilmektir. (Dersin akademik kataloğundaki hedeflerinden alınmıştır). Bu ders kapsamında öğretmen adayları yanlarına atandıkları mentor öğretmenlerin derslerini izleyip belli konularda gözlem yapıp gözlem formları doldurmakta, yine mentor öğretmenlerinin verdiği bazı görevleri yapma (gözetmenlik, quiz okuma,

materyal hazırlama v.b.) ve 40 dakikalık bütün bir dersi çift olduğu öğretmen adayı arkadaşı ile beraber anlatmaktadır. İşte bu doktora tezinin veritabanını da öğretmen adayının staj kapsamında işledikleri derslerinin video kayıtları oluşturmaktadır.

Ders başında 30 kişilik okul deneyimi öğrencilerine tez çalışmasından bahsedilmiş ve 16 öğretmen adayı gönüllü olarak araştırmaya katılacağını söylemiştir. 16 öğretmen adayından 14'ü İngilizce hazırlık programı olan bir liseye, 2 si ise bir ortaokula staj için gönderilmiştir.

Araştırmacı, öğretmen adaylarının ders işleyecekleri günlerde önceden sınıfa girerek 2 adet kamerayı sınıfa yerleştirmiştir. Sınıflar kalabalık ve geniş olduğundan dolayı bir kamerayı sınıf tahtasının yanına diğerini de en arkaya yerleştirmiştir. Sonuç olarak 3 aylık bir süre içinde 16 öğretmen adayının 4 er kez işlediği dersler kayıt altına alınmıştır. Veri analizine geçmeden önce, konuşma çözümlemesinin çıkışı ilkeleri, analitik çözümleme araçları ve yabancı dil sınıflarında kullanımı anlatılacaktır.

Konuşma Çözümlemesi

Konuşma çözümlemesi insanların belli bir düzeni ve kuralları olan etkileşimi üretme ve sürdürme yollarını araştırır. Harvey Sacks etkileşimdeki konuşmanın belli bir düzeni olduğunu savunmuştur. Sacks'ın ortaya koyduğu konuşma çözümlemesinin genel prensipleri şunlardır:

- etkileşim sistematik bir şekilde organize ve bir düzen içindedir
- konuşucuların etkileşimi sürdürmek ve öznelerarasılığı sağlamak için metodları vardır
- konuşma çözümlemesi veri olarak doğal olarak gelişen etkileşimi kullanmalıdır.
- analiz aşamasında dışarıdan bir kişinin düşüncesi ya da bir teoriden ziyade katılımcıların bakış açısı (emic perspective) kullanılmalıdır.

Bu temel ilkeler ışığında Hutchby ve Wooffitt (1998) konuşma çözümlemesinin iki temel soruyu cevapladığını belirtmiştir:

-hangi etkileşimsel görevler dizisel yapı kullanılarak başarıyor ve katılımcılar bu görevlere kendi aktif yönelimlerini nasıl gösteriyorlar?

Seedhouse (2004) daha kısa ve net bir şekilde etkileşimin her bir yapısı için *niye, bu biçimde ve bu sırada* diye sormamız gerektiğini belirtmiştir. Bu soruları yanıtlamak için söz sırası alma, yeğleme ve onarım düzenlerine analitik olarak bakılır.

Bu doktora tezinde yabancı dil sınıflarının zenginliğini ve doğal olarak gelişen etkileşimin dil sınıfı olması sebebiyle karmaşıklığını daha iyi yansıtması bakımından konuşma çözümlemesi kullanılmıştır. Konuşma çözümlemesi Seedhouse (2004) un da belirttiği üzere söylem analizine kıyasla yabancı dil sınıflarının etkileşim yapısını daha iyi inceler ve 3 basamaklı dizi düzeninin aralarında kaçırılan katılımcıların kullandığı etkileşimsel kaynakları daha iyi ortaya koyar. Ayrıca vücut dili, tonlama, duraksamalar, sessizlikler örtüşmeler v.b gibi etkileşimdeki detayları kendine özgü çeviriyazı sistemi ile daha ayrıntılı bir şekilde yansıtır (Sert, 2011).

Bu tezde ilk kez çalışılacak olan kaçırılmış öğretim fırsatları konuşma çözümlemesi çerçevesinde incelenmeye çalışılmıştır. Bu bağlamda eğer;

1. Öğretmen adayı öğrencilerin yetersiz bilgi iddialarına (claims of insufficient knowledge; Sert, 2011), bilinmeyen sözcük arayışlarına ve sorularına yönelmeyip onları cevapsız bırakıyorsa
2. Öğretmen adayı öğrencilerin dersin amacına uygun düşmeyen ve gramer açısından yanlış olan cevaplarını tekrar ediyorsa
3. Öğretmen adayı öğrencinin yanlış cevabına gizli onarım (embedded repair) yaparak cevap veriyor ancak bunu açıkça belli etmiyorsa

Bu kesitler kaçırılmış öğretim fırsatları olarak analiz aşamasında değerlendirilmiştir İlk sırada belirtilen durumlar konuşma çözümlemesinin analitik ve teorik çerçevesinde kaçırılmış bir öğretim fırsatı olarak değerlendirmeye uygundur. Çünkü etkileşim sekteye uğramış, öğrencilerin yeğlediği cevap öğretmen

adayından gelmemiştir. Ancak diğer iki durumda öznelarasılık korunmuş katılımcılar etkileşimi sekteye uğratmadan devam etmişlerdir. Bu durum konuşma çözümlemesinin teorik çerçevesinde başarılı bir etkileşimin gerçekleştiğine işaret eder. Ancak öğretmen adaylarının da aynı zamanda öğrenmek ve öğretmek amacıyla sınıfta bulunması göz önüne alındığında sınıf içi etkileşimin en temel hedefi olan öğretim gerçekleştirilmemiş demektir. Bu nedenle bu doktora tezinde konuşma çözümlemesinin teorik sınırlarını biraz aşarak araştırmacı uzmanlık alanına dayanarak dışarıdan bir gözle *kaçırılmış öğretim fırsatlarını* analiz etmiştir.

Bu bölümde analizin nasıl yapıldığı aşama aşama özetlenecektir. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) analiz aşamasında söz sırası başlangıcı bitişi, örtüşmeler, sessizlikler ve duraksamaların çeviriyazıda detaylı bir şekilde belirtilmesinin önemini belirtmiştir. Daha sonra konuşmadaki tonlama vurgu ve stresin de belirtilmesi gerektiği ve bunun yanı sıra katılımcıların her türlü yüz ifadesi ve vücut dilinin de çeviriyazı yoluyla aktarılmasının gerekliliğinin altını çizer.

Bu çalışmada aynı ekranda video çeviriyazı (transcription) ve çeviriyazıyı yapacak bazı butonların olduğu Transana isimli bir program kullanılmıştır. Her bir öğretmen adayının videosu bu programa yüklenmiş ve konuşma çözümlemesinin kullandığı Jefferson (2004) çeviriyazın sistemiyle çeviriyazıya aktarılmıştır. Daha sonra her bir dizi (sequence) nin nerde başlayıp nerde bittiği belirlenmiştir. Bu dizilerde her söz sırasında konuşucunun ne yapmaya çalıştığı gelişen etkileşime bakılarak analiz edilmiştir. Bununla beraber katılımcıların söz sıralarını nasıl tasarladıkları ve vücut dili ile nasıl destekledikleri de çeviriyazıya aktarılmıştır. Çeviriyazı sonrası alt bağlamlar ve öğretmen ve öğrencilerin öğretimsel hedefleri etkileşimdeki kanıtlara dayalı bir şekilde belirlenmiş ve kullanılan etkileşimsel kaynaklar son olarak analiz edilmiştir.

Geçerlik ve Güvenirliğin Sağlanması

Konuşma çözümlemesi geçerliliği sağlamak için katılımcıların bakış açısını temele almayı ve bir sonraki sıranın kanıt getirme işlemi (next turn proof procedure) prensibini kullanarak katılımcıların yönelimlerine kanıt getirmeyi planlamıştır.

Geçerlik aynı zamanda bulguların farklı sınıf ortamlarına da genellenebilir olmasını gerektirir. Seedhouse (2004) bu genellemeyi yapılılabilmesi için 10-15 ders saati verinin yeterli olabileceğini belirtmiştir. Bu bakımdan bu tezin veritabanını oluşturan 43 ders bu çalışmayı geçerli kılar. Ayrıca geçerlilik için çeviriyazının kalitesi etkileşimi olabildiğince tüm ayrıntılarıyla yansıtması da geçerliği arttıran faktörlerdendir.

Konuşma çözümlemesinin kullandığı video kayıtlarının isteyen herkese ulaşılabilir olması güvenilirliği arttıran faktörlerdendir. Ayrıca bu tez çalışması özelinde okul deneyimi dersi kapsamında başlangıcından bitişine kadar işlenen her dersin kayıt edilmesi de güvenilirliği arttırmıştır. Derste kullanılan ders kitabı, akıllı tahta v.b gibi materyallerin çeviriyazıda gerektiğinde belirtilmesi de güvenilirliği artırır. Birden fazla videokayıt cihazı kullanılması, araştırmacının veri oturumlarına katılıp verisini alandaki uzmanlarla paylaşarak çeviriyazının kontrolü ve diğer uzman araştırmacıların da veri analizine katılması güvenilirliği arttıran etmenlerden diğerleridir.

Bulgular

Bu bölümde araştırma sonucunda ortaya çıkan bulgular özetlenecektir. İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği aday öğretmenlerin stajları kapsamında işledikleri derslerdeki dizesel ve pedagojik düzen 3 farklı öğretimsel odağın olduğunu ve öğretimsel odakların da farklı etkileşimler ortaya çıkarttığını belirtmiştir. Bunlar şöyledir: odağın yapı olduğu bağlam, odağın anlam olduğu bağlam ve odağın akıcılık olduğu bağlam. Bu bağlamlar öğretimsel hedefin ortaya konması ve sürdürülmesi ve öğrenci katkılarına cevap verilmesi şekillendirilmesi ve bunun sonucunda öğretim fırsatlarının doğru bakımından incelenecektir.

Odağın Yapı Olduğu Bağlam

Bu bağlamda öğretmen adayları ve öğrenciler yapı ve doğruluğu hedef olarak ortaya koymuşlardır. Dilin dilbilgisi açısından doğru kullanımı en önemli hedeftir. Bu bağlamı başlatmak için öğretmen adayları *cevabı bilinen bilgi sorusu* (known-

information question) sormuşlardır. Cevabı bilinen bilgi sorularını takiben öğretmen adayları öğrencilerden gelen katkıları öğretmen başlatımlı onarımla şekillendirme yoluna gitmişlerdir. Takip eden söz sırasında öğrencinin onarım yapması için etkileşimsel kaynaklar kullanmışlardır Bir sonraki söz sırasında öğrencinin onarım yapması için öğretmenin kullandığı etkileşimsel ve öğretimsel kaynaklar şunlardır: eksik tasarlanmış sözce (designedly incomplete utterance), cümlenin tamamını öğrenciden talep etme (request for full sentence) ve metalinguistik açıklamalar. Eksik tasarlanmış sözceler öğretmenler tarafından yapı ve doğruluğa odaklandıkları zaman en çok kullanılan kaynak olmuştur. Öğrenciden bütün cümleyi talep etme de öğretmen adayının anlık hedefini açığa çıkarmış ve öğrencilerin takip eden söz sıralarında yanıt olarak cümleyi bütün olarak vermelerini sağlamıştır. Vücut dili yardımıyla yapılan açıklamalar (embodied explanations) edatları (prepositions) öğretirken öğretmen adayları tarafından sıklıkla kullanılmıştır. Öğretmenin son söz sırasında ise *açık olumlu değerlendirmelerde* bulunduğu ya da öğrencilerin bir önceki söz sırasında verdikleri yanıtları tekrar ettiği bulunmuştur. Bazı durumlarda ise öğretmen adayları herhangi bir şey söylemeden başka bir öğrenciye söz sırası vererek yeni bir soruya geçmiştir. Diğer bir deyişle son diziyi atlamıştır. Yapı ve doğruluk bağlamı öğretmen adaylarının dersin ve etkileşimin devamlılığını öğretim fırsatlarını değerlendirmeye yeğlediğini göstermiştir. Çünkü çoğu zaman değerlendirme yapımları geri dönüt vermeleri ya da detaylandırma soruları (elaboration questions) sormaları beklenen yerlerde öğretmen adayları diğer bir soruya ya da konuya geçmeyi yeğlemiş ve yeni bir dizi başlatmışlardır.

Öğretmen adaylarının yapı ve doğruluğa odaklandıklarında öğrencilerden aldıkları sorulara yönelme biçimleri dikkat çekicidir. Öğrenciler öğretmen adaylarına genelde aktivite ile ilgili ya da bilgi soruları yöneltmişlerdir. Öğretmen adayları bu soruları hemen cevaplama, soruları atlama ve yanıt vermeme ve son olarak da soruyu sınıfa geri yöneltme gibi yollar izlemiştir. Sorulara yönelmeyip yanıt vermedikleri durumlar doğal olarak öğretim fırsatlarının kaçırıldığı anlar olarak analize katılmıştır.

Yapı ve doğruluğun hedef olduğu durumlarda öğretimi kolaylaştıran öğretmen hareketleri vücut dilini kullanma, tahtayı kullanma, cümlelerin tamamını öğrenciden talep etme ve metalingüistik açıklamalarda bulunma olmuştur.

Öğretim fırsatlarını kaçırmalarına yol açan hareketler ise gereğinden fazla eksik tasarlanmış sözce kullanımı, öğretmen yankısı (teacher echo), gereğinden fazla *okay* gibi diziyi kapatıcı sözce kullanımı, öğrenci sorularını geçme ya da değerlendirme yapmadan bir sonraki soruya geçme olarak bulunmuştur.

Odağın Anlam Olduğu Bağlam

Odağın anlam olduğu bağlamda öğretmen adayı genelde bir kelimenin anlamını sınıfa sorarak bir diziyi başlatır. Bu soru tasarımı ise cevabı bilinen bilgi sorusu gibi tasarlanmaz. Genelde öğretmen adayı *şu sözcüğün anlamı ne olabilir, ne düşünüyorsunuz* gibi sorular tasarlayarak (negotiated question) sınıftaki herkesin fikrini almayı hedeflemiştir. Bu bakımdan odağın anlam olduğu bağlam cevabı bilinen bilgi sorularıyla başlatılan dizilerden farklı olmuştur. Öğretmen adayları kelimelerin anlamını öğrencilerin bulmasını desteklemek amacıyla ders kitabından ve de hazırladıkları sunulardan faydalanmışlardır. Sorulardan sonra gelen bekleme zamanı ve detaylandırma soruları da öğrencinin katılımını sağlama yolunda faydalı olmuştur.

Odağın anlam olduğu bağlamı sürdürebilmesi için öğretmen adayının öğrenci katkılarına şekillendirme, soruların, yetersiz bilgi iddialarına ve bilinmeyen kelime arayışlarına yönelmesi gerekmiştir. Öğrenciler bilinmeyen kelime arayışına girdiği zaman öğretmen adayının cevabı hemen verdiği durumlar olmuştur ki bu hem dersin devamlılığını sağlamış hem de öğretimsel hedeflerin ulaşıldığı anlar olmuştur. Bazı durumlarda öğretmen öğrencilerin bir ağızdan verdiği yanıtların hepsine yönelemeyip yanlış cevapları tekrar ettiği de analitik çözümlemede ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu durumda öğretmen adayının dersin devamlılığını yeğledikleri bulunmuştur. Özetlemek gerekirse öğretmen adaylarının saklı onarım yapması ama bunu öğrencilerin anlayacağı bir şekilde tasarlamaması, yanlış cevapları öğretmen adayının tekrar etmesi ve söz sırası almayı öğretmen adayının yönetememesi öğretme fırsatlarının kaçırılmasına yol açmıştır. Öğretim fırsatlarının çoğaltıldığı

durumlar ise soru tasarımının uygun olması, öğretmen adayının soru sorduktan sonra beklemesi ve başka sözcüklerle yeniden açıklama yapması olduğu gözlemlenmiştir.

Odağın Akıcılık olduğu Bağlam

Odağın akıcılık olduğu bağlamda öğretmen adayları van Lier'in (1988) *konusarak öğretme* –konuşurken öğretme (conversational teaching) diye tanımladığı ya da Waring (2013) sınıftaki etkileşimsel rutinler diye ifade ettiği öğrenme ortamları olmuştur. Bu bağlamlar sınıfta derse başlamadan önce öğrencilerle sohbet etme amacı da taşımaktadır. Ancak iletişim dili İngilizce olduğundan öğretim fırsatlarının da doğacağı aşıkardır.

Akıcılık bağlamında öğretmen adaylarının öğrencilerin katkılarını etkili bir şekilde almak için sıklıkla kullandığı etkileşimsel kaynak kendi kısa hikayelerini anlatmak olmuştur. Bu hikayeler haftasonu yaptıkları aktiviteler, yapmaktan zevk aldıkları sporlar, başlarına gelen olaylar şeklinde çeşitlendirilebilir. Bu kısa ve öğretmenin kendisi ile ilgili olan hikayeler öğrencilerin dikkatini çekmiş onları dersi dinlemeye ve katılmaya motive etmiştir. Bunlar öğrencilerin söz sırası almak istemesi için parmak kaldırma davranışlarından ve kendi hikayelerini anlatmalarından anlaşılabilir. Öğretmen adaylarının bu kısa anlatıları öğrenciyi derse katmak için güdüleyen ve katılımlarını sağlayan öğretimsel ve pedagojik bir kaynak olmuştur. Böylece soru tasarımı ve sorulardan sonra cevapların gelmesi için öğretmen adayları bekleyerek akıcılık hedefini tutturmayı amaçlamışlardır.

Ancak öğrenci katkısı geldikçe onu şekillendirmesi , öğrencilerin yetersiz bilgi iddialarına cevap verebilmek, bilinmeyen kelime arayışlarına yardım etmek kısmında öğretmen adaylarının dersin devamlılığını tercih edip öğrenciyeye yönelmediği veride ortaya çıkmıştır. Özellikle akıcılığın hedeflendiği durumlarda öğrencinin kelime arayışlarında yardım etmemek öğretim fırsatlarının kaçırılması anlamına gelmektedir.

Son kısımda tez çalışmasından çıkan sonuçlar ışığında sınıf içi araştırmalar, sınıf içi etkileşimsel yeti, öğretmen eğitimi ve sınıf içi araştırma konusunda öneriler sunulacaktır.

Öneriler ve Sonuç

Sınıf içi etkileşimsel yapı bağlamında bu tez öğretmen adaylarının kullandığı iki yeni etkileşimsel kaynak ortaya koymuştur. Bunlardan biri *öğrencilerden bir cümleyi bütün olarak söylemelerini talep etmek* diğeri de *öğretmenlerin kendi hikayelerini anlatmalarındır*. Odağın yapı ve doğruluk olduğu sınıf içi etkileşim sırasında öğretmen adayının öğrencilerden bir cümleyi bütün olarak söylemesini istemesi öğrencilerin takip eden söz sıralarında onarım yapmalarını ve öğretmenin talebine yöneldiğini açıkça ortaya koymuştur. Öğrencilerin cevap olarak genelde yarım ya da tek kelimelik cevaplar verdiği durumlarda öğretmen adayının tüm cümleyi istemesi öğrencilerin takip eden söz sırasında onarım yapmasını sağlamıştır.

Bu doktora tezinin sınıf içi etkileşimsel yetiye diğer bir katkısı ise öğretmenlerin kendi hikaye ve anlatılarını ilk söz sırasında anlatmaları olmuştur. Öğretmen adaylarının akıcılığı hedeflediği durumlarda öğrencilerin katkılarını almak onların istekliliğini sağlamak için öğretmen adayları kendi kısa hikayelerini anlatmıştır. Bu kısa anlatıları öğrenciler ilgi ile dinlemiş ve kendileri de daha sonra söz sırası almak istemişlerdir. Bu hikayeler hem öğrencilere dil olarak bir model sağlamış hem de düşünme zamanı vermiştir.

Aynı zamanda sınıf içi etkileşimsel yetinin önemli bir kısmının da öğrencilerin cevaplarını şekillendirmek, onlara geri dönüt vermek olduğu bu tez sonucunda ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca öğrencilerin sorularını cevaplamak, bilmedikleri bir kelime arayışına geçtikleri zaman öğretmenin etkileşim içinde ona yardım etmesi de sınıf içi etkileşimsel yetinin önemli bir parçasını oluşturur.

Bu doktora tezinin sonuçları düşünüldüğünde özellikle konuşma çözümlemesinin hizmet öncesi öğretmen eğitimi derslerinde kullanılması açısından bazı öneriler olacaktır. Özellikle fakülte içinde metodoloji derslerinde öğretmen adaylarının yaptıkları mikro-öğretimlerin daha gerçekçi olması için bu tez verisinin de gösterdiği öğretmen adaylarının zorlandığı bazı durumlar kullanılabilir. Örneğin bazı roller mikro-öğretim sırasında sınıftaki diğer öğretmen adaylarına verilip o roldeki gibi davranması istenebilir. Örneğin bu rollerden bazıları şunlar olabilir:

öğretmenin anlık hedefinin dışında konu dışına çıkan sorular soran bir öğrenci, derste sürekli Türkçe konuşan bir öğrenci, yanlış cevaplar veren bir öğrenci, yetersiz bilgi iddialarında bulunan bir öğrenci, belli bir kelime arayışına giren ve yardım isteyen bir öğrenci v.b. gibi roller diğer öğretmen adaylarına verilebilir.

Öte yandan farklı kademelerde ve farklı bağlamlarda İngilizce öğretmenlerinin işledikleri derslerin bazı bölümleri kısa klipler halinde öğrencilere fakültelerde gösterilip bu kliplerin ardından öğrenme / öğretme fırsatları analiz edilebilir. Okul deneyimi dersi için de öğretmen adaylarının kendi pratiklerini videoya çekmesi ve o kayıtları izleyip öz değerlendirme yapmaları mesleki gelişimleri açısından yararlı olacaktır. Video kayıtları aynı zamanda onlar için üzerlerine fikir yürütebilecekleri kendilerini tekrar tekrar izleyip daha iyi öz değerlendirme yapacakları bir materyaldir. Kendilerini başarılı ya da başarısız buldukları öğretim fırsatlarını yakaladıkları ya da kaçırdıklarını düşündükleri kesitleri konuşma çözümlemesi yolu ile incelemek onların mikro detaylara odaklanmalarını sağlayacak ve kendi öz farkındalıklarını arttıracaktır.

Sınıf içi etkileşim araştırmaları bakımından da kaçırılan öğretim fırsatları ilk kez çalışılan bir konu olmuştur. Konuşma çözümlemesini yabancı dil öğretiminde uygulanması ve kaçırılan öğretim fırsatlarına dışarıdan bir uzman görüşünün de getirilmesinin gerekli olduğu görülmüştür. Bu bağlamda konuşma çözümlemesi ile yapılacak gelecekteki çalışmalar için bu doktora tezi bir örnek teşkil edecektir.

Appendix O: TEZ İZİN FORMU/THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences	<input type="checkbox"/>

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Balıkçı
Adı / Name : Gözde
Bölümü / Department : İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) : ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE PEDAGOGICAL FOCUS IN TEACHER-LED FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS IN PRACTICUM

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master Doktora / PhD

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.**
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two year. ***
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months. ***

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.

A copy of the Decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date