
GAZİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Gazi
1926

INTERACTIONAL RESOURCES FOR RESTORING UNDERSTANDING OF TEACHERS' INSTRUCTIONS IN AN EFL CLASSROOM

Fatma Badem

MASTER THESIS

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

GAZI UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

JULY, 2018

TELİF HAKKI VE TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

Bu tezin tüm hakları saklıdır. Kaynak göstermek koşuluyla tezin teslim tarihinden itibaren 1 (bir) yıl sonra tezden fotokopi çekilebilir.

YAZARIN

Adı: Fatma
Soyadı: BADEM
Bölümü: İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
İmza:
Teslim Tarihi: 05.07.2018

TEZİN

Türkçe Adı: Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Sınıflarında Öğretmen Yönergelerinin Anlaşılmasının Sağlanması için Kullanılan Etkileşimsel Kaynaklar

İngilizce Adı: Interactional Resources for Restoring Understanding of Teachers' Instructions in an EFL Classroom

ETİK İLKELERE UYGUNLUK BEYANI

Tez yazma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyduğumu, yararlandığım tüm kaynakları kaynak gösterme ilkelerine uygun olarak kaynakçada belirttiğimi ve bu bölümler dışındaki tüm ifadelerin şahsıma ait olduğunu beyan ederim.

Yazar Adı Soyadı: Fatma BADEM

İmza: ……..

JÜRİ ONAY SAYFASI

Fatma BADEM tarafından hazırlanan "Interactional Resources for Restoring Understanding of Teachers' Instructions in an EFL Classroom" adlı tez çalışması aşağıdaki jüri tarafından oy birliği / oy çokluğu ile Gazi Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Danışman: Doç. Dr. İskender Hakkı SARIGÖZ
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Gazi Üniversitesi

Başkan: Doç. Dr. İskender Hakkı SARIGÖZ
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Gazi Üniversitesi

Üye: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gülşen DEMİR
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Ufuk Üniversitesi

Tez Savunma Tarihi: 19/07/2018
Bu tezin İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda Yüksek Lisans tezi olması için şartları yerine getirdiğini onaylıyorum.

Prof. Dr. Selma YEL
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürü ……

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

After an intensive period of almost ten months, today I am writing this note of thanks to express my appreciation to the people who have supported and helped me throughout this period. I would first like to thank my thesis supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. İskender Hakkı Sarıgöz for his continuous support and motivation. I would also like to express my gratitude to the jury members of my thesis: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gonca Yangın Ekşi and Assist. Prof. Dr. Gülşen Demir for their invaluable feedback and comments.

I am extremely grateful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Ufuk Balaman for his never-ending support and patience. His guidance helped me in all the time of my research from the first day. I have been very lucky to have a mentor who quickly responded to all my questions and widen my perspective through his thought-provoking questions. Completing this work would be very difficult for me without his extensive professional directions and continuous encouragement. My sincere thanks also go to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Olcay Sert who encouraged me to attend the course that I took two times although I could not complete my research before the deadline. I would also extend my thanks to Dr. Nilüfer Can Daşkın, Tolga Keleş, Betül Çimenli, Merve Bozbıyık and Umut Özçelik for their valuable suggestions. I have learned many things from them during our data sessions that we held at HUMAN Research Centre. I am gratefully indebted to my friends Fatıma Nur Fişne, Merve Öksüz Zerey, Betül Kınık and Seval Bayrak for their motivational talks and sincere friendships and also to Yusuf Emre Yeşilyurt for sharing many books that I needed during the preparation of my thesis. Fatıma Nur read this thesis thoroughly and kindly offered her suggestions. Merve, I always remember your creativity in making working plans for us in Ankara, Selçuk and Adana. My thanks also to all of the students and the teacher as they kindly accepted to participate in my research. I offer my special thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cem Balçıkanlı and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kemal Sinan Özmen for their constructive feedback and also to Esra Kızılet for her help with paper works.

I began to write the first words of this thesis at the smallest library in the world (Estes Park, Colorado) and put the final touches in Paşalimanı. Despite the difficult times that I experienced during the preparation of this thesis, I had great times and amazing memories with my crazy friends and sister. Ayşe, my little sister, my other half, my mentor, my trouble-shooter. She is the only person that I need all through my life. She always cares for me and manages to cheer me up no matter how down I feel. She even made up a good meaning for describing my name to all of our foreign friends. I'm so blessed to have you in my life. Thank you for the wonderful memories that we had in seventeen countries and I'm so excited to make more of them with you. Halenur İlhan and Kübra Erdal, my sisters at heart. They always make my good times better, hard times easier. Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my precious friend Kübra. I managed to complete this thesis in spite of her! She is much more than a home mate and always supported me throughout my venture by supplying me with hundreds of twisters that I needed to get inspired. Hale opened the door of her sweet home to me whenever I needed to refresh my mind. She boosted my mood by feeding my head and made my world colorful during our sleepovers. Thanks for being such awesome friends. I would also like to thank Burak Korkmaz for his never-ending joy that has a magnetic force pulling and healing me. Although coming into my life in the middle of my journey, he taught me to let the things happen, and now I no longer hold on to my fears. Many thanks also go to Yavuz Karadeniz for spending time to clip my videos at the exact point on the first try and for his special talent in improving my mood with his single word. İlayda, Boncuk, Bihter, Afife, Bayram and Nermin, my lovely cats! Thank you for coming into my life and making it richer, happier and more colorful. In particular, I am so grateful for İlayda as she never left my side during my nightlong working hours (although she couldn't stop herself sleeping on my computer) and for Boncuk for being so special and even drying my tears (I'm sure you are very happy now).

Finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my mother and my father for making my life perfect and teaching me and my sister how to be brave about life. You were always there for me when times were tough and I am sure you will be with me and hold my hands. I am forever indebted to you for putting my needs first and providing me with continuous encouragement throughout the years. Your support is my wings that make me reach my dreams.

YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE SINIFLARINDA ÖĞRETMEN YÖNERGELERİNİN ANLAŞILMASININ SAĞLANMASI İÇİN KULLANILAN ETKİLEŞİMSEL KAYNAKLAR

(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)

Fatma BADEM

GAZİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Temmuz, 2018

ÖZ

Sınıf yönergelerinin sosyal ve pratik düzenleri, onlarca yıldır budun yöntembilimciler ve konuşma çözümlemeciler için bir araştırma konusu olmuştur. Bir kısım çalışma söz sırası alma, dizi düzeni ve sınıf kurallarının etkili uygulamasını araştırmıştır (Cromdal, 2003; He, 2000; Machbeth, 1991; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979a; Melander & Sahlström, 2009; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Payne & Hustler, 1980; Tholander & Aronsson, 2003). Bunun aksine, uygulamanın oldukça yaygın olmasına rağmen birine bir şey yaptırmak için tasarlanan yönergeler bir araştırma alanı olarak nispeten daha az ilgi görmüştür (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Ervin-Tripp, 1976). Mevcut çalışmalar çoğunlukla konuşma eylemlerine (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969) ve direktif biçimlerine (Goodwin, 2006a, 2006b; West, 1990) odaklanmıştır. Öğrenme fırsatlarını geliştirmede yönergelerin kritik rolü ele alındığında, bu çalışma öğretmenlerin yönergelere bağlı olarak ortaya çıkan sorunların giderilmesi için kullandıkları etkileşimsel kaynaklarının yanı sıra öğretmen yönergelerinin dizisel düzenlerini de sunmaktadır. Bu amaçla bu çalışma İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak (EFL) öğretildiği bir sınıfta öğretmenin çevrimiçi karar verme yetisi ile yönergelerin dilsel düzenlerindeki anlamayı yeniden kurmak için etkileşimsel kaynakları nasıl kullandığını

ortaya çıkarmayı hedeflemektedir. Bu çalışma, orta düzey İngilizce sınıfından beş haftalık bir sürede toplanmış olan 31 saatlik sınıf etkileşimi video kaydından yararlanmaktadır. Bulunan fenomen yerleşik ve ortaya çıkan eylemleri titizlikle çevriyazısı yapılmış, doğal gelişen etkileşimde konuşmaya dayanan veri güdümlü, içeriden bakış açısıyla incelemek için analitik gündem sunan Konuşma Çözümlemesi (Liddicoat, 2007; Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell, 2010; ten Have, 2007) ile incelenmiştir. Analizler, öğretmenin analitik çalışma yürütme ve alternatif gidişat yolları araştırma yoluyla, aktivite başarısını ve öğrenme fırsatlarını potansiyel olarak engelleyebilecek anlama problemlerinin üstesinden gelmek için birçok etkileşimsel kaynak kullandığını göstermektedir. Bulgular ayrıca belirli bir dersin pedagojik hedeflerine ulaşmak için görev kurma ve onların takibini içeren eylemlerin çeşitli etkileşimsel düzenlerini de sunmaktadır. Ek olarak, verilerin derinlemesine incelenmesi, öğretmenin aktivite başlatılması içermeyen uzun sessizlikleri, öğrencilerin yanlış cevapları ve uygun olmayan katkılarını prosedürün anlaşılmadığını bildiren ipuçları olarak nasıl ele alındığını ortaya koymaktadır. Öğretmen yönergelerinin anlaşılmaması ve sorunların çözülmesini araştıran ilk çalışma olarak bu tez, sınıf içi etkileşimsel yeti (CIC) (Walsh, 2006) için yeni bir boyut önerecek ve dil sınıfları ile öğretmen yetiştirme ve eğitimine katkılar sunacaktır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Öğretmen yönergeleri, Anlama, Etkileşimsel kaynaklar, Yönetsel bağlam, Sınıf içi etkileşimsel yeti, Konuşma çözümlemesi

Sayfa Adedi: 214

Danışman: Doç. Dr. İskender Hakkı SARIGÖZ

INTERACTIONAL RESOURCES FOR RESTORING UNDERSTANDING OF TEACHERS' INSTRUCTIONS IN AN EFL CLASSROOM

(Master Thesis)

Fatma BADEM

GAZİ UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

July, 2018

ABSTRACT

Social and practical organizations of classroom instruction have been a research interest for ethnomethodologists and conversation analysts for decades. A number of studies have investigated turn-taking, sequence organization, and achievement of classroom rules (Cromdal, 2003; He, 2000; Machbeth, 1991; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979a; Melander & Sahlström, 2009; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Payne & Hustler, 1980; Tholander & Aronsson, 2003). In contrast, instruction in the sense of directives that are designed to get someone to do something has received relatively less attention as a research area (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Ervin-Tripp, 1976) despite the prevalent nature of the practice and existing studies mostly have focused on speech acts (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969) and formats of directives (Goodwin, 2006a, 2006b; West, 1990). When the crucial role of instructions in optimizing learning outcomes is considered, this study presents sequential organization of teacher instructions as well as interactional resources employed by teachers in order to resolve understanding troubles that emerge with regard to instructions. To this end, this study aims to document how an EFL teacher deploys interactional practices for restoring understanding in instructional sequences through her online decision-making ability. This

study draws upon 31 hours of classroom interaction video recordings collected over 5-week period in an intermediate level English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom. The emergent phenomenon was investigated from the perspective of Conversation Analysis which offers an analytic agenda to examine situated and emergent actions with an emic, participant-relevant, data-led standpoint based on meticulously transcribed naturally occurring talk-in-interaction data (Liddicoat, 2007; Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell, 2010; ten Have, 2007). The analyses show that the teacher uses a number of interactional resources in order to manage understanding troubles, which may potentially hinder task achievement and learning opportunities, through carrying out complex analytic work and exploring alternative trajectories. The findings also present various interactional organization of the actions of setting up tasks and pursing them until reaching pedagogical goals of a specific lesson. Furthermore, the close examination of the data also reveals how the teacher treats long silences including no activity initiation, students' wrong answers or contributions as clues signaling non-understanding of the procedure. As the first study to investigate non-understanding of teacher-instructions and resolution of troubles, this study offers a new dimension to Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) (Walsh, 2006) and has direct implications for language classrooms and contributes to teacher training and education.

Key Words: Teacher instructions, Understanding, Interactional resources, Procedural context, Classroom Interactional Competence, Conversation analysis

Page Number: 214

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. İskender Hakkı SARIGÖZ

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TELİF HAKKI VE TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU ..... **i**

ETİK İLKELERE UYGUNLUK BEYANI ..... **ii**

JÜRİ ONAY SAYFASI ..... **iii**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ..... **iv**

ÖZ ..... **vi**

ABSTRACT ..... **viii**

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **x**

LIST OF FIGURES ..... **xiv**

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ..... **xv**

CHAPTER 1 ..... **1**

INTRODUCTION **1**

1.0. Introduction **1**

1.1. Background to the Study **1**

1.2. Problem Statement **5**

1.3. Aim and Significance of the Study **6**

1.4. Research Questions **8**

1.5. Definitions of the Terms **8**

1.6. Outline of the Study **9**

CHAPTER 2 ..... **11**

LITERATURE REVIEW **11**

2.0. Introduction **11**

2.1. Classroom Discourse and Interaction **12**

2.1.1. Teacher Talk **13**

2.1.2. Classroom Interactional Competence **21**

2.1.3. Classroom Contexts **27**

2.2. Teacher Informings, Directives, and Instructions **29**

2.3. Displaying / Claiming and Repairing Understanding **41**

2.4. Conclusion **49**

CHAPTER 3 ..... **50**

METHODOLOGY **50**

3.0. Introduction **50**

3.1. Purpose and Research Questions **50**

3.2. Research Context and Participants **51**

3.3. Data Collection **53**

3.4. Conversation Analysis **55**

3.5. Transcribing, Building a Collection, Data Analysis **59**

3.6. Validity of the Study **61**

3.7. Reliability of the Study **63**

3.8. Ethical Considerations **64**

3.9. Conclusion **65**

CHAPTER 4 ..... **66**

DATA ANALYSIS **66**

4.1. Extract 1 ..... **67**

4.2. Extract 2 ..... **74**

4.3. Extract 3 ..... **77**

4.4. Extract 4 ..... **83**

4.5. Extract 5 ..... **88**

4.6. Extract 6 ..... **91**

4.7. Extract 7 ..... **96**

4.8. Extract 8 ..... **98**

4.9. Extract 9 ..... **104**

4.10. Extract 10 ..... **109**

4.11. Extract 11 ..... **114**

4.12. Extract 12 ..... **118**

4.13. Extract 13 ..... **123**

4.14. Conclusion **129**

CHAPTER 5 ..... **132**

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION **132**

5.1. Sequential Organization of Understanding Troubles and Their Resolution ... **133**

5.2. Detecting Understanding Trouble **141**

5.3. Exploring Interactional Resources **147**

5.4. Conclusion **154**

5.4.1. Limitations of the Study **156**

5.4.2. Implications and Suggestions for Language Education, Instructional Contexts and Classroom Interactional Competence Development **158**

REFERENCES **164**

APPENDICES **188**

APPENDIX 1: ORIGINALITY REPORT 189

APPENDIX 2: JEFFERSON TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTION 190

APPENDIX 3: DATA COLLECTION CHART 191

APPENDIX 4: EXTRACT 1 OMITTED LINES 193

APPENDIX 5: EXTRACT 3 OMITTED LINES 194

APPENDIX 6: EXTRACT 5 OMITTED LINES 195

APPENDIX 7: EXTRACT 8 OMITTED LINES 196

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Pre-announcement as a type of informing……30

Figure 2. Teacher informing……31

Figure 3. Claiming and demonstrating understanding……..42

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CA	CONVERSATION ANALYSIS
CEFR	COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE
CIC	CLASSROOM INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE
CIK	CLAIMS OF INSUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE
CLIL	CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING
DA	DISCOURSE ANALYSIS
EFL	ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUGE
ELL	ENGLISH LANGUAGE LITERATURE
ELT	ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING
ESL	ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
FL	FOREIGN LANGUAGE
IA	INTERACTION ANALYSIS
L2	SECONG LANGUAGE
SETT	SELF EVALUATION OF TEACHER TALK
SLA	SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITON
TT	TEACHER TALK
UTP	UNWILLIGNESS TO PARTICIPATION

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction

This study focuses on interactional practices that are employed by an EFL teacher to resolve students' understanding troubles that emerge with regard to task instructions. The purpose of this study is to demonstrate how the teacher notices the understanding troubles, and accordingly how she orients to them in relation to Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) (Walsh, 2006). This chapter is devoted to the description of the research strands that inform this study; namely, informing (Heritage, 2012a; Gardner & Mushin, 2013; Kendrick, 2010; Robinson, 2009; Sidnell, 2012; Terasaki, 1976); Classroom Discourse (Hellermann, 2008; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015), Conversation Analysis (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) that inform this study. Firstly, the background of the study will be presented with reference to Classroom Discourse methodologies, and the justification of the selection of Conversation Analysis as the research methodology will be given. In 1.3., aim and significance of the study will be presented with reference to the research gaps in the literature given in 1.2. What follows will be definitions of key terms that will facilitate the readability of the study. This chapter will be concluded with the outline of the thesis.

1.1. Background to the Study

This study focuses on foreign language classroom interaction drawing upon the methodological principles of Conversation Analysis to investigate how the teacher gives

instruction before initiating the tasks in procedural context (Seedhouse, 2004), what kind of troubles emerged with regard to task instructions, how students' understanding troubles are resolved, and which interactional resources are employed by the teacher to restore understanding of instruction. Since it is classroom-based investigation, this study is informed by multiple research strands that are believed to contribute to foreign language education literature based on micro-analytic investigation of the data. The first research strand that this study builds on is informings (Heritage, 2012a; Gardner & Mushin, 2013; Kendrick, 2010; Robinson, 2009; Sidnell, 2012; Terasaki, 1976) which are abundant in educational settings due to the institutional objectives. Although classroom interaction is mainly shaped with teachers' factual and procedural informings, in this field there exist a research gap which this study attempts to address. Specifically, this research focuses on procedural informings which transfer the instructions and information regarding procedures that the students need to follow while they engage in an activity. In a broad sense, instruction is defined as "directions that are given to introduce a learning task which entails some measure of independent student activity" (Ur, 1996, p. 16). Teachers act upon what learners show them in terms of receipt of the information, which signals the contingent nature of the classroom interaction; however, some understanding troubles could emerge because of various reasons. Therefore, the second field that this study is informed is understanding which is described by Lynch (2011) as a technical phenomenon that involves turn-taking, repair and adjacency pair organizations. As Mondada (2011) puts forward it is not considered to be "a mental process but it is related to the next action achieved by the coparticipants and demonstrating her understanding" (p. 543). In interaction, taking a turn could be an evidence of understanding since in the second pair part interlocutors show whether they understood what the first speaker intended to convey. As Conversation Analysis enables researcher to investigate this sequential nature of understanding with its participant-relevant perspective, it is adopted for the analysis of the data-set which includes 31 hours classroom interaction recording collected over a 5-week period in an intermediate level EFL classroom.

Since the 1980s, considering the vital role of conversation in human social life, researchers have been prone to take it as a field of study (Clayman & Maynard, 1995; Goodwin & Heritage, 1990; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1989). With Firth and Wagner (1997)'s paper, which critically examines the predominant view of discourse and communication within Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research, detailed examination of foreign language talk has had

a great impact on SLA literature. Claiming that theories and research in SLA reflect an imbalance between cognitive orientations and social orientations to language, Firth and Wagner (1997) called for reconceptualizing SLA. This reconceptualization involves "(i) a significantly enhanced awareness of the contextual and interactional dimensions of language use, (ii) an increased emic (i.e. participant-relevant) sensitivity towards fundamental concepts, and (iii) the broadening of the traditional SLA data base" (p. 758). After this critical paper, interaction and naturally occurring talk have begun to influence SLA literature (He, 2004; Hellermann, 2008; Markee, 2000) and a new field, Conversation Analysis (CA), emerged. Instead of prioritizing theory-driven, analyst-relevant, etic perspective, CA with its very detailed transcription system enables researchers to analyze interaction with emic perspective. It approaches the data without "any prior theoretical assumptions, or assuming that any background or contextual details are relevant" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 15). Evidence found in the data is required for making any claim. With its unique transcription system (Hepburn & Bolden, 2013), CA makes it possible to analyze both verbal and nonverbal aspects (including suprasegmental aspects) of interaction, thereby providing researchers with the opportunity of capturing all details of talk, which increases its power as a methodology analyzing talk-in-interaction.

There are a variety of approaches rooted in different disciplines for understanding foreign language classroom discourse. Following different research designs, these approaches have attempted to examine participation structures, interaction patterns and speech events (Aleksandrzak, 2013). In order to gain clear understanding of classroom interaction and instruction giving and following processes, in this research, the principles of CA were chosen over other approaches, namely Interaction Analysis (IA) Approach and Discourse Analysis (DA) Approach. Firstly, rooted in behavioral psychology, IA "establishes objective and reliable classroom profile" (Lee, 2011, p. 11) using observation tools and coding-systems; however, it is criticized mostly for not setting a complete display of classroom communication. It is assumed to focus only on observable aspects and fail to account for some other significant interactional resources happening in a classroom. Additionally, it resorts some fix prior criteria or categories for studying classroom communication; as a result, according to Wallace (1998) it disregards describing full complexities of classroom interaction. As Seedhouse (2004) asserts IA examines interaction from one-sided perspective and dilutes what actually occurs. Secondly, employing structural-functional linguistics

principles, DA attends to structural patterns and functional purposes of classroom discourse. It claims language classrooms have a triadic dialog structure which is IRF involving teacher questions (Initiation), student response (Response) and teacher feedback or follow up questions (Feedback/Follow up). Yet, it is also assumed to be deficient in describing a whole picture of classroom interaction. Regarded as appropriate for traditional teacher-centered classrooms, DA approach creates asymmetrical relation between students and teacher by ignoring the equal rights given by student-centered FL classroom tenets (Walsh, 2006a).

Developed from Garfinkel's (1967) ethnomethodology, CA; on the other hand, "is an approach to investigate the sequential organization of talk-in-interaction" (Liddicoat, 2011). The main difference between CA and other approaches mentioned above is that CA rejects approaching the data with predefined categories or theories, that is, instead of matching interactional patterns with preconceived criteria, researchers obtain them from the data. It also captures all details of interaction such as intonation, overlap, pace, pitch, volume, smiley voice, the length of silence, pause, inbreath and nonverbal details, therefore it covers "continuous temporality of action, prior and subsequent actions, multimodal resources, participation frameworks, ecology making up the interactional space, and artifacts" (Mondada, 2013, p. 55).

The last research strand that informs this study is Classroom Interactional Competence. CIC is a concept that refers to teachers' and learners' ability "to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning" (Walsh, 2011, p. 158). While issuing, instruction, assigning procedural informings, eliciting response from students, making correction and during classroom activities, it is interaction between teacher and students that create increased learning opportunities. It emphasizes the collection of skills that enhance the learning opportunities (Walsh, 2011): (i) maximizing interactional space; (ii) shaping learner contributions; (iii) effective use of eliciting; (iv) instructional idiolects and (v) interactional awareness. However, although it is fundamental for carrying out a task properly, issuing clear instructions is not included in the concept of CIC. To this end, this study attempts to address Walsh (2006a)'s call for more research in different contexts and educational settings for full understanding the uncovered features of CIC by offering a new feature (providing clear instructions) to it. The following section will describe the problem addressed in this study.

1.2. Problem Statement

In educational settings, pedagogical goals are achieved through teacher instruction which is a fundamental part of teacher talk. They transmit the procedural information concerning what students are supposed to do in order to accomplish a task. As Waring and Hruska (2012) argues the efficacy of teacher instructions has a pivotal role in maximizing learning opportunities, therefore they are considered to be an integral element of teachers' pedagogical repertoire. When teacher instructions are not unequivocal enough, students cannot be sure of what they are expected to do and why, so they attempt to create their own learning agendas which could give rise to chaos hindering task accomplishment. Although there exist some studies on categorization of instructions as speech acts enjoying various functions (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Searle, 1969), the issue of how teachers provide task instructions and how students follow them has received little attention in teacher training and education and SLA literature. As Markee (2015) points out there is an absence of empirically based works that illumine the instruction giving and following process, despite the prevalent nature of the practice. In this regard, it is necessary to examine the micro-detail of the procedural interaction to provide full description of how teachers issue instructions and how students demonstrate (non)understanding of them. Related to understanding, Sacks (1992) presents a clear distinction between claiming and demonstrating understanding and recently the concept has been investigated in Conversation Analysis literature in various contexts including apprenticeship in dental clinics (Hindmarsh, Reynold & Dunne, 2011), storytelling (Kidwell, 1997), math classes (Koole, 2010), instructed actions in different settings such as medical (Koschmann, 2011; Nishizaka, 2011) and educational (Lindwall & Lymer, 2011; Macbeth, 2011; Zemel & Koschmann, 2011); however, there is still a research gap in the investigation of understanding in procedural context (Seedhouse, 2004), which is addressed with this study. Also, concerning the resolution of understanding troubles emerged with regard to task instructions, interactional resources that teachers employ to negotiate meaning in instructions need to be depicted in relation to Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC), which is defined as teachers' and learners' ability "to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning" (Walsh, 2011, p. 158). It includes various features including maximizing interactional space; shaping learner contributions (Walsh, 2011); successful management of claims/displays of insufficient knowledge (CIK) (Sert, 2011); increased awareness of unwillingness to

participate (UTP) (Sert, 2013) as well as effective use of the board (Can Daşkın, 2015). This study, therefore, attempts to contribute to the understanding of CIC by offering a new item to it (providing clear instructions to students) through taking microscopic look including multimodality into instructional practices. The analysis draws on a micro-analytic account of instruction-giving turns, emerging understanding troubles, and the teacher's orientation to the troubles in the following resolution turns through a participant-relevant, data-led and emic perspective.

1.3. Aim and Significance of the Study

This study aims to investigate how an EFL teacher restores understanding of task instructions through deploying various interactional resources. It emphasizes the understanding troubles and their resolution in instructional sequences. Since some terms are considered to be key for the best understanding of this study, the definitions of them should be presented first. Instruction, first of all, has various uses interconnected to each other. In this study, it is used to refer to teacher directives which are "designed to get someone to do something" (Goodwin, 2006b; p. 517). In this study, the focus on task instructions provided to the students orally by the teacher to announce what they are expected to do to accomplish the given task. Secondly, CA does not approach troubles as a foreign language speaker's deficiency but it refers to the breakdowns in communication that hinders the task progressivity. Understanding; on the other hand, is treated as a local and instructional phenomenon within CA perspective. In a conversation, parties with each of their contributions, show one another how and whether or not they understand the prior turn, and they act upon what people demonstrate concerning the receipt of information. Therefore, this thesis also attempts to shed light on the teacher's analytic work she carries out after the students' demonstration of (non)understanding by bringing evidence from the recorded classroom interaction data.

Considering the research strands that this study will inform and the pedagogical goals, it is believed that the findings of this thesis will have significant implications not just for EFL classrooms but they will shed light on all instructional settings, as well. Since teacher practices such as handling the understanding troubles in order to increase the comprehensibility of the instruction, thus ease the task accomplishment, are among the main

concerns of all educational settings, it is anticipated that this study will also contribute to instructional contexts in addition to foreign language classrooms.

Through a micro-analytic investigation of an intermediate level EFL classroom with 15 students, this study describes the interactional resources that the teacher deploys to manage understanding troubles by adopting an emic perspective to the data. The sequences including the steps from instruction-giving turn to resolution of the trouble have been examined, thus it can be argued that this study will also contribute to the procedural context, which has been relatively less investigated compared to form-and-accuracy and meaning-and-fluency, by describing the sequential organization of turn-taking system.

The social and practical organization of classroom interaction has been studied for decades by ethnomethodologists and conversation analysts (Hall, 2004; Hellermann, 2008; Machbeth, 1991; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Melander & Sahlström, 2010; Payne & Hustler, 1980). Waring & Hruska (2012) investigate directives that hinder learner participation and diminish learning opportunities focusing on interaction between a tutor and a first-grade tutee, but there is still a huge gap in classroom context which this study will address. However, instructions in the sense of directives have received less attention, which is one of the research gaps that this study will address. More specifically, no study thus far has investigated non-understanding in instructional sequences which this study will be first to analyze through adopting a participant-relevant, data-led approach. The study will also contribute to existing interactional practices deployed by teachers in order to resolve problems concerning task instructions by describing each of them with fine-detailed transcriptions and displays interactional nature of teacher instructions which are traditionally associated with individual practices. Furthermore, this research is believed to build the scope of CIC through offering *issuing clear instructions* as a new dimension to the concept. Although among the features of CIC there are maximizing interactional space, shaping learner contribution (SLC), effective use of eliciting, instructional idiolect, interactional awareness, it does not include any item concerning providing task instructions which is as crucial as other features and needs to be developed.

This study also brings new insight into students' understanding troubles which impede task achievement and reveals that the only reason of failure in tasks cannot be attributed to students' deficiency in foreign language, but there are various factors having an impact on activity accomplishment. Lastly, it has implications for both Teacher Education and Training

literature and also other instructional settings having similar pedagogical goals with language classrooms, through detailed CA analyses of the resolution of understanding troubles and restoration understanding with regard to instructions.

1.4. Research Questions

With the abovementioned aim in mind, and in line with the data-driven approach of Conversation Analysis to the data, the current thesis will address the following research questions:

1. How are understanding troubles that emerge with regard to task instructions and their resolutions sequentially constructed?

    - What next actions are employed by the teacher after the students' understanding troubles?

2. How does the teacher notice understanding troubles?

    - How do the students demonstrate their non-understandings?

    - Which sources does the teacher rely on to detect understanding troubles?

3. What are the interactional resources that the teacher deploys in order to resolve emergent troubles and restore understanding?

The research questions will be uncovered in Data Analysis chapter in one main section, yet they will be focused on separately in Discussion chapter under three subsections addressing each research question.

1.5. Definitions of the Terms

Classroom Discourse: "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" (Sert, 2015, p. 9).

Classroom Interactional Competence: "The ability of teachers and learners to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning" (Walsh, 2006a, p. 158).

Conversation Analysis: “Conversation Analysis, a research tradition that grew out of ethnomethodology, has some unique methodological features. It studies the social organization of conversation, or talk-in-interaction, by a detailed inspection of tape recordings and transcriptions made from such recordings” (ten Have, 1990, p. 23).

Instruction: It refers to certain social actions, such as orders or directives, which are “designed to get someone to do something” (Goodwin, 2006, p. 517).

1.6. Outline of the Study

The current thesis is organized into 5 chapters: (1) introduction; (2) literature review (3) methodology; (4) data analysis and findings; and (5) discussion and conclusion. This chapter presents an overall understanding of the thesis by focusing on various research strands that this study will inform, as well as the statement of problem, aim and significance of the study, research questions, and definitions of the main terms that will be mentioned in the following sections. The second chapter (2. Literature Review) will provide an overview on Classroom Discourse with five subsections. Firstly, the role of teacher talk and major studies will be reviewed. It is followed by Classroom Interactional Competence. In the subsections of 2.2. the development of CIC and its main components as well as some leading research studies will be detailed. 2.1.3. will introduce four classroom micro-contexts with reference to various repair organizations and turn-taking systems. Following this, in 2.2. teacher informings, directives and instructions will be framed through sample extracts. Finally, 2.3. will provide a review of research on the distinction between claim and demonstration of understanding and repair practices used to restore understanding will be presented. In the third chapter, adopted methodology will be described with its main principles. Also, research context and participations will be introduced, which will be followed by detailed information about data collection process. In 3.5. will elaborate on the transcription of interactional data, building a collection and data analysis process. In 3.6. and 3.7., how the validity and reliability of the thesis were achieved will be explained. What follows will be the clarification of ethical issues through research principles.

Chapter 4 will present the detailed analysis of the extracts and in-depth understanding of findings. As the emergent interactional resources were used in combination by the teacher Data Analysis and Findings chapter will not be divided into subcategories reflecting these

practices separately; however, each extract will be given under an extract number and code to facilitate readability. Based on 31 hours classroom interactional data, 13 most representative extracts from 86 cases will be provided. The analysis and claims will be supported with real evidences bringing from extracts. Finally, analyses of extracts will be summarized and the phenomena under investigation will be overviewed in 4.14. Conclusion section in relation to Classroom Interactional Competence and Classroom Discourse.

Chapter 5 will discuss the methodological and pedagogical findings of the research by establishing link to the existing research in literature and offer a new dimension to CIC: providing clear instructions to the students. In the light of the research questions, the chapter is organized into three sections: (1) sequential organization of understanding troubles and their resolutions; (2) detecting understanding troubles in instructional sequences; and (3) exploring interactional resources. Each section will address a research question given in Introduction and Methodology chapters. In 5.1., four types of sequential organization of understanding troubles will be depicted with short version of the extracts. The second section (5.2.) will illustrate how the teacher manages to recognize the troubles. Finally, 5.3. will provide detailed description of each interactional resource employed by the teacher to restore understanding concerning task instructions. In 5.4. the overall findings will be discussed in relation to CIC and the features of CD and a new feature to CIC will be proposed. The last chapter will be concluded with the limitations of the study (5.4.1.) and implications and suggestions for language education, instructional contexts and classroom interactional development (5.4.2.)

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0. Introduction

This chapter aims to present a review of research body that this study centers on with three main sections. First, the features of Classroom Discourse and Interaction will be presented and as well as its unique characters such as IRF (Initiation - Response - Feedback) exchange structure, the similarities between classroom interaction and mundane talk will be given. In relation to the basic features of Classroom Discourse and Interaction, teacher talk, Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) and classroom contexts will be reviewed in separate subsections. In 2.1.1., the significant role of teacher talk in promoting interaction in classroom settings will be presented with various Conversation Analytic studies. Following this, the development of CIC will be depicted by referring to Interactional Competence (IA). In addition to basic features of CIC, regarding the development of it in teacher talk, some models will also be introduced in 2.1.2.2. subsection. In 2.1.3., the reflexive relationship between pedagogical focus and the organization of turn-taking and repair will be depicted within various classroom contexts, with a specific emphasis on procedural context (Seedhouse, 2004) which this study builds on. What follows will be the revision of a research body of teacher informings, directives, and instructions in different educational contexts (Heritage, 2012a; Gardner & Mushin, 2013; Kendrick, 2010; Robinson, 2009; Sidnell, 2012; Terasaki, 1976). In the last main section, firstly, the key terms used in data analysis chapter, namely, claim or demonstration / display of understanding (Koole, 2010; Sacks, 1992) are introduced through sample extracts to facilitate the intelligibility of the main argument of the thesis. Then, a review of the practice of repair of understanding as a teacher-turn

including interactional resources will be presented, and the link between student-understanding troubles and the resolution of them will be established.

2.1. Classroom Discourse and Interaction

Classroom discourse refers to all forms of talk that could be found within a classroom context or other educational setting. As Jocuns (2013) puts forward classroom discourse involves all types of talk and interaction occurring in other settings; however, compared to other contexts and settings, the communicational patterns in language classrooms is unique in that language is considered to be "the vehicle and object of instruction" (Long, 1983a, p. 9) in these settings. According to Willis (1992) language is not only the focus of the lesson but also a means for achieving it. Although classroom interaction has been a focus for researchers for sixty years, research revealing the complex relationship between interaction and teaching-learning has just arisen. In recent studies classroom interaction is claimed to be "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" (Sert, 2015, p. 9). Crucially, communication in the classroom is central to teaching, learning and organizing all activities carried out in the classroom. Through interaction, the students acquire knowledge, claim (non)understanding, and resolve troubles in communication, therefore it could be claimed that language "lies at the heart of everything" (Walsh, 2011, p. 2) in a classroom setting.

Walsh (2011) presents four features of classroom discourse which illustrates the nature of interaction taking place in the classrooms: (i) control of the interaction; (ii) speech modification; (iii) elicitation; (iv) repair. Firstly, in classrooms the person who has control over the communicational patterns and manages the conversation is the teacher. They control the turn-taking, ask questions, provide feedback, thus occupy more interactional space, which demonstrates the asymmetrical role of the interactants in an educational setting. Another characteristic of classroom discourse is speech modification. Commonly, teachers deliberately change their speech for various reasons. To illustrate it, they mostly speak in a slower pace and louder, use emphasis on selected utterances, and use pauses strategically to make some points remarkable, so that all of the students in the class can progress together

without getting lost. Furthermore, they pronounce, articulate the utterances properly and use accurate intonation in order to enable students to expose target language clearly. Walsh (2011) defines the third feature of classroom discourse as "the strategies used by teachers to get learners to respond" (p. 11). Through asking question teachers manage pedagogical and interactional goals of the lessons and control the discourse. In addition to display questions the answers of which are also known by the teacher, referential questions are also asked to open more interactional space and opportunity for students. The last feature is repair which includes various ways through which teachers deal with and manage breakdowns that could hinder communication and reaching pedagogical goals. It is crucial for teachers to select the repair strategy that would be most appropriate for the pedagogical context of the moment. In addition to these features, IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) structure is also one of the most common feature of classroom discourse. Put forward by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), IRF occupies most of the interaction between teacher and students. The first and the final part of the triadic structure are realized by teachers, so it explicates the reason why teachers speaking more than students. However, overuse of the structure could result in mechanical classroom interaction which decreases learning opportunities. All of these features of classroom discourse as well as their role in increasing learning opportunities and construction understanding will be dealt with in more detail in the following sections of this chapter. However, it should be noted that appropriate use of these features by teachers determines the interactional, and thus pedagogical performance in the classroom, since as van Lier (1996) claims "interaction is the most important element in the curriculum" (p. 5). This position brings the role of the teacher into the forefront in creating space for learning, which will be discussed in the following section (2.1.1. Teacher Talk) in this chapter.

2.1.1. Teacher Talk

Communication in EFL classrooms is central to classroom activities and a very complex phenomenon considered to be crucial for learning. Since in language classrooms, teachers play a key role in the organization of communication and interaction, it could be better to focus on teacher talk more in teacher training. As a starting point, it is essential to analyze L2 classroom interaction systematically for better a understanding of what actually happens in the classroom. According to Long (1983; 1996, as cited in Walsh, 2011), learning can be promoted through communication, when learners engage in the negotiation of meaning.

For learners who study a foreign / second language, the main setting to be exposed to and to practice the target language is the classroom where the language is used by the teacher for communicating with learners and conducting instructions with its own special style and goals. Ellis (1985), formulates his own view on teacher talk and treats it as "the special language that teachers used when addressing L2 learners in the classroom" (Ellis, 1985, p. 145), and also emphasizes its own special formal and linguistic properties. On the other hand, Chaudron (1988) summarized the research results of teacher talk in second language learning classroom through pointing out the following features of teacher talk:

1) The speed of teacher talk seems slower;
2) More frequency of pause showing speakers' thinking or conceiving and with longer time;
3) Clearer and more understandable pronunciation;
4) Easier chosen vocabulary;
5) With lower subordinate degree (less use of subordinate clause);
6) More narrative sentences or declarative sentences than interrogative sentences;
7) More frequency of teachers' self-repetition. (p. 88)

Being the main teaching media and major source of comprehensive target language, Teacher Talk (TT) has a great role in foreign or second language classrooms. In addition to being objective of learning language, it is a medium of teaching, as well. That increases the significance of TT, the proper use of which may increase the positive effect on learners' output. van Lier (1988) (as cited in Walsh, 2006a) considers the interaction as a key to language learning and to become an effective teacher. According to him, interaction should be taken as a fundamental of SLA curriculum. With their choice of language and interactional practice, teachers have an impact on learning by promoting or hindering it.

Despite occupying a critical part of classroom teaching, teacher talk has been given academic attention as early as those related to teaching methodology. After classroom-originated research arose, the process of teaching and learning, as occurring in the classroom, gained interest. Classroom-centered studies "simply tries to investigate what happens inside the classroom" (Allwright & Bailey, 1991, p. 3). TT gets its due attention after developments of the micro-teaching classroom research. Increasing interest has been given to teacher language with the rejection of teaching methods as the main determinant of learning success. Earlier, teaching was based on finding the input method, however, having walked away from methodological focus, researchers' attention was directed "to the process of classroom interaction by collecting language data from the classroom itself" (Ellis, 1985; p. 143). As

Gaies (1983) points out a classroom research entails interaction analysis, teacher talk, discourse analysis. Research on TT has gained great attention including all dimensions of classroom teaching process from giving interaction to providing feedback.

According to Nunan (1991), not only in implementing teaching plans but also in reaching teaching objectives, TT plays a crucial role in the process of teaching and learning. It is important as being the major source of target language input and for the organization of classroom, as well. While some researchers explored the amount of teacher talk, and study it as the time basis (Stern, 1983), many others believe the quality of teacher talk, the kind of input and interaction is particularly important (Can Daşkın, 2015; Ellis, 1985; Walsh, 2002). Ellis (1985) also pointed out that successful teaching could depend on the language used by teacher and interaction in the classroom. Despite different views on TT, it is believed that it serves as a valuable input and has vital role for generating interaction, thereby making the learning takes place. In addition to studies explaining the quality and quantity of the teacher talk, much of the focus was given to the features of it. In addition to the formal features of TT (speed, pause, repetition or modification) and functional features (the quality and quantity of it,) the questions that teachers use, feedbacks and interactional features were studied in language teaching field.

Criticizing the common view that compares classroom communication to communication that occurs outside the classroom, Walsh (2002) argued that as in every institutional setting, classroom also takes its own restrictions in language selection through some features that are unique to context.

1. Teachers largely control the topic of discussion;
2. Teachers often control both content and procedure;
3. Teachers usually control who may participate and when;
4. Students take their cues from teachers;
5. Role relationships between teachers and learners are unequal;
6. Teachers are responsible for managing the interaction which occurs;
7. Teachers talk most of the time;
8. Teachers modify their talk to learners;
9. Learners rarely modify their talk to teachers;
10. Teachers ask questions (to which they know the answers) most of the time. (Walsh 2002, p. 4).

On turn taking, many works have offered significant perception related to its nature distinct from standard conversation. (e.g. Markee, 2000; McHoul, 1985; Mehan 1979; Poole 1990;

Seedhouse, 2004). To illustrate, with his study on teacher-directed talk McHoul (1978) attempted to outline the differences between classroom talk and ordinary talk in relation to turn-taking system by focusing on teachers' role as being the only party directing speakership in any way. Furthermore, Mehan (1979) proposed three ways teachers use in selecting the next speaker: initiation to reply, initiation to bid and individual nomination. Markee (2000) also indicated learners' choral repetition, elaborated and long turns as variations from ordinary conversation. On the other hand, Waring (2013), produced a microanalytic work to show how teachers cope with the chaos with competing voices such as (i) different answers to teachers' initiation and (ii) the co-presence of selected and unselected respondents (p. 317). In the study, two practices were documented for competing with this kind of chaos in the classroom: selective attending and sequential attending. The former refers to teacher's uptake of one response among the competing voice, the latter involves teachers' acknowledgement of competing voices one by one.

Many other researchers, on the other hand, acknowledge the context-depended nature of teacher talk in classroom (e.g. Johnson, 1995; Seedhouse, 1996; van Lier, 1988). Putting emphasize on the match of language and pedagogic purpose, Seedhouse (2004) claims when there is a huge deviation between them, learning opportunities and acquisition are missed. For this reason, teacher talk as Walsh (2002) suggests will depend on the goal of the specific class. Adopting the position that teachers have crucial role in establishing meaning and keeping communication, Walsh (2002) examined the ways teachers, through their talk, construct or obstruct student involvement in classroom communication. Direct error correction, content feedback, confirmation check, extended wait-time, and scaffolding were revealed as increasing learning potentials and clearly evidenced to lead greater involvement by controlled use of language, as well as its coincidence with pedagogical purpose of the class. Besides, teachers' turn completion by filling in the gaps immediately after a student's turn instead of allowing time for shaping their utterances, teacher echo which disrupts the progress, and teacher interruptions leading to breakdowns in learners' communication resulting in obstruction; in other words, they reduce learning potentials. Can Daşkın (2015), collecting data from a Turkish state university examines the interactional patterns for shaping learner contributions, in form-and-accuracy and meaning-and-fluency contexts. Having similar findings with Walsh (2002), Can Daşkın (2015) expanded Walsh's findings by adding two particular teacher practices: (i) translation from L2 to L1; (ii) use of the board,

which were found to clarify the meaning for students. The conclusion of the study proposes that teachers make use of different kind of interactional practices for promoting students' contributions; however, an interactional practice that supports participation in one context may not be constructive in another. In terms of moving out of IRF sequence, this study also corroborates some research in the literature (e.g. Lee, 2007; Waring, 2008; 2009). Shamsipour and Allami (2012); on the other hand, focus on the awareness of interactional processes that teachers and learners have. Similar to Walsh (2002) they divided the interactional features into two according to their constructiveness and destructiveness.

As stated in the previous section (see 2.1. Classroom Discourse and Interaction) IRF is the most common interactional structure of classroom discourse. In classroom contexts, teachers generally have a position that requires them to respond students' contributions, which refers to feedback in general. As one of the main part of TT, feedback is also studied with various dimensions in language teaching-learning field. Much of the IRF discussion has evolved around the feedback or evaluation turn of the sequence (Hall, 1998; Hellermann, 2003 Jarvis & Robinson, 1997; Lee, 2007; Nassaji & Wells, 2000, Park, 2013; Waring, 2008). For Nassaji and Wells (2000), it is created in the exchange sequence, F turn has various functions to manage various goals; however, Seedhouse (2004) focused on its absence in the IRF sequence and claimed that such non-existence suggests positive evaluation. Basing her study on sociocultural theory framework which conceives interaction as a key for learning, Waring (2008) focused on the use of explicit feedback by teachers and its relation to learning opportunities. In her study, with explicit positive feedback, Waring refers to positive assessment turns like *good, very good, excellent* etcetera. Pursuant to sociocultural theory of learning, this study details explicit positive assessment within homework checking context. The findings of this study suggest that its use could terminate some opportunities such as "voicing understanding problems and exploring alternative correct answers" (p. 589). Similarly, Park (2013) also focused on the third turn in L2 classroom interactional context and specifically analyzed the role of repeats in both meaning-and-fluency and form-and-accuracy contexts. Repeats in feedback turn was found to promote the progress of turn so the students elaborate on their response in meaning-and-fluency context. On the other hand, in form-and-accuracy context, repeat confirms the student response given in the second pair part of the triadic structure.

Classroom discourse researchers through following the spirit of sociocultural theory, which discerns learning as occurring during social interaction (Lantolf & Poehrer, 2014), focus on how feedback turns promote or hinder learning opportunities. Particularly, the third turn of IRF sequence (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) have been addressed including the actions that involve promoting peer response, asking for elaboration, working on what the learners are given as a response (e.g.: Cullen, 2002; Hall, 2002) or implying correctness by absence of the third turn (Seedhouse, 2004). For example, Fagan (2014) explored interactional practices applied by one ESL teacher in positive feedback turns. From 26 hours of video-recorded classroom data, 3 practices are emerged: (i) giving positive assessment, (ii) inviting peer assessment, and (iii) implying positive assessment. Also, he documented sequential environments of each practice with their different construction and circumstances influencing their use and displayed that teachers utilize positive feedback turns not just for acknowledging the correct response or close the sequences, but for addressing the immediate needs of learners, as well.

As reconsideration of positive assessment turns, Wong and Waring (2008) portrayed the use of *very good* and claim that in particular context, its use may have inhibiting role in learning opportunities. According to Mehan (1979), positive assessment signals the end of the sequence, and furthermore Fanselow (1987) claims they announce the time to move to the next activity. Offering that positive assessment such as *very good* imply not only case closing but also sequence closing (Mehan, 1987), Wong and Waring (2008) contributed to existing literature. Right along with this, related to handling with positive assessment complexities, they suggested a variety of recommendations which include among others: using 'very good' rarely, asking follow-up question, asking for clarification, asking allowance to go on with a new action, and accepting students' responses with less evaluative words.

In literature, many categorical formulations of teachers' third turn exist such as evaluation, feedback or follow-up (e.g. Barnes, 1992; Cazden, 1986; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Wells, 1993). In third turn, teachers not just respond to students' previous turn, they also ask students to elaborate or reformulate their turns even if they include correct responses, that is, the functions of teacher-third-turns cannot be foreseen because they enjoy many possibilities based on the second turn of students. Lee (2007) calls it the most immediate context. He deals with third turn position in teacher talk by specifying local contingencies emerged in the second pair part and displays unanticipated scope of practices teachers

applies. His study offers that by carrying out complex analytic work, teachers determine what their students already know and what they need to know or what problems they have and accordingly they can direct the discourse to particular direction by passing the original questions, steering the sequences, intimating answers which do not fit the formal categories. In other words, that study offers teachers do not do the same thing continuingly in their response to students turn.

In general, researchers have focused, in particular, on F-move in order to analyze the ways that TT increase learning opportunities (Cullen, 1998; 2002; Jarvis & Robinson, 1997; Kasper, 2001; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Walsh, 2002). However, unlike previous studies Garton (2012) discussed teacher-fronted interaction with respect to learner talk. Her study describes how teachers and learners construct interaction together and how students take initiative for creating learning opportunities. The result of the research presents the most common learner initiatives which are confirmation checks, especially after teacher's non-understood instructions in procedural context (see Seedhouse, 2004), clarification requests, information requests, hypothesis testing. Pedagogically, when taking initiatives in classroom interaction, no doubt students produce "practice opportunities" (Allwright, 1984, p. 167) not only for themselves but also other students in the classroom.

Investigation of classroom talk is traditionally limited to IRF exchanges (Initiation-response-feedback (Evaluation) (Mehan, 1979a; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975); however, some critics have existed about IRF sequence that have been argued in terms of its minimizing nature. It was criticized especially for decreasing student participation / initiation and therefore learning (e.g. Nystrand 1997; Tharp & Gallimore 1991). On the other hand, many other studies call attention to teachers' management of students' contributions (e.g. Mehan, 1979b). These research studies; in particular, focusing on third feedback turn emphasize how teacher can make use of learner turns to improve opportunities (e.g. Hall & Walsh, 2002; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Toth, 2011). A range of classroom discourse studies centering on teachers' ability to handle learners' participation and regulate interaction flow of the lesson (Allwright, 2005; Cazden, 2001; Johnson 1995). As one of the aspect of TT, being able to deal with unexpected learner contributions was portrayed by Fagan (2012). He examined language learners' participation in classroom interaction and particularly focused on discursive practices of one novice English as a second language teacher during whole class activities. In particular, two practices come out from the video recorded data: glossing over

learner contribution and assuming the role of information provider. While the first one refers to the teacher's immediate or completely not addressing the contributions, the latter occurs when the teacher is not given learner response or when learners mitigate a sequence as the teacher has already started a new activity. Waring (2009), based on a single case analysis, displayed how an ESL learner moves out of IRF sequence and creates a new interaction structure which enables students to initiate negotiations. She examined homework review activity and portrayed the way in which IRF exchange can be modified. Related to moving out of IRF structure in classroom, if learners have opportunity to manage the discourse, then the classroom will be rich in terms of learning (e.g. Ellis, 1998; van Lier, 1988). Deviating from the triadic exchange system encourages more understanding that may not be possible in the boundary of IRF. According to Walsh (2002), "confirmation checks and requests for clarification are to be encouraged not only from teachers to learners but more importantly from learners to teacher" (p. 12).

Despite some evidence offering participation in classroom conversation may hinder learning (Waring, 2011), based upon the sociocultural theory under the perspective of which learning includes discussion, dialogues, and interaction collectively, Walsh and Li (2013) investigated how teachers with particular practices including extended-learner turns, increased planning-time, increased wait-time, teachers' reduced-echo stimulate interactivity in classroom. Also, they claimed that establishing the context clearly, decreasing teacher interruptions and allowing alternative response for more student participation pave the way to successful elicitation which is categorized in the interactional practices that create space for learning.

More recently, classroom discourse has depicted teachers' way of treating students' participations whether in teacher or learner-initiated sequences of talk. Hall and Walsh (2002) describe *dialogic interaction* occurring between interlocutors when teachers' third turn is not used only for evaluation. Expectedly or not, if student contribution exists, teachers can utilize these turns to improve dialogic interaction by (i) acknowledgment of all responses and intensifying it later during the activity (e.g. Cullen, 2002), (ii) asking for classification and confirmation (e.g. Lee, 2007), (iii) assisting learner-learner interaction (e.g, Antón, 1999), and (iv) stimulating students for elaboration of their last turn (e.g. Liu, 2008; Wells, 1993). However, it was also found that teacher's some instructional practices after learner contributions may impede further student-student participation. Markee (1995) describes

how a teacher by utilizing center-questions changes learner-centered communication to a teachers-centered one. While this study does not include an exhaustive list of discursive practices or present a generalization of all novice teachers' practices, giving the importance to teacher talk, it is an example for bridging classroom discourse fields to language teacher education. With the same criticism, Li (2013) argues most of the conversational studies have concentrated on teacher turns in IRF exchange and focused on student initiatives (Waring 2011) in IRF sequence, particularly how post-expansions (Schegloff, 2007) are initiated by students. Li (2013) describes this initiation as action as an interaction beginner that creates contingency into IRF exchange and generate new learning opportunities.

Moreover, in recent years, while some researchers have focused on the interactional practices in the border of IRF structure (e.g. Hellermann 2003; Waring 2008; 2009), other applied linguists have explored structural properties out of this triadic exchange structure, examining question-types, repair, student-initiations, teacher directives (He, 2000; Jacknick, 2009, 2011; Markee, 1995, 2015; Richards, 2006; Seedhouse, 2004; Waring, 2011). Besides them, others investigate yes-no question types (e.g. functions of yes-no questions, Bennett 1982; Schegloff 2002). For example, Raymond (2010) examined the difference between yes-no interrogatives and yes-no declaratives in teacher-talk. In addition, Waring (2012) increased our understanding of yes-no question types employed by teachers in the classroom context focusing on the environments that some evaluation is relevant. All of these properties of teacher talk in classroom discourse will be reviewed in the next sections with reference to classroom interactional competence to lay the groundwork for the resources that this study attempts to add to the existing literature.

2.1.2. Classroom Interactional Competence

2.1.2.1. From Interactional Competence to Classroom Interactional Competence

With the increasing focus on interaction between participants, a growing number of scholars have begun to examine its role in a sequential basis in various research contexts. Canale and Swain (1980) explored communicative approaches to second language acquisition by questioning existing principles and brought modified ones through which appropriate assessment instruments and approaches could be developed. The term *competence* and

performance were firstly introduced by Chomsky (1965) and signal different concepts. While competence refers to linguistic knowledge, performance points to "the actual use of language in concrete situations" (Canale & Swain, 1980, p. 3). Chomsky (1965) discussed the necessity of examining language in abstractions which point to native speakers' ideal linguistic system and ignores the natural talk that he considers too arbitrary to analyze. However, according to Campbell and Wales (1970), producing utterances which are appropriate to the context is quite more important than producing grammatical utterances. Parallel to their view, Hymes (1972) proposes the notion of communicative competence that entails both linguistic and sociolinguistic rules of the language as opposed to Chomsky's dichotomy. According to Hymes, it is more necessary for language learners to be able to use language appropriately in daily interaction. Following Hymes' concentration on the communicative aspect of language, Canale and Swain (1980) and Bachman (1990) propound models of language competence that involve organizational competence as well as pragmatic competence. Yet, within the framework of communicative competence, the focus is on individual speech production rather than collective competence; however, learners for effective communication need to pay attention to the context, need to be able to convey the meaning and understand, require clarification and repair understanding troubles. In this connection, Kramsch (1986) introduces the notion of interactional competence which provides students with "emancipating, rather than compensating foreign language education" (p. 370). Being in favor of collective enterprise interactional competence requires close attention to speakers' contributions and support to each other by valuing listening as much as speaking. Interactional competence is defined by Young (2008) as a "relationship between the participants' employment of linguistic and interactional resources and context in which they are employed" (p. 101).

The main difference between communicative competence and interactional competence is that the latter emphasizes what a speaker does during conversation instead of what he knows, hence it underscores intersubjectivity. In this sense, Young (2011) asserts that "an individual's knowledge and employment of these resources is contingent on what other participants do" (p. 430). It emphasizes the context-specific nature of interaction and co-construction of meaning jointly, and involves taking turns, requesting for clarification, clarifying the meaning and passing the turn. In other words, the focus is on what goes on between the participants, how they convey the intended meaning and establish understanding

collaboratively. To define features of interactional competence Young and He (1988) specifies some resources such as (i) management of turn taking, (ii) topic management, (iii) rhetorical scripts, (iv) lexical and syntactic structures, and (v) means for signaling boundaries of an interactive practice. Following this, Young (2008) enhanced the list of interactional resources constituting IC with some additions: identity resources, linguistic resources, interactional resources involving speech acts, turn taking, and repair (p. 71).

Asserting that interactional competence does not just involves formal system of language but entails control over semiotic system, as well, Markee (2008) offers three elements to interactional competence: "(i) language as a formal system (involves pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar), (ii) semiotic systems (turn-taking, repair and sequence organization), and (iii) gaze and paralinguistic features" (as cited in Walsh, 2012, p. 3). Likewise, Barraja-Rohan (2011) attributes learners' L2 interactional competence to their L2 mastery in turn-taking system, sequential organization of language, intersubjectivity and paralinguistic activities such as pauses, intonation, laughter and gaze.

The development of L2 interactional competence over time has taken great attention of many scholars from different research contexts like participation framework (Hall, 1999; Hellermann & Cole, 2009; Nguyen, 2006, 2011; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Young, 2000, 2013; Young & Miller, 2004), in repair organization (Balaman, 2016; Balaman & Sert, 2017; Martin, 2004, 2009; Martin & Sahlström, 2010, Sert & Balaman, 2018), turn completion and organization (Çimenli, 2017; Hall, 1995; Melander & Sahlström, 2009; Taguchi, 2014) and such research contexts as vocabulary teaching (Markee, 2008; Pekarek Doehler, 2010) and storytelling (Berger & Pekarek Doehler, 2015) in language interviews (van Compernolle, 2011). They all depict longitudinal development of interactional competence in second language (L2) based on conversation analytic examinations.

2.1.2.2. The Development of Classroom Interactional Competence

In daily life people understand each other through interaction by taking turns, showing listenership with some verbal tokens and body language, repairing understanding troubles and negotiating meaning. Similarly, institutional goals are achieved through interaction (e.g. courtrooms, doctor-patience interaction) as in language classrooms where students learn target language in and through interaction, therefore, student engagement in interaction is

considered to be a key for language learning. Ellis (1998) also argues the fundamentality of interaction for language acquisition in a similar way with Walsh (2006) who presented evidences in literature to prove the strong relationship between classroom interaction and language learning. In that vein, Johnson (1995) claimed that "the teacher plays a critical role in understand, establishing, both classroom learning and second language acquisition" (p. 90). According to researchers (Ellis, 1998; Glew, 1998; Musumeci, 1996) who assign key role to the teacher in classroom interaction, simplified or even just comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) is "an insufficient condition for second language acquisition to occur" (Glew, 1998, p. 1) Walsh (2006a) also discusses the role of the teacher in interaction and stressed the "prime responsibility" (p. 21) of the teacher who is to manage the discourse through taking on different roles in order for making the meaning available for all students in the classroom as well as increasing learning opportunities.

With the application of conversation analysis research in educational contexts, there has been increasing attention paid to naturally occurring talk in classroom settings. What actually happens between participants has been observed in order to systematically analyze co-construction of meaning, which points to the significance of classroom interactional competence (Walsh, 2006a). Walsh (2002; 2006a; 2011) puts the classroom interaction at the center of the language teaching and learning, which points that teachers increase learning opportunities for learners while asking questions, eliciting answers, making corrections etcetera. Walsh (2011) defines Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) as teachers' and learners' ability "to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning" (p. 158). While issuing instruction, assigning procedural informings, eliciting response from students, making correction and during classroom activities, it is interaction between teacher and students that create enhanced learning opportunities. The features of CIC involve (a) maximizing interactional space; (b) shaping learner contributions; (c) effective use of eliciting; (d) instructional idiolects and (e) interactional awareness.

Maximizing interactional space includes increased wait-time, that is, instead of filling the spaces through teacher-echo, teachers can wait for students to formulate their responses in-activity, therefore promoting enhanced learner turn. Teachers shape learner contributions generally in feedback turns while teachers are seeking clarification on students' contribution, scaffolding, modelling, or repairing. It involves "taking a learner response and doing something with it rather than simply accepting it" (Walsh, 2011, p. 168). In other words,

teachers do not directly take the students' first contribution but push them to give more comprehensible response (Walsh, 2006, 2011, 2012), so that other learners in the classroom can be exposed to more meaningful input. It can be argued that these interactional strategies are crucial to move the classroom interaction forward and make student contributions more meaningful and available for the rest of the classroom which is considered as appropriation by Walsh (2006a). For instance, requesting clarification upon a student's response, the teacher minimizes the possible breakdowns hence preventing misunderstandings.

Teachers' questioning practices that is also a part of teachers' CIC have been extensively examined in SLA literature (Brock, 1986; Koshik, 2002; 2005; 2010; Long & Sato, 1983; Mehan, 1979; Searle, 1969; Thompson, 1997; White & Lightbown, 1984) and regarding eliciting, Walsh (2006) emphasizes the distinction between asking questions and exploiting questions which involves "paying close attention to learner replies so that their contributions can be optimized" (p. 137). Teachers instructional idiolect could include a kind of accent or speech habits that can be considered inappropriate for classroom context. In order for effective use of instructional talk, teachers should adopt more formal and controlled style in their talk. Interactional awareness is the core concept of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC). With regard to classroom modes, the interactional features change and the teachers with high awareness can adopt different roles accordingly. In addition to role awareness, online decision making also requires enhanced awareness in that it ensures the smooth flow of the interaction using strategies to minimize conversational breakdowns.

Walsh indicates the need of more research in different contexts and educational settings for full understanding the uncovered features of CIC. Can Daşkın (2015) addressed this need by investigating interactional patterns applied by teacher for shaping learner contributions in both form-and-accuracy and meaning-and-fluency contexts. She depicts how an EFL teacher does not simply accept learner's response but extends it for shaping it through repetition, extension, clarification, paraphrasing and elaboration questions as in Walsh and Li's (2003) study. On the other hand, differently from their analysis, she brought out that the teacher shapes learner contributions by translating them in L1 and L2, and by using the board, as well. This research reveals that teachers shape learner contributions in various ways that differ according to the classroom contexts, and the effectiveness of the resources employed teachers depends on that specific contexts. In addition, Sert (2015) proposes four more items that would make the teaching-learning process more effective: (i) successful management of

claims/displays of insufficient knowledge (CIK) (Sert, 2011); (ii) increased awareness of unwillingness to participate (UTP) (Sert, 2011; 2013); (iii) effective use of gesture, and (iv) successful management of code switching (Sert, 2011). Sert (2011) argues that in managing of students' CIK, establishing recipiency, allowing adequate time, paying attention to students' gestures that indicate trouble, and online decision-making skills play a crucial role. According to him, in order to avoid students' UTP and interactional troubles teachers need to increase their awareness through close attention to students' multimodal aspects such as gaze aversion and withdrawals. He also discussed the role of teacher gestures in eliciting a student response, repairing troubles and shaping their contributions and considers it as an integral element of classroom interactional competence.

Sert (2011) depicts how an EFL teacher orients to students' claims of insufficient knowledge that may be resulted from the teacher's not establishing recipiency (Mortensen, 2009). He suggests that through epistemic status check and with the help of the students' nonverbal clues, the teacher interprets their insufficient knowledge. Also, it is demonstrated that through certain interactional resources such as embodies vocabulary explanation, deictic gesture, effective use of code-switching and designedly-incomplete utterance (Koshik, 2002) the teacher may manage to get student engagement. Moreover, Escobar Urmenata (2013) through CA ethnographic perspective aims at determining the applicability of preservice content and language integrated learning (CLIL) model in teacher education program and describes how teaching and reflection cycles support each other. In a more recent study, Escobar Urmenata and Etnitskaya (2014) drawing upon teacher - led classroom discussion in a CLIL science classroom describe a multiparty negotiation process and the multimodal resources employed by the teacher to expand student participation. As parallel with Walsh's (2006b) study, they argue that merely given the floor to the students does not give rise to language acquisition. Thus, they contribute to the understanding of the relationship between language learning and interaction.

In another groundbreaking research Walsh (2002) revealed the ways that teachers obstruct and construct student participation. Claiming that the ability to use the language that is appropriate for the context of the moment as important as adopting suitable methodology, he exhibits the close relationship between teacher talk and learning opportunities. Effective use of direct error correction, content feedback, confirmation checking, extended wait-time and scaffolding facilitate learner participation. However, with some practices like turn

completion, teacher-echo and interruption, the teacher could miss the opportunity for shaping learner contributions thus hinder participation. Walsh (2002) by drawing attention to quality of teacher talk rather than quantity, highlights the vital role of teachers in promoting second language acquisition.

Highlighting the necessity of the development of CIC for teachers, Walsh (2006) introduces Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk framework for reflective practice to language teachers with the aim of increasing awareness of language use and online decision-making practices in various classroom modes. SETT contains four classroom modes and several interactures in each mode. This framework has been utilized in various contexts including TESOL classrooms in the Middle East (Howard, 2010), initial teacher education program (Walsh & Lewig, 2008); EFL context (Aşık & Kuru Gönen, 2016; Shamsipour & Allami, 2012). Like SETT model, another CA-integrated, microscopic and reflective model (IMDAT) for language teacher education was proposed by Sert (2015). It illustrates how CIC development can be traced by using methodological tools of CA and aims at raising teachers' interactional awareness on CIC through paying attention to micro details of interaction. IMDAT has five phases: (I)ntroducing CIC; (M)icro-teaching; (D)ialogic reflection; (A)ctual teaching; (T)eacher collaboration and critical reflection. The next section will introduce four classroom contexts.

2.1.3. Classroom Contexts

In classroom settings, there is a reflexive relationship between pedagogical goals and classroom interactional organization including turn-taking, embodied actions and sequence organization. When the pedagogical focus varies, the organization of turn-taking, sequence and repair vary, too. As Sacks et al. (1974) put forward "turn-taking systems are characterizable as adapting to properties of the sorts of activities in which they operate" (p. 696). Seedhouse (1996) distinguished the classroom contexts as form-and-accuracy, meaning-and-fluency, task-oriented, and procedural contexts. In form-and-accuracy context; for example, because the focus is on the accurate production of the sentences, the type of interaction is language-centered. The teacher's aim is to get a very specific string of linguistic forms from students, instead of developing fluency, so the turn-taking system is tightly-controlled by the teacher, consisted of adjacency pairs involving teacher prompt and student production. As "certain types of activity naturally lead to certain types of repair"

(van Lier, 1988, p. 211), repair practices change according to the context of what is being done. In this context, learner-contributions that do not correspond to the certain string of linguistic forms required by the teacher are treated as trouble, and repair is mostly initiated by the teacher.

In meaning-and-fluency context; on the other hand, the main aim is to maximize the opportunities of interactional space for students. Contrary to the form-and-accuracy context, the focus is on expression of meaning and content, therefore the interactional organization is less rigid. The students have more interactional space and produce longer turns that include overlaps and pauses as in daily conversation. The teacher provides content feedback rather than repairing inaccurate grammatical utterances. The focus of the repair is on mutual understanding and negotiation of meaning; for this reason, unless incorrect forms lead to a breakdown in interaction they are generally ignored or embedded correction is used. In other word, repair practices in this context are similar to ordinary conversation which includes clarification requests and differently from form-and-accuracy context, learner initiation of repair to each other's contributions is exist as well.

The third context is task-oriented in which teachers allocate a task to students without engaging in the interaction. Students communicate with each other to accomplish the task, so the main aim is the successful accomplishment of the task instead of language. Seedhouse (1999) specifies three characteristics of task-oriented contexts (i) "reflexive relationship between the nature of the task and the turn-taking system" (ii) "there is a tendency to minimalization and indexicality", and (iii) "tasks tend to generate many instances of clarification requests confirmation checks, comprehension checks, and self-repetitions" (p. 120). Interactional organization depends on the task given by the teacher and students display orientations to the task through some features like confirmation checks. In this context, anything that may hinder the task accomplishment is treated as trouble, therefore repair practices aim at establishing mutual understanding, thus negotiation of intersubjectivity and reaching a shared understanding.

What is the most relevant to the current study is the procedural context that occurs in each lesson. In procedural context, teachers transmit procedural informings concerning classroom activities that are mostly delivered in a monologue. In addition to providing informings, in this context teachers initiate and conclude classroom activities through the use of various discourse markers which help students to follow the flow of the lesson. Procedural context

is characterized by the absence of learner involvement and strict turn-taking system managed by the teacher who mainly utilizes confirmation checks and transition markers in their turns. However, Seedhouse (1996) offers some potential variations to the turn-taking system of this context. Firstly, a student can ask a question or request clarification concerning procedure. Secondly, the teacher can direct some display questions to the students to make the turn-taking system more interactive. Lastly, the teacher may require verification or explanation from the student with regard to the procedure that they will follow. The next section will present a description of the main body of teachers' informings, directives and instructions together with the related studies carried out in various contexts, then the research gap on the conceptualization of teacher instructions as a part of CIC will consequently be revealed.

2.2. Teacher Informings, Directives, and Instructions

In a conversation, information transfer between speakers is permeative. Despite the fact that every bit of utterances or even gestures bear and transmit some kind of information, questions are given the primary focus of information transfer. Informings, like questions, "establish an asymmetrical relationship between speaker and recipient relative to the matter formulated in the turn" (Kendrick, 2010, p. 58). They transfer knowledge from one participant to the other; the former is knowing and the latter claimed to be unknowing one. Questions, however, make information transfer from recipient to the questioner, while informings convey it from informer to the recipient. Questions and informings, nevertheless, are treated as complimentary actions to each other. Studies on questions have received considerable attention in conversation analysis literature, informing-related research is on beginning phase, though (but see Heritage, 1984; Robinson, 2009; Sidnell, 2012). However, few studies having reference to informings exist in CA literature. For example, Terasaki (1976) takes pre-announcements as a type of informings. In the extract below, in a pre-announcement format, Mal gives a news to Lyn:

```
01. Mal:    *°An'° I* also have s'me other *ne:ws*.
02. Lyn:    Wha:t.
03.         (0.5)
04. Mal:    Seven e'clock temorrow >morning;= I get< the
05.         motorbike.
06.         (0.5)
07. Lyn:    What's happened with it.
```

Figure 1: Pre-announcement as a type of informing. Gardner, R., & Mushin, I. (2013). Teachers telling: Informings in an early years classroom. *Australian Journal of Communication, 40*(2), 63-82.

In line 4 and 5 Mal tells his news to Lyn and he is in K+ position while Lyn is in K- position (Heritage, 2012a). Furthermore, Heritage also examined informings and takes *oh* (1984) as a response to informings. On the other hand, Ekberg (2011) analyzed the data from community home care service context and discussed prospective informings.

Regarding questions and informings as two types of specifications used for knowledge sharing, Sidnell (2012) distinguished informings and questions, and displayed epistemic asymmetry. In relation to epistemic status, Labov and Fansel (1977) made the distinction between A- and B- events, the former of which is supposed to be known only to A, and the second one is regarded as to be known only to B. Kamio (1997) focusing on Japanese language developed these concepts claiming that speakers and listeners have their epistemic territories. These epistemic territories embody "what is known and how it is known" (Heritage, 2012a, p. 6). Heritage examined informings extensively, in particular participants' knowledge status and their epistemic stance (2012a, 2012b). In his 2012a study, he addressed the significance of three elements in request information: interrogative morphosyntax, interaction, and epistemic domain. Moreover, he focused on imbalances in information in conversations by putting emphasis on epistemic status and stance. He labeled the person who is in unknowing position as (K-), and more knowing one as (K+). He argued that speakers in (K-) position tend to initiate sequences and elicit information from the recipient in (K+) position. To handle a specific type of counterinformings (Heritage, 1984), Robinson (2009) looked into an interactional practice. Counterinformings arise "when one speaker responds to another in a way that publicly exposes that the two speakers hold an incompatible position on a same matter" (Robinson, 2009, p. 581).

In literature, one can find little about what informing is or different types of informings; however, in daily conversation many practices which can be regarded as informing exist such as complaints or requests. According to Heritage (2012a), declarative syntax is not the mere way to express informing. For example, in the extract below, the teacher signals that students should be quiet because they have a visitor in the classroom in line 5 and line 8. Instead of using an imperative or declarative form, the teacher achieves this classroom behavior management with an informing.

```
01. Miranda:      Two sleep- fuh muh birth[day a:y,=la[mmy]=
02. Lamont:                                        [↑E:]=
03. Miranda:      =[me ay:.
04. Lamont:       =[pick- ↓duh wr[onguh one.
05. T-Adira:                     [↑I've got some ↓ru:de people
06.               at thuh mo:↑ment?
07. Giselle:      Yah Trelly de[:h.
08. T-Adira:   →                [Now ↑we've got visitors
09.            →  [in   our  cla:]:ssroo:m?
10. Laurence:     [↑↑Kelly give-]
11.               (0.6)
12. Lamont:       An' ↑Mistuh ↓Hammond ↑too:¿
13. T-Adira:      An' they're see:ing- (0.6) ↑↑some people;=being
14.               a liddle bit ru:de;=and-=talking while thuh teacher
15.               is ta:lking.
```

Figure 2: Teacher informings. Heritage, J. (2012a). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 45*(1). 1-29.

Compared to questions, informings get less verbal response, which makes it difficult for teachers to perceive students' display of understanding and learning. In addition, questions call up responses more easily, which is also a demonstration of epistemic status (Heritage, 2012a; Stivers & Rossano, 2010). Since classroom is the center for knowledge acquisition and demonstration, there is a great amount of research on epistemic trajectories in CA literature (e.g.: Hellermann, 2003; Heritage & Heritage, 2013; Hosoda & Aline, 2013; Lee, 2006, 2007; Machbeth, 2003; Mehan, 1979; Waring, 2008, 2009, 2012; Zemel & Koschmann 2011). In CA literature, studies mostly focus on epistemic status of participants and changes on it (e.g. response tokens, Gardner, 2007; Heritage, 1984; question formats,

Raymond, 2003; asymmetries between participants, Heritage & Raymond, 2005), and Sidnell (2012) treated the informings and questions are integral actions by asserting that "both tellings (declaratives, assertions etc.) and questions can be seen to index the differential knowledge of speaker and recipient- which is to say, that these two broad types involve specifications for the distribution of knowledge" (p. 299). In this paper, Sidnell (2012) extensively examined evidentiality and epistemic positioning by putting the analytic focus on interactional structure, knowledge asymmetry, sequential organization and epistemic asymmetry in agreements and confirmations, as well as emphasized the contract between *tell* (informing) and *ask* (question).

As for classroom context, in order to determine the steps that take place in the rest of the lesson, teachers need to know students' understanding of a particular object. Responses to teachers' questions provide clear evidence of understanding. This benefit of questions may be one of the factors make them prevalent in classroom context and in literature as a research area (e.g. IRF). The abundancy of IRF exchange in classrooms may be a reason for prevalence of question practices in classroom settings. It is an easier way to find out what learners know or not know, and teachers may have not difficulty in catching the evidence of understanding with students' responses to the questions asked by teachers in the first phase of IRF sequence (but see Gardner & Mushin, 2013; Koole, 2010). For this reason, responses to questions are more concrete than responses to informings which are generally acknowledgement of understanding, but not demonstration of it. It claims that something has been understood, it gives no proof, though. With informings, teachers tell students the content and the students respond to these informings not only verbally but also nonverbally, which enables teacher to track students' engagement. Through examining students' verbal and nonverbal reactions during and after informings, teachers can reach students' epistemic trajectories. No matter how hard to find studies which prioritize teacher informings, for giving the goals of the class and expressing the things that students should learn, informing receives particular importance according to some frameworks such as direct instruction (e.g. Archer & Hughes, 2011; Rowe, 2006) which requires teachers to tell directly and explicitly to students what they are going to learn in the lesson.

As in other contexts such as institutional talk or daily conversation, in classroom interaction there exists a few studies on informings. For example, Mortensen (2011) described the ways of teaching new vocabulary as embedded in ongoing interaction, not as a separate activity.

In this way, "word explanation is jointly extracted ad explained by the teacher and students" (p. 136), through the students' demonstration of being a candidate for understanding. Gardner and Mushin, on the other hand, in their 2013 paper, using data from early years classroom interaction in Australia analyze sequential organization and distribution of informings in 15 hours recordings. In harmony with previous research in literature, they remarked abundancy of questions in classroom data compared to informing practices. They found that factual informings, which is some piece of information transferred to students as "information" in sequence initial position are rare in data, while procedural informing, which transfers the procedural information and instructions to the students, and multi-unit turns such as questions and designedly incomplete utterance (Koshik, 2002) are used in particular to elicit response, as they mobilize more answer, therefore have more evidence in relation to students' understanding. Moreover, in their data, informings are used for prefacing to elicit turns such as scaffolding. In other words, they serve under other actions. In order to constrict the choices, teacher informings occur after failing to get correct answer, and they follow absence of student answer, as well. All in all, the basic suggestion they offer is that teachers avoid factual informings to convey knowledge to learners, they postpone them after other strategies like IRF sequence instead (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975).

More recently, in relation to the previous study, Gardner and Mushin (2017) examined students' responses to teachers' informings as well as the evidence for engagement with learning. In particular, they focused on students' gaze and body orientations and track their epistemic trajectories to increase understanding of how learners engage with teachers' informings. In consistent with their previous research, they found questions more frequent in classroom conversation. Furthermore, procedural informings in which teacher tells students what to do and how to do an activity are also very common compared to factual informings with which teachers convey the "curriculum content directly" (p .13) Also, they draw attention to scarcity of direct informing and remark that they provide little information to teacher about the next steps of the lesson. From their analysis, two practices implying that informing turn is probably understood come to the forefront:

1. Choral repetition of informing by the students
2. Repeating what the teacher has said

While the first one is teacher-oriented, the second one is student-driven. This study has very crucial implications in that it draws attention to gaze behavior and body orientations which

teachers use, and it increases understanding in student engagement by raising awareness of giving instruction after all students' attention are kept down. They also labeled the aim of the lesson "WALT (We are learning to…)", and what the students will learn at the end of the lesson as "WILT (What I'm looking for…)" (p. 17). First one implies a joint action, while the second one gives an opportunity to students to work independently, which requires them to carry out a task. Regarding the design of WALT and WILT, while the former one is presented like a procedural informing, the latter defines the steps of the task that will be performed in the classroom.

Before presenting a detailed review of oral instructions in relation to conversation analytic methodology, it could be best to underline that the term instruction has various meanings. First of all, it refers to the main issue of a variety of educational settings (Lindwall, Lymer & Greiffenhagen, 2015). In this sense, it could be used as a synonym of teaching and education. According to Bruner (1966) "instruction consists of leading the learner through a sequence of statements and restatements of a problem or body of knowledge that increase the learner's ability to grasp, transform, and transfer what he is learning" (p. 49). Secondly, it refers to a written text such as the ones that guide readers to follow some directives for doing or creating something. Finally, the term instruction is used for referring to directives that are "designed to get someone to do something" (Goodwin, 2006, p. 517). According to Ur (1996), instructions can be defined as "directions that are given to introduce a learning task which entails some measure of independent student activity" (p. 16). They are actions to get hearer to do something, and Searle (1969), in his study in which he categorizes illocutionary acts into five as representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaration, labeled directives as attempts with varying degrees such as order, command, require, invite, advice and the like. Also, he included questions into the directives group for they have the same function.

It is clear in the literature that while there is next to no research in teacher education and training field, scholars from communication and linguistics analyze instruction as speech acts enjoying various functions. In addition, the studies in discourse analysis and sociolinguistics focus generally on politeness or power of these actions (e.g. Brown & Levinson, 1978; Ervin-Tripp 1976). Nevertheless, in one of the recent works, Lindwall et al. (2015) explored instruction giving in four different contexts. In written instructions which guide the reader to create or to do something, they pointed the incomplete nature of

instruction giving, because as Garfinkel (1967) claimed in order to follow instructions, learners need ad hoc considerations since they cannot be grasped fully in their written form. He put emphasis on the problems while following instructions in terms of full understanding or troubles that can be emerged anytime. Another context that Lindwall et al. (2015) analyze is the directives that are given one to one. In this kind, a potential contingency offers an interactional nature to design of the instruction, that is, sequence of instructions can be designed as correctional turns (see Keevallik, 2012; Machbeth, 2004; Weeks, 1985). Corresponding with this sequential organization of instructions Goldberg (1975) presented that to overcome troubles instructions can be "broken down into its smaller component parts each of which is delivered one at a time over a series of sequentially placed turns" (p. 273). The third context is feedback given by a teacher to a text that students have worked on. It has some similarity with the previous context in that the instructions are given stepwise. Depending on students verbal and nonverbal response to feedback such as displaying understanding, further instructions are designed. The final context is cohort-organized instruction which includes whole-class directives and generally teacher ask "test-question" (Searle,1969) which is regarded by Lindwall et al. (2015) as instructive question as the teacher asking the question actually knows the answer. In this study, they displayed the teachers' utterances are contingent upon previous students' turns. In this sense, Lee (2007) focused on the contingent nature of third turn which is designed according to responses coming from the students. Claiming that pre-fixed actions cannot achieve intended goals, Lee (2007) adds some more uses of third turns such as parsing the question into smaller components. When the teacher fails to get the answer from the student; they make use of questions to move students to a direction, which requires teacher to make analytic work on troubles in students' turns or what they know and do not know.

Related to following instructions, in an analysis of two pairs' ways of interpretation of the same written and oral instructions, Coughlan and Duff (1994) displayed how they understand the same instructions quite differently from each other. However, despite some differences, in bodily orientations and acknowledging the teacher's instructions the students have similarities, as well. From a teacher training perspective, this study is quite valuable for showing how students interpret instructions and do task in a different way, which demonstrates the complexity of instruction giving and following sequences. One suggestion they put forward is integrating every piece of verbal or nonverbal contributions such as eye-

gaze and gestures to make the unpredictable actions clearer. As Markee (2015) stated, because "instruction giving and following are two sides of the same interactional coin" (p.117), many researchers including Lindwall et al. (2015), Hellermann and Pekarek Doehler (2010), Seedhouse (2008) and Markee (2013) put a focus on multimodal approach to analyze these sequences. Hellermann and Pekarek Doehler (2010) at the same time considered that the things happen in the classroom talk is "always highly contingent on factors that emerge as being locally relevant in particular instances of talk-in-interaction". (p. 28), for this reason, it could be best to treat the analysis of instruction-giving as a multimodal phenomenon. Markee (2015) like Seedhouse (2008) focused how teachers of English as a foreign language give oral instructions to students in a classroom setting. He analyzed two different instruction giving sequences occurring at different times and different pedagogical contexts and showed how similar these two teachers' instruction giving in terms of organizational structure and grammatical resources. Related to organization of oral instructions, the data revealed that in instruction giving both teachers include how students will work, what materials they need, what tasks they are required to achieve, how they will achieve the task, how much time the activity requires and why they are going to do the task. As for syntactic organization, not only a great number of unmodulated forms including imperatives and declaratives, but also modulated forms such as "Could you + V", "Why don't you ..." and "Shall we +..." exist. Although one of the data fragment was collected long years before the second data, the similarity between them is considered "unlikely to be mere coincidence" by Markee (2015, p. 121).

In CA literature, related to the composition of instruction giving sequences different views exist. For example, Seedhouse (2008) describe teachers' oral instructions as monologues occurring before the activities and at the beginning of the lesson. According to Seedhouse (1996) at these stages teachers pass on information related to procedures of the task that students will achieve at the later stages of the lesson. He also differentiates this context from the other pedagogical contexts (fluency and meaning context, form and accuracy context, text-based context) in that its main objective generally is to establish the other contexts; for this reason, it involves monologues, which makes it the strictest one in terms of turn taking. Although Seedhouse (2008) describes instruction-giving as monologue that the teacher holds the floor without a fear of interruption, two types he specified to indicate this context may have variations. Firstly, students can ask a question and by this way they take the turn during

procedural monologue. Secondly, the teacher makes this procedural information-giving process more interactive enabling students to take turns.

Arguing that complexities of classroom discourse that cause some problems in the classroom can be uncovered with fine-grained conversation analytic transcription, Seedhouse (2008) examined teachers' oral instructions in terms of experience that teachers have in profession. By stressing the importance of creating appropriate pedagogical focus in teaching process, he revealed the relationship between getting students to do what a task requires and creating target pedagogical focus. If the required focus cannot be created properly, students in the classroom may not understand what they are to do, hence it may cause confusion. Seedhouse (2008) examined two EFL teachers, one of whom is inexperienced, the other one has some experience in teaching, in terms of the ways they issue instructions and detailed how novice teacher could not ensure the match between pedagogical focus and instruction, whereas experienced teacher managed to establish parallelism between them and mark each stage of instruction by means of distinctive intonations. Another prominent feature of experienced teacher in the data is that she could give instructions in accordance with the nature of speech exchange system of the talk. Seedhouse in this study called attention to the relationship between being a competent teacher and the ability of managing-and-shifting pedagogical focus. He offers that teachers should explicitly voice the focus which should be one at a time with clear and full instructions in order not to confuse students about the intended pedagogical focus. To highlight the importance of it, Johnson (1995) also made a similar claim:

> Explicit directions and concrete explanations can help second language students recognize the implicit norms that regulate how they are expected to act and interact in classroom events. Without such explicitness, second language students can become confused about what is expected of them, or how they should participate (p. 163).

Even though Seedhouse (1996) provided the variations of procedural context given above, he described the speech exchange system of teacher monologue as the most suitable one to focus. On the other hand, Markee (2015) approached with suspect to this characterization instructional nature of teachers' instructions because according to him it could be true when only teacher's recording is transcribed. In his paper, with recordings taken from different angles in the classroom, it is apparent that students even do not wait for being given permission to talk; on the contrary, by interpreting instruction they "actively accept being designated as next speaker" (p. 122), so he argues that instructions are created in sequential

basis. Moreover, St. John and Cromdal (2016), in their recent paper, revealed task instructions are interactionally complex and collaboratively created with students, no matter how much they are associated with individual and noninteractional operations. Upon students' questions which ease to follow teacher's instructions, teachers while responding to the individual they benefit from the question and addresses whole class, which is defined as "dual addressivity – targeting two or more addressees in response to a student question" (p. 252). Contrary to the view that treats instructions as noninteractional objectives, they argue that as responding students' questions, teachers oblige "to uphold the general instructional agenda" (p. 254), as well. Also, they explored the methods that both students and teacher participate in the sequential organization of instructions. Particularly, how the teacher makes use of an individual's question to provide directives effectively to all students for achieving the classroom task objectives properly was analyzed. In other words, teacher treats a students' question as "representative of collective instructional need" (p. 266), and so takes advantage of it to address the whole classroom body for the sake of instructional unambiguousness. By creating the dual addressivity, teachers use student contributions as an asset to meet the lacks in instructional understanding. As Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) described when students are involved in the task instruction process, recipient design is increased. Operations of instruction sequences is not only accomplished by the teacher, students also involve in this action so that a participant framework can be created, which implies incomplete nature of instructions (Garfinkel, 2002). Students questions are handled by the teacher in two ways. Firstly, the teacher simply responds to the question immediately after it is asked. Secondly, the relevancy of the student contribution to instruction is emphasized by the teacher in order to keep the continuity of instruction for all students in the classroom. Furthermore, this interconnected nature of task instruction giving process implies the contingency of teacher's turn on students' contribution as in Lee (2007)'s study on the third turn where he describes the teacher's performance is highly related to students' actions. Through the use of plural personal pronouns, bodily orientations, gaze and gestures conduct, teachers could create a single body of audience that enables them to issue the directives to the whole group.

Regarding collaborative and complex nature of instruction-giving and following, Waring and Hruska (2012) worked on videotaped tutoring sessions. Unlike St. John and Cromdal (2016), they include only one undergraduate tutor and a tutee in first grade and focuses on

the problems making it difficult to follow directives. Also, in addition to conversation analytic framework, ethnographic information was also utilized to detail and enrich the analysis. In instruction giving and following, the troubles that the students have especially in understanding the questions asked by the teacher and in following the directions properly were revealed to be problems emerging from the nature of teacher directives. Particularly, two specific features they refer: (i) clarity of directives and (ii) relevance of directives. Various self-repairs in one question, unclear verbal and nonverbal references, problems related to question design that does not restrict the number of potential answers are among the problems leading to lack of clarity in directives, thereby creating difficulty in following them. Specifically, teachers' use of ambiguous pronouns and conflicting messages contribute to the confusion. As for relevance issue, Waring and Hruska (2012) call attention to giving an account for why students are going to do the following task. Since when the reason behind an activity is not made explicit to students, it could be hard to engage them in the ongoing task, therefore lack of explanation may be a reason of failure. When teachers give clear and simple directives, instead of complex directives, students' engagement is facilitated and learning opportunities are increased. Otherwise, students try to make sense of given instruction based on their own understanding without complete apprehension of the lesson objectives. Regarding this, they lay weight on explicitness of teacher directives. When the students know what and how they are required to do, classroom objectives are achieved more easily and learning opportunities are maximized accordingly.

In the literature, the functions, forms and typology of directives could seem to vary from one culture to another. Arguing that adults' directives can be a source for socializing children or transmitting cultural values to children, He (2000) centered upon repeated prototypes of teacher directives profiling their sequential organization and specifying lexical and grammatical patterns. Specifically, he discussed directives in terms of both their grammatically or lexically organization, and their functions. Based on 10 hours of video recorded data drawing from Chinese Heritage Language School, two directive types were defined: instructional / initiating directives (also see Markee 2015; St. John & Cromdal, 2016) and disciplinary / responsive directives. Instructional / initiating directives are used for carrying out teaching objectives and procedures. Teachers implement prefixed classroom activities or manage classroom with this kind of directives in several ways: (i) discourse markers + imperatives, (ii) test questions + imperatives, and (iii) modalized preference /

permission statements. Discourse markers + imperatives, as a universal directive type, is used before carrying out an activity or classroom management and students mostly show no or little verbal uptake to this kind. Similar to Markee (2015) and St. John and Cromdal's (2016) view on collaborative creation in instructions, He (2000) examined teacher directives not as monolithic structures but described their complex structures through Test questions + imperatives variation. Presenting a question, teachers create interactional space for students during instruction-giving so that they can craft directives jointly. The question is not a real one; instead the answer of it is actually known by the teacher. When learners' answer to this kind of question matches up with teacher's expectation, the teacher uses it for issuing the next part of the directives. If it does not, teacher contradicts it, since the purpose is to provide students to anticipate the next directive. Last variation of instructional / initiating directive is modalized preference / permission statements in which teacher use modals such as *can* and *may* to mitigate the imperative statements even though there is no other optional way for students to do the activity. In other words, teacher issues the directives as if the students had other choices, but in fact the presented directive is obligatory. All these variations show that instead of simply asking students to do something, teachers can make their students have interactional space by enabling them to anticipate next directives with test questions and make them deduce the directive by the help of modalized forms. Like He (2000), Holmes (1983) also focused on syntactical forms of teacher instructions and came up with three broad categories: (i) imperatives, (ii) declaratives, and (iii) interrogatives. He specified the modal use in the interrogative category to soften the command or to vary directive form with a question, as in He's (2000) test question type. According to Holmes (1983), the most frequent directive forms are imperatives for they do not give rise to misunderstanding. Based on moral supplications, disciplinary / responsive directives are issued after students' problematic behaviors for orienting students to their own behavior in order to evaluate their behaviors' moral aspect and giving directives to change the behavior. In this section, firstly teacher informings in relation to information transfer and epistemic status of the interactants were reviewed based on conversation analytic studies. Regarding demonstration of epistemic status, the contract between question and informing was specified by putting the analytic focus on interactional structure and sequential organization of both. Then, the contingent nature of teacher directives / instructions which are mostly shaped according to students' second pair part was examined, and finally how the instructions are interactionally complex

and collaboratively created with students was depicted through recent works. In the following section, the distinction between displaying and claiming understanding will be revealed and repair practices used to restore understanding will be briefly introduced.

2.3. Displaying / Claiming and Repairing Understanding

In classroom settings, it is through the interaction between students and teacher that teaching and learning practices are attested. Based on students' demonstration or claim of understanding, teachers shape the next action in teaching process and undertake a repair work if needed. Understanding between an agent and an addressee is described by Lynch (2011) as a technical phenomenon that involves turn-taking, repair and adjacency pair organizations. It is considered as a key to accomplish social actions and maintain mutual understanding in everyday life. It is a fundamental to achieve joint action in institutional setting such as call-centers (Baker, Emmisson & Firth, 2005) or medical consultation centers (Lehtinen, 2005; Peräkylä, 1995; Pilnick, 2003; Sarangi & Clarke, 2002; Silverman, 1997). In educational settings, it is achieved collectively and interactively at the level of providing instruction, information and treating instruction. Like other institutional settings, in educational context teacher acts upon what the addressee shows him in terms of receipt of the information. This sets out the contingent, embodied and intersubjective nature of understanding rather than cognitive and individual achievement. Conversation analysis and ethnomethodology highlight the sequential nature of understanding, hence for conversation analysists, it is considered as a local and situated matter, that is, parties to a conversation display understanding on prior turns and each new turn provides information whether and how the message is received, so that participants could formulate further contributions accordingly. Therefore, it is not "treated as a mental process but is related to the next action achieved by the coparticipants and demonstrating her understanding" (Mondada, 2011, p. 543). Taking a turn is an evidence of understanding because as Schegloff (1992) argues, in the second turn interlocutors show whether they understood what the first speaker intended to convey. This demonstration provides the speaker with the information about how and to what extend he was understood, so that he makes repair if needed.

The concept of understanding has been investigated in CA literature and some distinctions have been made between claiming and demonstrating understanding which are given in the extract below:

1	A:	where are you staying
2	B:	Pacific Palisades
3a	A:	oh at the west side of town
	vs	
3b	A:	oh Pacific Palisades

Figure 3: Claiming and demonstrating understanding. Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation.* Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Sacks (1992) contributed a lot to the literature and with the extract above stressed the difference between what speaker A does in 3a and 3b. In 3a, he redescribes by reformulating the location told by speaker B, therefore demonstrates understanding. On the other hand, in 3b he merely claims through only repeating the previous turn after producing a change-of-state token *oh* (Heritage, 1984). Mondada (2011) investigates the evidences of understanding that are displayed by participants publicly stressing the importance of understanding in instructional settings. Focusing on the gaze, gesture, facial expressions of participants such as movement of eyebrows he discussed the embedded nature of demonstration of understanding and argued that understanding is displayed in multimodal ways as well as with linguistic resources. Similarly, through both verbal and nonverbal resources, interlocutors can detect the troubles in understanding and constitute third-position repair (Schegloff, 1992). Similarly, Hindmarsh, Reynolds and Dunne (2011) describe the ways how participants with their body language show alignment with the recipient's actions, and display understanding of the ongoing talk. Like Mondada (2011) they discussed the role of bodily conduct on demonstration of understanding and embodiment of (mis)understanding. Drawing upon the distinction made by Sacks (1992) between claiming and displaying understanding, they investigate interaction in clinical dental training between students and supervisors. They focused on the instructional resources used by supervisors to assess students' understanding and argued that those interactional resources are not tied only to the talk content, but also to the timing of the talk, and its embodiment in bodily actions. They brought evidence from a corpus of audio-visual recordings to the fact that students bodily conduct cannot be isolated from their verbal claims. In addition to gesture and facial

expressions, the role of touch on displaying of understanding as well as on negotiation was also extensively explored by Nishizaka (2011).

Another distinction was made between *displays of understanding* and *display of knowing* by Koole (2010). They are two distinctive interactional objects that occur in different interactional environments. While *do you understand* prefers a claim of understanding given by recipient, *do you know* question requires demonstration of knowing through adding something to or making interpretation of the original speaker's turn. Coulter (2005) argues that interpretation shows how something is understood; however, *do you know* question is concerned with whether or not it is understood. Kidwell (1997), by considering recipient proactivity, explored how an unaddressed participant displays recipiency to a storyteller who addresses to another person in her talk. Similar to Goodwin (1980, 1986, 1987), by orienting to interactional asymmetry she analyzed an unaddressed recipient's gaze directions through which she displays of her knowledge to a storyteller.

In order to learn whether what the speaker has said is understood or not, an understand check is produced by the speaker, yet in order to evaluate the correctness of understanding, questions related to what the interlocutor means are asked. When problematic understanding exists, the original speaker may undertake repair which Schegloff (1992) calls as third-position repair which is made after an interlocutor's response indicating trouble in understanding or incorrect interpretation in second position with regard to the previous turn. Third-position repair implies that participants constantly observe the possible understanding troubles in the ongoing talk. In educational setting, teachers exploit triadic unit: instruction - informing - understating checks. With understanding checks students are invited to show whether or not and to what extend they have understood and how they have received the information. With acknowledgement, which could be triggered by teacher's interactional organizations such as yes / no questions, they do not display understanding but just claims that they understood. However, reformulation as Sacks (1992) argues requiring some sort of analysis of the previous turn demonstrates understanding. In sum, students claim understanding with the tokens like *yes* or *oh yes* to the teacher's understanding check that can be provided in the form of *yes / no interrogative* or *do you understand?* at the end of the discourse unit or demonstrate understanding optionally added to the acknowledgement. Also, in the course of the discourse unit, that is, during teacher's explanation or instruction,

students can produce acknowledgement or provide uninvited demonstration of understanding.

After informing statements, interlocutors display or claim their understanding with a repetition and paraphrasing the previous contribution. Repetition is used to show that the information given by the speaker has been registered. In a corpus of native Norwegian clerks and nonnative clients, Svennevig (2004) extensively investigates sequential aspects, distribution and functions of other repetition. After informings, a plain repeat accompanied with falling intonation refers to display of hearing, while those repeats include a response particle describes claim of understanding. Repetition with falling intonation typically occurs in third-position and is used as a sequence closer. Rising repeats, however, not only signal understanding and acknowledgement of the prior turn, but also display emotional stance such as interest or surprise. Heritage (1984) treats repetition with rising intonation as news for recipients and calls them newsmarks. Likewise, Maynard and Zimmerman (1984) also examine the role of repetition with rising intonation in eliciting further talk and consider them responsive turns inviting a response to questions and informing statements. Furthermore, Hindmarsh et al. (2011) drawing upon the distinction made by Sacks (1992) between claiming and displaying understanding investigate interaction in clinical dental training between students and supervisors. Like Mondada (2011), they discussed the role of the participants bodily conduct on demonstration of understanding and embodiment of (mis)understanding. They emphasized the fundamentality of multimodal aspects in talk by arguing that demonstration of understanding is not acquired simply by talk, and students' bodily conduct is not taken in isolation from their verbal claims. Focusing on the interactional resources used by supervisors to assess students' understanding they claimed that those interactional resources are not only tied to the talk content, but also to the timing of the talk and its embodiment in bodily actions.

Based on each other's actions and turns, and by displaying understanding to prior turns, participants establish and maintain intersubjectivity in their interaction. Drawing upon He and Young (1998) and Young and Miller (2004), Kasper (2006) offers interactional competencies that include repairing troubles speaking, hearing, and understanding. Since repair is a topic of a whole separate domain in the scope of conversation analysis, a brief overview of it will be given in this section below for developing understanding regarding repair as an interactional practice in resolution of understanding troubles.

All conversations may have some difficulties that delay or impede negotiation of meaning and understanding. Through repair practices, speakers can deal with the troubles that emerge in talk. Repair, as one of the integral components of interactional competence, is a required ability in dealing with breakdown, and ensuring understanding. In educational settings, it plays a crucial role in teachers' classroom interactional competence in that it eliminates understanding troubles that hinder the smooth flow of ongoing interaction. As in mundane conversation, in classroom settings mishearing and misunderstanding occur; however, teachers with good interactional skills manage to reach and maintain mutual understanding with certain interactional practices. Regarding the place of repair in teachers' interactional competence, Scarcella (1988) claimed that "the ability to carry out self-repair and to elicit repair from one's conversational partner is an essential skill for a second or foreign language learner" (p. 76). In SLA literature, its relation to pedagogy and students' misunderstandings has been examined by many scholars (e.g. Hosoda, 2006; Kasper & Kim, 2007; Kurhila, 2001; Nakamura, 2008; Wong, 2000a, 2000b). It is a broad term including correction as well, however conversation analysis uses repair instead of correction as well as repairable or trouble-source to indicate the problem in talk. Conversation analytic repair is defined by Schegloff, et al. (1974) as "a set of practices whereby a co-interactant interrupts the ongoing course of action to attend to possible trouble in speaking, hearing or understanding the talk" (as cited in Kitzinger, 2013, p. 229), and a distinction in repair initiation and repair outcome has been made. While Wong and Waring (2010) define repair initiation as "the practice of signaling or targeting a trouble-source" (p. 214), repair outcome refers to the resolution of the problem. Another important distinction in repair is between self and other which refers to the two different classes of participants (Schegloff et al., 1977): repair could be initiated and completed by the same person who owns the trouble-source or by different speaker in another turn, which clarifies the difference among the repair types: (i) self-initiated self-repair; (ii) self-initiated other-repair; (iii) other-initiated self-repair; (iv) other-initiated other-repair. While problems of hearing are mostly associated with other-initiated repairs, errors in grammar and problems of word selection is associated with self-repairs.

In self-initiated self-repair, repair is initiated and completed by the speaker of the trouble-source while it is completed by another speaker in self-initiated other-repair, which often involves a word-search practice. Likewise, the distinction between other-initiated self-repair and other-initiated other-repair is about the person who undertakes the repair work. Wong

and Waring (2010) consider four types of self-initiated self-repair (but see Schegloff, 1992 for fourth-position repair): (1) same-turn repair; (2) transition-space repair; (3) third-turn repair; (4) third-position repair.

Same turn-repair refers to a type of repair which is accomplished in the current turn by the owner of the trouble, and initiated with cuts off, sound stretch, pause, perturbations or repetition. The use of these kinds of repair initiators is considered as a sign of interactional competence (Goodwin, 1981; Schegloff, 1987, Wong, 2000c). Insertion, deletion, replacement and abandonment are same-turn repair methods (Schegloff, 1979), and as the names suggest, insertion refers to addition of an item after repair initiator, whereas deletion points to omitting an item before uttering the whole statement. Repairing a trouble-source with replacement method involves changing an item with another one; in abandonment; on the other hand, repair attempt that has been already initiated is abandoned completely.

Transition-space repair is defined as "an attempt to fix the trouble source by its speaker just after the first possible completion point of the turn-constructional unit that includes the trouble-source" (Wong & Waring, 2010, p. 222). On the other hand, third-turn repair refers to correcting trouble in the third-turn. However, in this type any other turn does not indicate the problem, which is considered as the difference between third-turn and third-position repair that is what this thesis presents as an interactional resource employed by the teacher for resolution of the understanding trouble emerged in instructional sequences. Schegloff (1992) defines it as "an attempt to fix the trouble-source by its speaker based on the next speaker's response, which displays a possible misunderstanding of the trouble-source turn" (p. 1302). According to Gass (2003) in second or foreign language classroom interaction, negotiation of meaning has a critical role and third-position repair is closely related to avoiding and correcting misunderstanding through dealing with problems of incorrect reference and incorrect relevant next actions (Schegloff, 1987, 1992). Third-position repair involves four elements: (Schegloff, 1992, as cited in Wong & Waring, 2010, p. 226):

> (i) Repair-initiating component (e.g., *no; no no; no, no, no; oh; oh no; oh yeah; well)*.
>
> (ii) Acceptance/agreement (e.g., *yeah, I know, I realize that too, that's OK, Oh I know)*.
>
> (iii) Rejection of misunderstanding (e.g., *I don't mean that, I'm not X-ing*, that's *not what I mean.)*
>
> (iv) Repair proper (e.g., *I mean Y*.)

Other-initiated self-repair, in a similar vein, provides learners with negotiation of meaning. If the speaker of trouble-source does not fix the trouble within his own turn, the next speaker

will have the opportunity for repairing it. Similar to same turn repairs, other-initiated self-repair includes certain repair initiators, as well (Schegloff, et al., 1977) such as open class initiators (*Huh?, Pardon?*), wh-interrogatives (*who, when),* partial repetition of the trouble-source + *wh*-interrogative; partial repetition of the trouble-source and *You mean* + understanding check. Whereas open class initiators do not specify the trouble-source thus the next speaker has to find the location and the nature of the problem, wh-interrogatives directly pinpoint the trouble by implying the exact location. In partial repetition initiators, the speaker through the use of rising intonation indicates the trouble source. As the strongest repair initiator, *You mean* + understanding check specifies the trouble-source exactly. Other-initiated self-repair is least occurred type of repair and it takes two forms: (i) exposed correction and (ii) embedded correction specified by Jefferson (1987). She details the series occurring in repair sequences as XYY and XYX. In the former series, a speaker produces an utterance (X), and in the following turn another speaker produces an alternative (Y). In the final turn, the first speaker utters the alternative (Y); however, when the first speaker rejects the alternative, the repair sequence takes the form of XYX. Both series can be accomplished embeddedly into the ongoing talk, which Jefferson (1987) calls it as *by-the-way* or *embedded correction* which takes place without interrupting the ongoing trajectory of the talk (see Han, 2002, for the four states of embedded correction). Exposed correction, on the contrary, is done by stopping the ongoing talk "to overtly address a trouble-source" (Jefferson, 1987, p. 96).

In SLA research literature, it is important to set a clear understanding of L2 classroom repair organization. Concerning this Markee (2000) claimed "the conversational repair is viewed by SLA researcher as the sociopsychological engine that enables learners to get comprehended input" (p. 31). Related to the development of interactional competence, Bouwer and Wagner (2004) display the cases in which speakers' progress in establishing interactional intersubjectivity by employing a set of repair-initiating techniques. Slotte-Lüttge (2007) focusing on the interaction between bilingual students and the teacher depicts how students invoke code-switching followed by a direct repair. In the same context, Gafaranga (2000) examined medium language and other language repair accomplished by bilingual students, and he suggests that students show orientation to their other language to deal with the difficulties about word searching. Furthermore, based on the longitudinal video recordings of psychotherapist-patient interaction, Martin and Sahlström (2010) detail the

progressional change from other-initiated to self-initiated repair organizations that participants use in order to resolve understanding troubles. The similar results are reached by Hellermann (2009) who describe the gradual increase in self-initiated repair of an adult language learners in an 18-month period. With a longitudinal tracking of task-oriented interactions, Sert and Balaman (2018) examined how L2 learners repair their teammates' talk, which firstly consists of overuse of other-initiated other-policing and then evolves into self-initiated policing over time. Specifically, they documented how L2 learners negotiate and co-construct the rules of an online task and displayed how the rules of the task are made relevant within repair sequences. With a process-oriented tracking, they describe that the learners develop L2 interactional competencies in dealing with troubles that hinder progressivity in task accomplishment in an alignment with other findings in literature (Martin, 2004, 2009; Martin & Salhström, 2010).

Seedhouse (2004) emphasized the reflexive relationship between repair type and classroom context. He asserts that pedagogical goals of each classroom context result in different repair organizations and types. Van Lier (1988), and Jung (1999) also offer this variable approach (Seedhouse, 2004) that refers to the fact that as pedagogical focus varies, trouble-sources also varies accordingly, which give rise to different kinds of repairable occur in each context. In form-and-accuracy context, since turn-taking is strictly controlled by the teacher, trouble-source is largely made of linguistic structures and patterns. Correspondingly, the teacher undertakes repair work when students' response is not exactly the same with the response that the teacher intended to receive; therefore, in this context repair is initiated by the teacher by a majority (Seedhouse, 2004). Contrary to form-and-accuracy context, in meaning-and-fluency context the focus is on expressing meaning through establishing mutual understanding and negotiating meaning. Since overt repair is considered to interrupt the flow of the interaction, in this context repair takes the form of embedded correction mostly as in ordinary conversation. Also, not only the teacher but the students as well initiate and complete repair. In task-oriented context, the focus in on neither personal meaning not linguistic form, but on the task accomplishment. Therefore, repair work is done in order to eliminate troubles that impede learners to complete the task successfully. As they vary across contexts, it is essential to develop an emic perspective in analyzing repair in order to detect what the trouble and repair is in each context. Seedhouse (2004) suggests context-based

approach to use appropriate repair type which can be useful in one context but not or even confusing in others.

What this study is mostly relevant to is the students' misunderstandings or misinterpretations of the procedure that they are required to follow. In this regard, third-position repair "allows for the possibility of repairing a trouble in understanding of a prior turn (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 234). Repairing understanding problem in procedural context, teachers mostly utilize repair initiators like *no, I don't mean*, or *I mean*. Based on each other's actions and turns, and by displaying understanding to prior turns, participants establish and maintain intersubjectivity in their interaction.

2.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, the research fields, which are relevant to the phenomenon under investigation, were presented into three main sections. The first section was dedicated to the description of Classroom Discourse and Interaction. It is divided into three subsections including the main features of and previous research on teacher talk, classroom interactional competence, and micro-analytic classroom contexts. In the second section, an in-depth scrutiny of teacher informing, directives and instructions with their main features were provided. Lastly, in 2.3. research on displaying understanding and repairing troubles in understanding was reviewed from Conversation Analytic perspective. The next chapter will illustrate the methodological details of the study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.0. Introduction

The third chapter of the thesis is dedicated to the methodological details of the study with regard to the research context, methodology, data collection and analysis process. In 3.1. the aim of the thesis and the research questions with reference to the significance of the study will be given. In 3.2. the details of the research context and the participants will be presented. 3.3. will provide a detailed transcription of data collection procedure from the very beginning. What follows will be in-depth description of Conversation Analysis (CA) as a research methodology to investigation of naturally occurring talk as well as its basic principles. In section 3.5. the transcription convention will be introduced, and the process of constructing a collection and data analysis procedure will be provided. 3.6. and 3.7. illustrate how the validity and the reliability of the research were ensured. The chapter will be concluded with the clarification of the ethical issues of the study.

3.1. Purpose and Research Questions

As was indicated in 1.3. Aim and Significance of the study, the main aim of the current research is to document how an EFL teacher manages understanding troubles which emerge in relation to task instructions delivered orally by the teacher. Through a micro-analytic investigation of an intermediate level EFL classroom interaction, the focus of this study will be on understanding in procedural context. Both the ways the students demonstrate or claim their non-understanding, and the sources through which the teacher notices the troubles will be uncovered. Moreover, it is also aimed to extend the existing interactional resources to

restore understanding and intersubjectivity and to increase the scope of practices that language teachers can utilize to resolve understanding problems. The following research question will be addressed in this study based on the methodological underpinnings of CA:

1. How are understanding troubles that emerge with regard to task instructions and their resolutions sequentially constructed?

    - What next actions are employed by the teacher after the students' understanding troubles?

2. How does the teacher notice understanding troubles?

    - How do the students demonstrate their non-understandings?

    - Which sources does the teacher rely on to detect understanding troubles?

3. What are the interactional resources that the teacher deploys in order to resolve emergent troubles and restore understanding?

The first research question will explicate the sequential organization of non-understanding of instructions and their resolution. The second one will portray the ways of the student' claim and demonstration of understanding troubles as well as other sources that the teacher relies on to detect the emergent problems. Finally, the last research question will detail the interactional resources employed by the teacher to resolve understanding troubles and restore understanding in procedural contexts. Each research question will be addressed in Chapter 5 in separate subsections.

3.2. Research Context and Participants

The data for this thesis was obtained from College of Foreign Language of Gazi University in Turkey. During five weeks in the fall semester of the 2016-2017 academic year, an EFL classroom which had students both from English Language Teaching and English Language Literature departments were video-recorded. The collection process was carried out from the beginning of December 2016 to the second week of January 2017. There were 15 students one of whom is Kazakh, and the rest of the classroom are Turkish. Their ages range from 18 and 29. The students were sitting in U-shaped seating arrangement facing the teacher. There was female dominance in the classroom: while five of the students are male, ten of them are female, however, there is no case that makes this dominance relevant to the phenomenon

examined in this thesis. In order to maintain the student' anonymity, they were given pseudonyms, and the first three letters were used in transcription to indicate them.

All of the students were accepted to the university according to their results of central placement examination including two different exams. The first exam is YGS consisting of 80 multiple choice English questions testing students' vocabulary and grammar knowledge, and reading skills. It does not give place to speaking, writing, pronunciation and listening questions, which means that YGS does not test students' productive skills, hence in their first year at the department both ELT and ELL students have mainly language skill classes. In preparatory school, the students are placed to different classes according to their proficient levels which is determined at the beginning of the academic year with placement exams. These exams test not only productive but also receptive skills of the students by including reading, grammar, vocabulary questions, and a writing and speaking exam. The students in this dataset are intermediate level students. The main coursebook used in the classroom is Language Leader designed for B1 (Intermediate) students according to Common European Framework of Reference for Languages CERF which specifies the linguistic abilities of intermediate level learners who:

> can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc.
>
> can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken.
>
> can produce simple connected text on topics, which are familiar, or of personal interest.
>
> can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes & ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans. (p. 5)

The coursebook involves twelve units with different themes. Each unit grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening, speaking/pronunciation, scenario, and study & writing skills tasks. After the completion of each three units, the students have a review part. In addition to Language Leader, for each language skill various extra materials were utilized. Also, students have writing assignment portfolios as well as study packs that are given to them before each exam during the term. The students take three midterm tests which consist of language skill questions and mini quizzes at the end of each units related the unit content.

English is taught as foreign language in Turkey. The students do not have much opportunity for using English outside the classroom. The class has five classroom hours (50 minutes each) five days a week and two instructors one of whom teaches the first two and half of the third day of the week, and the other one meets the class the rest of the week. The recorded

teacher graduated from ELT department of one of the state universities in Turkey and has 7 years teaching experience at the same institution. In addition, she performs at testing office in two and a half-day of each week.

In this thesis, one of the instructors teaching 13 hours in a week was recorded. It means that one EFL teacher and one classroom are included in this data, so the validity issue might be argued; however, as Liddicoat (2011) discusses, analyzing any instance of interaction that potentially useful for analysis to uncover how the interactants orient to each other in and through interaction lays in the logic of Conversation Analysis. In a similar vein, Sacks (1992) states that the analysts "can come up with findings of considerable generality by looking at very singular, particular things by asking what it takes for those things to have come off" (p. 298). Since CA provides researcher with fine detailed conclusions on the given data set, the number of the participants is not regarded as a matter of concern. Furthermore, in this study, it is not intended to compare more than one instructor's teaching practices according to any pre-established criterion. The main aim of the analysis is to provide regularly occurring procedures accomplishing a particular type of action (i.e. resolution of understanding troubles hindering task performance) through drawing upon an EFL classroom data collection. The following section will illustrate how the data collection process is accomplished in this study.

3.3. Data Collection

For Conversation Analysts the basic starting point is studying naturally occurring talk to understand "the orientations, meanings, interpretations, understanding, etc. of the participants" (Schegloff, 1997, p. 166). To realize this, researchers need to collect data reflecting interaction that occurs regardless of the researcher, that is, the collected instances were not designed beforehand with any research purposes since such interactions cannot reflect the natural instances of how people actually perform in interaction. To this end, 31-hours video recording of an intermediate level EFL classroom interaction were collected over 5-week period (December-January in 2016/2017) (for the duration of the recordings, see Appendix 3: Data Collection Chart). The data set of this study consists of interaction that is considered to be much more adequate for drawing conclusions based on a conversation analytic classroom interaction research. Seedhouse (2004) regards the data involving

between 5 to 10 classroom hours as reasonable for making generalization drawing upon the recurrent phenomena. A week before the data collection process started, the researcher visited the classroom and gave necessary information about the research and emphasized the confidentiality of the recordings. After getting consent forms from each student, the recording process was initiated. However, recording naturally occurring talk is not always without difficulties. The act of the recording could affect how the interaction unfolds. Observation paradox is defined as "an alteration in the normal behavior of a subject under observation" (Alwright & Bailey, 1991, p. 71). In order to overcome this and to make the research less intrusive, the researcher did not involve in the recording process, and the cameras were placed on tripods.

Based on the one of the core principles of CA that "no order of detail in interaction can be dismissed priori as disorderly, accidental, or irrelevant (Heritage, 1984b, p. 241), three cameras were utilized in order to capture both what is said and how it is said, including the interactants' nonverbal actions. Focusing on both the students' troubles in understanding of instruction, and embodied actions deployed by the teacher to manage the troubles made necessary it to use multiple cameras. Using multiple cameras as put forward by Heath (2010) et al. "may be necessary to simultaneously record the activities of participants in different physical conditions" (p. 53). Video recordings enables to scrutinize the multimodal resources displayed by the participant (Mondada, 2013). Considering the role of nonverbal behaviors during communication in multiparty interactions, analysis of nonverbal conduct was not isolated. According to McNeil (1992), gestures have more than a facilitative role in meaning expression process; therefore, isolating multimodality from verbal interaction would be misleading. To this end, in line with the focus of this study which illustrates that the teacher's nonverbal features of interaction play a crucial role in co-constructing the meaning (i.e. instructions), one of the three cameras was positioned at the back of the classroom to capture the teacher's multimodal resources, while the other two cameras were focused on the students placed two different corners of the classroom. In the placement of cameras, close shots focusing on the participants are avoided; on the contrary, natural perspective on the scene was adopted. Since the voice quality of cameras are quite enough to catch the talk in great detail, there was no need to utilize any voice-recorder during data collection.

As ten Have (2007) claims, video recordings provide the researcher with "a wealth of contextual information that may be extremely helpful in the analysis of interactional talk –

as such, especially in complex settings with more than a few speakers" (p. 53). However, there is always a possibility for an aspect of the interaction that happens off-camera. Also, no matter how much detail is added to the transcriptions, they are not the same as the event recorded. These can be considered to be limitations of this study which will be presented in Chapter 5.

3.4. Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis was started in early 1960s and developed by Harvey Sacks and Emanuel Schegloff as a "naturalistic observational discipline that could deal with the details of social action rigorously, empirically and formally (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 289). It drew from Garfinkel's ethnomethodological perspective and also built on Goffman's (1964) sociological notions. As a field of sociology, ethnomethodology investigates "the common-sense resources, practices and procedures through which members of a society produce and recognize mutually intelligible objects, events and courses of actions" (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 2) and focuses on how interaction is performed by interactants, rather than the information being transmitted through interaction. The primary relationship between ethnomethodology and CA is based on the aim of studying social actions from the interactants' perspective; however, while ethnomethodology is used "to study any kind of human actions" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 13), CA centers upon "how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus on how sequences of action are generated (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 14).

The core principle that Sacks based on his research was that *there is order at all points in interaction*, which signals the systematic organization of talk in interaction. Indeed, it was quite a radical notion in the 1960s when the dominant linguistic view was "ordinary talk could not be the object of study for linguistics since it is too disordered" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 22). Chomskyan view treats mundane talk as defective and negatively affected by nonlinguistic items. However, considering the fundamental role of interaction in human social life, more importance has been given to the analysis of conversation as a research focus since the 1960s. Goffman (1964) stressed the need of studying interaction with its own system of structures instead of focusing only on linguistic properties of language. As an approach to study of social actions, CA was originally drawing on ordinary

conversation, yet it later on began to be applied to a wide range of social settings and contexts including courtroom (Atkinson, 1990; Atkinson & Drew, 1979), political speech (Atkinson, 1984; Heritage, 1988), medical interaction (Maynard & Heritage, 2005), news interview (Clayman, 1990; Greathbatch, 1990; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1990), Classroom Discourse (Markee, 2000; McHoul, 1978; Seedhouse, 2004; Waring, 2015), and "talk in interaction has become the accepted superordinate term to refer to the object of CA research" (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 4). CA commonly studies social actions achieved in interaction. Developing an emic perspective, analysts attempt to uncover "the underlying machinery" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 12) that enables participants to realize the organization and order of social actions. Differently from many other research methodologies that traditionally deduce analytic frameworks from established ideas, CA produces the ideas in more inductive manner. As Seedhouse (2004) defines, the main aim of CA is "to characterize the organization of the interaction by abstracting from exemplars of specimens of interaction and to uncover the emic logic underlying the organization" (p. 13).

There are four basic principles of CA (Seedhouse, 2005):

1. There is order at all points, the interaction is ordered and methodic.
2. Contributions to interaction are context-shaped and context-renewing.
3. No order of detail can be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental, or irrelevant.
4. Analysis is bottom-up and data driven.

The first principle points out the structural and systematic organization of interaction, which is opposed to 1960s' dominant linguistic view (Chomsky, 1965) claiming that naturally occurring talk is too arbitrary and defective to be studied on. The second principle is related to next-turn proof procedure (Wooffitt, 1990). Participants' contributions are only understood within sequential environments where they take place. Each conversational action both display understanding of prior contributions which requires analyses of "both the organization of action and of understanding in interaction" (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 288). It is the context that shapes and is shaped by what the participants say. Context influences what comes next and is influenced by each prior turn. This contextualization is, therefore, crucially important to understand the dynamic nature of talk. The third principle calls a transcription system with high granularity which includes more than the words that the interactants utter. It presents a convenient way to capture all details (including suprasegmentals and visual aspects) that enables the researcher to approach data in a robust way. In the current study, naturally occurring classroom interaction were obtained as the

primary data. Then, detailed transcripts were designed to make the data available for complex analysis through commonly accepted Jefferson transcription system (2004) (see Appendix 2). Lastly, in Conversation Analysis the data should not be examined with any theoretical assumptions or pretheroized understandings which predetermine what is relevant in the data. CA adopts data-driven approach in which the data lead the analysts to notice quite unremarkable but important features of a conversations. Imposing prior theories to the data is believed to obscure to recognize what is really relevant and interesting in interactions. Also, this approach avoids coding the data and creating categorizations of interactional actions according to predetermined criteria. Instead, CA adopts an emic perspective which enables to reveal actions and practices that participants use and orient to. In order to achieve emic approach, this study starts the analysis process with unmotivated looking at the data which was collected through video recordings and then transcribed with utmost details. Rather than imposing any external categories, participants' own meaning making practices were revealed and teacher's emergent interactional resources were documented. Unlike many traditional perspectives which merely focus on speaker, CA considers hearers as coparticipants who are needed to build conversational actions. Recipients of actions are also treated as active participants which makes the analysis highly interactive. As one of the key notions of CA, recipient design means that participants design their talk so as to be understood by an interlocutor (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979).

In consideration of these basic principles of CA methodology, in this study the analysis is based on naturally occurring classroom interactional data and adjacency pairs among interlocutors were focused on first. Secondly, how the students claim or demonstrate understanding to task instructions and how the teacher design next turn based on the students' contributions were scrutinized. Thirdly, through Jeffersonian transcription conventions (see Appendix 2) the data were transcribed. Lastly, the data were analyzed with no assumptions predefined in advance. The phenomenon under investigation emerged from the data through unmotivated looking.

In a conversation, turns do not appear independently, but they are designed to be clustered together, which is referred to as sequence organization that means a mechanism by which interactants make their utterances comprehensible. In this organization, "some actions make other actions relevant as next actions, which are in turn seen as being occasioned by the prior actions" (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 139). Schegloff and Sacks (1973) defines these paired

utterances as adjacency pairs which have some basic features: (i) they consist of two pairs; (ii) they are uttered by different speakers; (iii) they generally are placed next to each other. Although they are paired utterances involving first pair part (FPP), and second pair part (SPP), all adjacency pairs are not adjacent to each other. In some cases, other turns can between the two turns. While FPP initiates an action and makes a next action relevant, SPP responds to the first turn and completes the action initiated in the first turn. Adjacency pairs are building blocks of intersubjectivity since interactants display understanding to one another through these pairs, which enables researchers to track the progressivity in intersubjectivity.

Preference, turn-taking and repair are other elements of interactional organizations. In a conversation, participants have alternatives from which they choose a particular one to design their contributions. The concept of preference refers to the possible ways that participants can use to accomplish a conversation action. This is not related to liking or disliking something, but it involves affiliations and disaffiliations. For FPP of adjacency pairs, there are various alternative SPPs, that is, an invitation can be accepted or rejected; however, these two alternatives are performed differently (Pomerantz, 1984). Preferred responses are routinely delivered without delay or hesitation. Dispreferred actions are normally delayed in turns, and prefaced by discourse markers. They are often accomplished in a mitigated and indirect form and accounted for. As Heritage (1984) puts forward preferred actions are affiliative whereas dispreferred ones are disaffiliative.

Turn-taking is a rule-governed process and it is at the heart of CA (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). According to Sacks et al. (1974) decisions are enacted interactionally by participants. They are not preallocated rules for speaking change. A turn can be sentences, clauses or a single word. Turns are made up of turn constructional units (TCU). The possible completion of TCUs is projectable. A listener can project when a turn of talk will be completed and predict the point where a speaker change may occur. This point is called transition relevance place (TRP). Sacks et al. (1974) specify three levels of possible relevant completion of TCUS: grammatic completion, intonational completion action completion. At a TRP, a speaker-change can occur in two basic ways: (i) the current speaker can select the next speaker; (ii) a next speaker may self-select. The last element of interactional organization is repair which refers to "a set of practices designed for dealing with the types difficulties which emerge in talk" (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 208). It is a crucial mechanism that enables the

maintenance of intersubjectivity. There are four types of repair: (i) self-initiated self-repair, (ii) self-initiated other-repair, (iii) other-initiated self-repair, and (iv) other-initiated other-repair. The distinction is made with respect to who initiates and who makes the repair. Repairable or trouble can be anything that could hinder the flow of communication (problems of hearing / understanding / word selection, or grammatical error, etc.). As the types suggest a repair can be initiated and by the speaker of the repairable item or may be initiated by its recipient. Also, the trouble can be resolved by the speaker or recipient of the repairable. The following section will present the details concerning transcribing, construction of a collection and data analysis process.

3.5. Transcribing, Building a Collection, Data Analysis

In Conversation Analysis, the data should not be approached with any preexisting theoretical accounts; on the contrary, the analysis is made regardless of the prior intentions of the researcher. The basic data for conversation analysists is naturally occurring talk. It must first be recorded, and then transcribed. The transcriptions enable researchers "to see the transient and complex nature of talk captured in an easily usable, static format" (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 27). It should be noted that the transcription is not the data itself, in fact it is the starting point for analysis and it represents the primary data of the recorded interaction. Since in CA, no order of detail is considered irrelevant for understanding of the naturally occurring talk, transcription needs to be done with high granularity including not only what is said, but also how something is said, as well (ten Have, 2007). According to Hepburn and Bolden (2013) the transcripts must be "detailed enough to discover and describe orderly practices of social action in interaction" (p. 57).

Even though any prior assumption is avoided in CA, transcription can be shaped with the transcriber's perceptions of the interactional features. Thus, in order to avoid such possible researcher interference problems and to ensure the delivery of details, standard transcription systems (Hepburn & Bolden, 2013; Jefferson, 2004; Jenks, 2011) are employed. In this research, Jefferson's (2004) transcription convention which is commonly used was adopted to prevent the researcher effect and ensure the reliability of the research. Including the details such as pauses, overlaps, gestures, gaps, intonation, stress, pitch, elongations, pace of talk, researcher notes, screenshots, as Liddicoat (2011) states Jeffersonian convention system is

considered “a robust and useful tool for understanding the ways in which language is used in social interaction” (p. 29).

In the scope of this study, 31-hours classroom data were recorded, and thirteen extracts out of eighty-six were selected as the most representative ones in terms of documenting the phenomenon under investigation. They were transcribed by the researcher with Transana software which is a program used to analyze digital videos and audio data. The transcribed extracts were written in Courier New font type and detailed with sequential line numbers. At the beginning of each of the extracts, a code was given for their easy identification. Multimodal actions of interactants were also added on a separate line without assigning any line number and a + sign was used to specify the exact onset of the nonverbal behaviors. Furthermore, translation of Turkish utterances was also provided in the following lines in italics and bold.

As stated earlier in this chapter, the aim of this conversation analytic study is to identify the teacher’s interactional resources in order to resolve the students’ understanding troubles regarding task instruction. Through participant-relevant emic perspective and fine-detailed analysis, the orientation of the teacher to the first instruction in a revising turn is reflected. To this end, upon orthographic transcription of recorded data which is considered as the initial step, unmotivated looking procedure was carried out in line with the conversation analytic methodology (Liddicoat, 2011; Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell & Stivers, 2013; ten Have, 2007). Unlike many research methods, CA does not start with a hypothesis or a research question about the data. In order not to prioritize any predetermined understanding over the data, Psathas (1995) describes unmotivated looking as the first step for analysis for conversation analytic studies. It involves going through the data repeatedly and according to ten Have (2007) it enables the researcher to be open to discover any phenomenon emerged from the data, rather than searching for a predefined phenomenon.

During this preliminary analysis period, it was observed that the teacher’s interactional practices in her instruction revising turn have some similarities. Following this, the transcripts of selected extracts were detailed and expanded with the inclusion of visuals and nonverbal phenomena. After the whole data were examined and further instances which were regarded to have relation to the same point were found, building a collection process was initiated. 86 extracts were collected in total, and 13 of them were included in the analysis

chapter of this study. The following list will summarize the basic steps of transcribing and building collection process:

1. Watching the whole interactional data repeatedly
2. Starting the less detailed transcription with unmotivated looking
3. Determining an action sequence and initial decision of a phenomenon
4. Examining interactional organization of the action sequence (adjacency pairs, turn taking, and repair)
5. Expanding and detailing transcription with nonverbal actions
6. Going through the whole data repeatedly to find any further instance for decided phenomenon
7. Building the collection and starting data analysis process

In the data analysis chapter, each extract was given a code with a title. For example; Extract 1 has a heading of Extract 1: draw your feelings - 82/28.12.16. In this code, 82 indicates the number of extracts in the whole collection. 28 stands for the day of the month, 12 stands for the month (December) and lastly 16 represents the year (2016) that the data were collected. Coding of the extracts were considered to facilitate the identification of the extract for both researcher and the readers.

3.6. Validity of the Study

As Chaudron (1988) claims "any contemporary methodology for the analysis of classroom discourse must aim to achieve validity and reliability" (p. 23). In a broad term, validity refers to measuring what is originally aimed to be measured in the study and it is a crucial key to effective research. Validity could be addressed through credibility, depth and richness of the data. There are four major types of validity: internal, external, construct and ecological validity. Internal validity is defined as "the soundness, integrity and credibility of findings" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 255). It demonstrates that the analysis or findings can actually be sustained by the data. In qualitative research, researchers can achieve internal validity through meticulous recording and presenting the data in unbiased manner. At this point, CA's emic perspective assures the validity of the analysis, since "CA practioners cannot make any claim beyond what is demonstrated by interactional detail without destroying the emic perspective" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 255). In order to achieve validity, in this study

participant-perspective was adopted and details of interaction were scrutinized to develop any claim. External validity is about the extent to which the results could be generalized beyond the specific research context. A typical criticism of qualitative research is about their context-boundness which is considered to decrease its generalizability; however, as Peräkylä (1997) states the generalizability in CA "is closely depended on the type of conversation analytic research" (p. 214). Furthermore, sufficiently rich data which were meticulously detailed with in-depth analysis were provided to achieve external validity. From 86 extracts that were emerged from 31-hours classroom recording, the most representative ones (13 in total) were presented in this study. Thus, the size of the data is more than adequate to generalize the findings according to Seedhouse (2004) who claims that micro-analysis of five to ten hours recording of classroom interaction is considered to be reasonable to generalize findings. As Allwright and Bailey (1991) put forward "instead of claiming that whatever has been discovered must be true of people in general, a naturalistic enquirer will claim that whatever understanding has been gained by an in-depth study of a real-life classroom may illuminate issues for other people" (p. 51). However, in this study it cannot be claimed that the phenomenon on focus has commonalities with different classroom context, as this study is the first systematic investigation analysis the resolution students' understanding troubles regarding task instructions. In this study, the teacher's interactional resources and orientation to the students' understanding troubles is examined, so considering the rationally organized instructional discourse of EFL classroom it could be argued that this study can provide generalizable description of the interactional organization of the phenomenon.

Ecological validity, on the other hand, is related to giving "accurate portrayals of the realities of social situations in their own terms, in their natural or conventional settings" (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 138). It is fundamental to provide analytic findings which were not isolated and manipulated by the researcher. Conversation Analysis methodology tends to be strong to address this type of validity since researchers record naturally occurring talk as actually happening in its original setting. Also, to describe how interactants realize social actions in and through interaction, conversation analysis adopts an emic perspective which enables the researcher to provide justification by reference to the same interactional organization which the interactants are using.

The last type is construct validity which is about clarifying what the researcher puts forward with the use of constructs. It is important that the constructs which the analysts use be identical to that is generally accepted to be the construct (Cohen et al., 2007). For assuring this validity in this study, the organizations that participants orient to (Turn Constructional Unit) during interaction were scrutinized in terms of adjacency pairs, turn-taking and repair organization. TCU is "interactants' constructs rather than analysist's construct" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 257), so they reflect the participants' orientations that they actually experience.

3.7. Reliability of the Study

In qualitative and quantitative research, what reliability refers to differs. As Peräkylä (2004) puts forward "the specific techniques of securing reliability and validity in different types and qualitative research are not the same" (p. 17). In qualitative research, as Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) claim that it "can be regarded as a fit between what the researcher record as data and what actually occurs in the natural setting that is being researched" (p. 119). It is used as a synonym for credibility, dependability and trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Qualitative reliability also indicates that the researcher's approach is "consistent across different researchers" (Gibbs, 2007). Conversation analysis assures this fit and consistency with its emic perspective and research methodology.

Peräkylä (1997) defines key elements of reliability in conversation analytic methodology: (i) selection of what is recorded; (ii) the technical quality of recordings; and (iii) the adequacy of transcripts (as cited in Seedhouse, 2004, p. 254). Since CA is a data-driven approach which adopts a participant perspective, the researcher recorded the data with no predefined research focus and prior intentions. In addition, as stated earlier (see Validity of the Study) the reliability of the present study was raised by collecting 31-hours of classroom interaction data over 5 weeks. The second factor, technical quality of recordings is a crucial precondition for transcription process. It was ensured through use of three digital cameras placed on tripods. Prior to data collection, the researcher visited the classroom and becomes familiar with the setting in order to position the cameras at the best place to capture all details of interaction. During recordings, the researcher will not interfere the classroom interaction by holding a non-participant role. While two of the cameras facing at the students were positioned at the two corners of the classroom, the other one was placed at the back of the

classroom to catch the teacher's talk and multimodal actions. Since the voice quality was considered to be sufficient, no audio recorder was utilized during data collection process. Adequacy of transcript, on the other hand, was ensured by adopting a commonly used standardized transcription system (Jefferson, 2004, see Appendix 2). Furthermore, some of the extracts were presented in four data-sessions (22 December 2016, 6 April 2017, 6 December 2017, 14 March 2018) at Hacettepe University Micro Analytic Network (HUMAN) Research Centre to check the transcripts to confirm that they do not involve obvious mistakes. The transcriptions of some of the extracts also were examined in feedback sessions held by one of the leading members of the research group. Moreover, in order to raise the reliability and validity, in addition to data sessions, the researcher attended a master course (Conversation Analysis and Foreign Language Education) both in the fall and spring semesters of the 2015-2016 academic year. Another opportunity for validation of academic findings is conference presentations. The primary findings of the study were presented at three different conferences (Badem, 2018; Badem & Keleş, 2017). The following section is dedicated to how ethical issues about the research were handled.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

Conversation Analysis methodology uses audio and video recordings of naturally occurring talk as the data source, therefore it brings a number of ethical issues which need to be addressed before and after data collection process. Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (1993) defines ethics as "conforming to the strands of conduct of a given profession or group" (p. 61). In the planning phase of the research, researchers should evaluate the ethical concerns and correspondingly protect the right of human participants. Data obtained from participants during the course of an investigation should be confidential unless agreed upon in advance.

Whatever the source of the data is, researchers should always consider the issue of consent. According to ten Have (1999), consent issue should be in researchers' agenda, and the rights of the participants should be taken into consideration. He specifies these rights as:

> (i)to be recorded or to give access to the situation for recording purposes;
> (ii)to grant permission to use the recording for research purposes;
> (iii)public display or publication of the recordings in one form or another (p.61).

Before the data collection process, in this research the researcher contacted the school administration and received permission for video-recording in one of the EFL classrooms. Both the teacher and the students were informed about the research aim, duration, and the

data collection process of the research. They were also informed that the purpose of this research is not to evaluate their language skills and abilities but to investigate naturally occurring talk between them and the teacher. Then, before data recording began, the students were given a consent form for their interaction to be a subject of research. According to Heath et al. (2010) "by providing participants with an informed sheet about the research and then, they are asked to sign a form confirming their permission and participation" (p. 17). The consent forms involve the participants' rights and information about research details including that the recordings will be in video form, they are only used for research purposes and could be shared only with researchers and professionals, the participants have a right to withdraw from the research at any point, and their anonymity will be kept and assured. The participants accepted all conditions and they all signed the consent forms. In order to preserve their anonymity, the participants were given pseudonyms. The first three letters of their pseudonyms were used to indicate them in the transcripts. Their names were abbreviated as follows: Bey, Yap, Pır, Meh, Der, Fev, Sev, Ale, Nur, Sel, Mur, Alp, Tül, Tan, and Sah. Also, in the transcripts Tea is used to represent the teacher.

3.9. Conclusion

This chapter has described the methodological details of the present study. First of all, the purpose of the thesis and the research questions were introduced. Secondly, research context and participants were presented. In 3.3. the data collection process was illustrated, which was followed by the research methodology adopted in this study, Conversation Analysis. After the detailed description of CA and justification with regard to the adoption of CA as a research methodology, the transcription convention used in this study was presented in 3.5. as well as constructing collection and the information about data analysis procedure. What followed was the validity and reliability of the study. The chapter was concluded with the ethical issues taken into consideration.

. CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter will present extract analyses and findings which address the research questions given in Chapter 1 and 3. Based on the theoretical underpinnings of Conversation Analysis and drawing on detailed transcripts, micro-analysis of the most representative 13 extracts out of 86 will be given. The analyses of these extracts will uncover (i) sequential organization of understanding troubles coming out related to task instructions, which are orally delivered by the teacher, and their resolutions; (ii) the ways how understanding troubles are delivered; (iii) how the teacher detects the troubles; and (iv) the interactional resources employed by the teacher in order to resolve the troubles and restore understanding. It will also be revealed that upon the teacher's interactional practices, the students in some cases claim or demonstrate understanding through various ways. Furthermore, findings of extracts will illustrate that demonstration of non-understanding is not the mere way for the teacher to interpret the troubles. Since the interactional resources and the ways through which the teacher detects the understanding troubles are mostly used in combination, it is not possible to separate the phenomena into sections, therefore this chapter is organized in one main body. However, each extract will be presented under extract numbers to increase followability. It should also be noted that the extracts given in this chapter will not follow a chronological order since the present study does not intent to present a development in instruction giving practices or understanding in time. The chapter will be concluded with the presentation of general finding in 4.14.

The interactional data were transcribed according to Jeffersonian Transcription Conventions (see Appendix 2). It is well suited for the detailed analysis of conversation and is accepted

to be “a robust and useful tool for understanding the ways in which language is used in social interaction” (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 29). It enables researchers to transfer talk into written forms through indicating pauses, elongations, pitch, stress, intonation, overlaps, cut-offs, etc. In this study, non-verbal elements such as gestures has been included in the transcripts with + sign.

4.1. Extract 1

Extract 1 given below comes from the 11th week of the semester. It means that interaction takes place towards the end of the term. Before the extract starts, the class has been working on a reading exercise for about twenty-five minutes. It should be noted that as a classroom routine, towards the end of the lesson, the teacher makes the students listen to a song, and students sing the song by following the lyrics given beforehand. In addition, sometimes they have fill in the blanks exercise accompanied by listening. However, in this extract they have another task which they are not familiar with. The extract includes 3 segments. Between the first and the second segment there are 8 omitted lines (see Appendix 4). In the omitted lines, Tea explains how big the empty papers should be, therefore the interaction is considered to be irrelevant to the analyzed phenomenon within the scope of this thesis and these lines are not included in the extract below. Segment 3 follows Segment 2 without any deduction.

Extract 1: draw your feelings - (82/28.12.16) (Segment 1)

1	Tea:	how much time do we have i guess we have e[nough
2	Meh:	[less than twenty=
3	Tea:	=less than↑
		+ leans towards the students
4	Meh:	twenty
5	Tea:	less than twenty so >that it's enough< (0.2) .hh so↑ (.) six
6		days we will listen to but before listening i will er: make
7		another exercise with you
8		(0.5)
9	Tea:	↑get a piece of empty paper

The extract starts with Tea’s wh question directed to whole class to check the time for the upcoming activity (`how much time do we have`). In line 2, Meh gives an answer (`[less`

than twenty=) in an overlapping fashion with the teacher's last utterance (e[nough) in the previous turn. It is latched with the teacher's display of a hearing by repeating the first part of Meh's utterance that can also be heard as a request for turn completion due to the turn final rising intonation in line 3. It is also accompanied by her bodily orientation as she leans towards the students. Following Meh's response in line 4, repeating the student's utterance, Tea acknowledges the student's turn and indicates that twenty minutes is enough for the next activity in line 5. With a transition marker (so↑) and a rising intonation in word final position, she marks a transition to the next action and announces what they are going to do (six days we will listen to). Her formulation of informing (Gardner & Mushin, 2013, 2017; Heritage, 1984; Robinson, 2009; Sidnell, 2012) indicates a joint activity due to use of the first person plural pronoun (we will listen to). In line 6, beginning with a contrastive marker (but) followed by a sequential marker (before) she states that there will be another exercise first (i will er: make another exercise with you). After 0.5 seconds of silence she initiates the instruction with a rising intonation in turn-initial position and with an emphasis on the word *empty* (↑get a piece of empty paper). In the omitted lines of the extract, the students get their empty papers, and after they get ready, Tea goes on with providing the rest part of the instruction.

Extract 1: draw your feelings - (82/28.12.16) (Segment 2)

18 Tea: okay (0.2) ↑so (0.4) guys (0.4) i >will make you listen to< a
19 music (.) and please <try to: (0.4) dra:w or write anything
+ Meh talks to Mur
20 that you: feel or> that the song makes you feel (0.2) okay↑
21 (0.9)
22 Tea: ↑fine↓ (0.4) did you understand >what to do<=
23 Meh: =n[o
+ shakes his head laterally
24 Pır: [h[um hum
25 Ale: [ye[s
26 Meh: [i (.) [didn't listening
27 Tea: [>okay< ↑mehmet thank you very much (.) at least
28 someone says no >teacher i don't understand<
+ walks towards to Meh + raises her hand and stretches to Meh
29 Meh: because i didn't listen[ing you
+ stands up + gives five to Tea
30 Ss: [ehe he[he
31 Meh: [give me a five [ehe heh
32 Tea: [okay↓=
33 Ss: =eheh[ehe
34 Tea: [let's >give me another five< (.) honesty needs gift
+ Tea and Meh give five
35 Alp: =hocam bana da verin=
36 ***teacher give me too***
+ raises his hand
37 Ss: =eheh heh eh[eh

38 Tea: [okay (0.4) one more (0.2) okay (0.5) it's strange
39 but er: there is something er: (0.2) >motivated about< high
+ comes to the center of the classroom
40 five i guess so >people feel motivated< i feel >motivated< too
41 (0.4) .hh so↑ let's do it like tha:t u:hm: <you will listen to
42 the song and you will try to: dra:w o:r write about how the
43 song (.) make you feel> (0.3) okay↑ (.) this is [all
+ folds her hand
44 Meh: [huh (0.3)

The second part of the extract begins with a sequence closing third (okay) followed by a transition marker (↑so) marked with a rising intonation in initial position. Seedhouse (2008) argues that through effective use of discourse markers and remarkable intonation, experienced teachers signal transitions and mark different stages of the instructions. Here Tea initiates the instruction with a rising intonation which is followed by 0.4 seconds of silence. This projects a transition to the next activity. In line 18, she gives the instruction with bold imperatives (i will make you listen), which could be considered as a marker implying the teacher's unequal power in the classroom (Markee, 2015). In lines 20 and 22, she produces multiple understanding checks (okay↑), (fine↓ (0.4) did you understand >what to do<=) which are immediately followed by Meh's negative polarity marker (=n[o) accompanied by a lateral headshake to show his display of non-understanding. It is worth remarking that his display of non-understanding changes the participation framework. Considering that this is a procedural context (Seedhouse, 2004) and the teacher holds the floor most of the time, there is limited speaker change between the students and the teacher. Although it normatively signals a teacher monologue (Seedhouse, 2008), starting from line 23, the interaction turns into a multiparty activity (St. John & Cromdal, 2016) which is occasioned by the student's response showing non-understanding. In line 26, Meh attributes his non-understanding to not listening to the teacher's instruction. In the subsequent lines the teacher firstly values his participation (thank you very much). Then, Tea keeps on evaluating his response with high five which functions as a positive feedback here. After stating motivational role of giving high five (lines 38-40), Tea starts reformulating the instruction and makes her reformulation initiation explicit to the students by deploying a transition marker (so↑) marked with rising intonation (Markee, 2015; Seedhouse, 2008). In the next three lines, she issues the instruction again but this time in a slower pace than the surrounding talk and with emphasis on action verbs (you will try to: dra:w o:r write about how the song (.) make you feel). Based on the change in the pace of her talk and stressed words that could be considered as key for the activity achievement (Waring & Hruska, 2012), it can be claimed that the teacher makes some simplification on her reformulation of the instruction. In line 44, Meh claims understanding (Koole, 2010; Sacks, 1992) by producing a change of state token (huh) (Heritage, 1984) in an overlapping fashion with Tea's explicit sequence closer in the previous line (that' all).

Extract 1: draw your feelings - (82/28.12.16) (Segment 3)

45	Tea:	just fo- >concentrate on the so:ng and< (.) whenever you >feel
46		about the song< (.) <try to (0.4) write it down or draw it
47		down> (0.4) okay↑
48		(1.1)
49	Tea:	>clear this ↑time<
		+ leans toward the students
50	Meh:	y[es
51	Yap:	[yeah=
52	Tea:	=o[kay
53	Meh:	[but we will not er: fill in the blanks
54	Yap:	ehe [heh
55	Mur:	[oğlum napı[yon sen
		bro what are you doing
56	Tea:	[no: there is <↑nothing> related to do[ing
		+ spread her arms
57	Meh:	[hu:
58	Tea:	th[is
59	Mur:	[yok
		nope
60	Meh:	er: we- will er: we: l[isten
		+ points at a part of the paper on his desk
		+ Tea clicks her tongue
61	Tea:	[no exercise yeap=
62	Meh:	=hu[m:
63	Tea:	[no lyrics exercise (.) okay↓
64	Meh:	bunlar
		these
		+ points at the sheet on his desk and look at Mur
65	Mur:	tamam onu yapmıcaz
		okay we wont't do it
66	Tea:	here we go

In line 45, Tea makes an addition to the instruction regarding how to accomplish the task (`concentrate on`) with a same turn self-initiation self-repair (`just fo- >concentrate on the so:ng`) (Schegloff, 1997; Wong & Waring, 2010). Before proceeding to the ongoing utterance, she replaces the initial utterance with a new word after producing a cut-off (`fo-`). In addition, this time she produces a linguistically more simplified version of the instruction (`whenever you feel about the song`), instead of *how the song makes you*

feel. Following her understanding check marked suprasegmentally in line 49 (>clear this ↑time<>), Meh and Yap claim understanding (Koole, 2010; Sacks, 1992) with confirmation tokens (yes; yeah). In line 53, Meh does not only claim understanding but also clearly explicates his potential understanding by stating that they will not fill in the blanks ([but we will not er: fill in the blanks). Thus, he adds a new information that does not exist in the teacher's instruction. Although his utterance is not finalized with a rising intonation as in the formulation of question, it makes a response relevant. The following lines make it clear that it is treated as a trouble by coparticipant. It is oriented to with laughter by some of the students in the classroom as well as with the teacher's repair in line 56. Uttering a disagreement marker in turn initial position (no:) Tea employs a third position repair starting with an elongated repair-initiating component to Meh's potential understanding. It should be noted that as one of the interactional resources for doing meaning negotiation (Wong & Waring, 2010), third-position repair aims to avoid or correct potential misunderstandings (Schegloff, 1987b, 1992b). In her repair initiation turn, Tea emphasizes the word *nothing* (<↑nothing>) which is marked at suprasegmental level and accompanied by her nonverbal action in line 56. She spreads her arms to opposite sides, which is overlapped with Meh's elongated change of state token (hu:) (Heritage, 1987) in line 57. It is followed with another student's (Mur) disagreement marker (nope) in line 59. In line 60, Meh starts his turn with an elongated hesitation marker (er:). The formulation of this turn is similar to his previous turn in line 53, both of which display his potential understanding. In the next line, Tea confirms (no exercise) what Meh stated in line 60, then provides a confirmation token (yeap). In line 62, Meh shows acknowledgement (hu[m:) which is followed by teacher's repetition of her previous turn ([no lyrics exercise) and a turn closing marker (okay). Although Meh claims understanding in line 62, he requests clarification from his peer with a Turkish word (translation: these) accompanied by his orientation to the classroom material by pointing at the sheets on his desk in line 64, which is followed by Mur's repair in Turkish (translation: okay we wont't do it**)** in line 65**.** The extract ends with teacher's activity initiation (here we go).

Based on the close examination of this extract, it can be observed that troubles in understanding makes the teacher's deployment of a number of interactional resources to resolve the troubles. First of all, in the first segment of the extract, it is clearly seen that the

teacher initiates a procedural informing (Gardner & Mushin, 2017) without establishing mutual gaze with the students, as made observable when Meh claims non-understanding due to his not listening to the teacher. During the teacher's informing from line 1 to 4, Meh talks to the student next to him, which is the reason for the absence to mutual orientation as problematized by the teacher. Secondly, during the delivery of the reformulated instruction, Tea uses grammatically simplified forms. Therefore, it can be claimed that students' displays of non-understanding is oriented to by the teacher with simplification work. For example, in the first instruction-giving turn, she says *I'll make you listen* but in line 41 it changes into *you will listen,* thus she omits *make* and *the*. Another example of this simplification is the utterance *how the song makes you feel*. It gives place to *whenever you feel about the song*, which is quite less complex. Furthermore, she delivers the reformulated instructions in a slower pace and with elongated utterances to make them clearer for the students. This could be considered another example of the simplification work. She also makes an addition in line 45 (`concentrate on`) which is another resource that the teacher employs in order to ensure the students' understanding of the meaning (i.e. the instruction) in this extract.

As the teacher also observably is committed to make sure that everyone in the classroom understands the instruction and she engages in further meaning negotiation work after three students have already deployed some understanding tokens (i.e. hum hum, yes, yeah). Another interesting finding is the teacher's promotion of the displays of non-understanding in the classroom. Her preference is evident in (1) her bodily action with the high five with the students who claims non-understanding and (2) her utterance (`thank you very much, at least someone says no teacher i don't understand`) in lines 27 and 28 following Meh' displaying non-understanding in line 26. Showing her preference in such an explicit way, she also sets out to establish a classroom interactional norm of telling non-understanding. In brief, it is clearly observed that after students' claims of non-understanding, the teacher explicitly orients to them and engages in reformulation work. However, it is not conducive to make any claims regarding the effectiveness of the teacher's simplification of instruction for restoring understanding because even in the last line of the extract Meh still seeks for clarification and displays his potential understanding to a peer. Nevertheless, the evidence points to the teacher's interactional competence in locating non-understanding and trying to restore intersubjectivity with the deployment of diverse

interactional resources including reformulation/revisiting the instruction, omitting potentially complex grammatical items, repetitive understanding checks, embodied actions.

4.2. Extract 2

Extract 2 that follows presents interaction from 14th week of the semester and it lasts 1.09 minutes. Prior to the extract, the students completed a group discussion activity that they had engaged in for almost twenty minutes. Unlike the previous extract in which the teacher makes the meaning clear mostly by simplifying linguistic structures through reformulation, Extract 2 illustrates nonverbal resources simultaneously deployed in third-position repair by the teacher in order to resolve the understanding troubles with regard to the instruction. In this example, the teacher asks the students to describe themselves according to their listening performance during the previous group discussion activity.

Extract 2: efficient listener - (67/19.12.16)

1	Tea:	so guys (.) ladies and gentlemen (0.4) think about your
2		previous group discussion (0.2) because you are la:rge
3		groups actually and you had a discussion for more than (0.2)
4		fifteen minutes twenty or something that was really good
5		(0.4) in your group discussion (0.4) please think about your
6		own position (0.2) <↑how much <u>effi</u>cient (.) <u>listener</u> (0.3)
7		you: could be> level one↑ two↑ (.) or three ↑which one
8	Mur:	level one
9	Tea:	level one=
10	Ale:	=o:h eheh
11		(3.2)
12	Tea:	think about your er: personal you know (0.4) profile as a
13		listener in the previous group discussion how much (0.2)
14		efficient listener
15	Tül:	second one
16	Tea:	second one=
17	Tül:	=because er: meaning of <u>words</u> (0.2) confusing
18	Tea:	make you confuse huhu okay good one >you are one< all of
19		you↑ (0.2) that means you don't listen to each other
		+ points at Mur
20	Ale:	heh heh heh
21	Mur:	level one mı (.) good listener
		is it level one

22 Tea: >no no< i mean oh okay top one
+ points upward
23 Mur: huhu
24 Tea: you are mentioned (.) okay fine i mean stage one two three
+ raising her hand step by step
25 level okay level on[e
+ points at Mur's group
26 Mur: [huhu
27 Tea: level two
+ points Tül's group
28 Tül: °yes°
29 Tea: huhu
(6.2)
30 Tea: ↑how much efficient listeners (.) you think you were in
31 previous
+ points at the back group and goes towards them
32 Bey: i thi:nk >except< (0.2) heh £derya£
33 Tea: £derya£ eheh heh she is like with my e:r yes i'm
34 highlighting a person
35 Bey: a:nd other were level one
36 Tea: okay level one (0.3) what is >wrong with the derya< come o:n
37 >he is the only boy< in the group and he did it fast
38 Bey: £that's why£ they don't like me eheh heh

In the first line of the extract, the teacher utters a transition maker (so) which points to passing to an upcoming task. Then, by using address terms (ladies and gentlemen) and for 0.4 seconds of wait time, she gathers the students' attention. After she summarizes what they have done in the previous activity, in lines 5 and 6 she gives her instruction and formulates a question that is delivered in a slower pace and with an emphasis on the words *efficient* and *listener*. However, a trouble in the formulation of the question stands out. It may have developed out of the first language influence (Ellis, 1994; Luk & Shirai, 2009; Mitchell & Myles, 2004;) since the word order of the question is similar to Turkish language (L1) word order. In the same turn, the teacher provides levels (level one↑ two↑ (.) or three↑) so as the students to describe their performance in the previous listening activity. In line 8, it is followed by Mur's contribution. In the next turn, Tea echoes Mur's

response which is latched with Ale's laughter after an elongated surprise marker (o:h). After 3.2 seconds of silence Tea paraphrases her instruction and directs the same question to the students in order to increase participation (think about your er: personal you know (0.4) profile as a listener in the previous group discussion how much (0.2) efficient listener). This time the teacher does not produce a full form construction and she pauses for 0.2 seconds between *how much* and *efficient* in line 13. Another thing that makes Tea's expectation of more involvement evident is her attempt to establish mutual gaze with the students while she utters the instruction again. In line 15, Tül self-selects herself as the next speaker and provides a response, which is also followed by teacher echo. Tea displays confirmation through repetition of the student's turn. In the subsequent line, Tül provides elaboration on her response in her previous turn by pointing the complexity of the words as the reason for her listening performance. In line 18, the teacher shapes learner contribution (make you confuse) (Walsh, 2006, 2011) by paraphrasing the students previous talk. Then, she utters a confirmation token (hu hu) followed by an acknowledgement token (okay). It should also be noted that the student's further explanation on her previous turn receives an explicit positive feedback (Waring, 2013) (good one) from the teacher.

Following a short pause during which she establishes mutual gaze with Mur and pointing at him, in line 19 Tea repeats the student contribution he provides in line 8 with a faster pace and asks the other students if they are all level one with a turn final rising intonation. Then, she elaborates on her question to clarify the meaning which is marked with *that means* in transition relevance place after a slight pause. It triggers laughter from Ale in line 20, which may have resulted from the teacher's misunderstanding of what Mur refers to with level one. In line 21, Mur's question (level one mı) (translation: is it level one) and his repair regarding what he refers to with level one in the next turn makes the trouble salient. What happens next is a typical example of third-position repair employed by the teacher. Based on the previous student turn manifesting the understanding trouble, in line 22, through a repair-initiation component (Schegloff, 1992b) (>no no no<) delivered with an increased pace and with a repair proper (i mean) she undertakes repair work. Later, in the same turn producing a change of state token (oh) (Heritage, 1984) and an acknowledgment token (okay) Tea displays her understanding and also by reformulating the student's turn accompanied with her bodily action (she points upward) she demonstrates understanding

with regard to the referent. It should be noted here that third-position repair commonly deals with two kinds of problems: incorrect reference and incorrect relevant next action (Schegloff, 1987b; 1992b). The present repair action is an example of misunderstanding of referents. Tea treats level one pointing to the least efficient listener, which is observable with her interpretation in line 19 (`that means you don't listen to each other`). Therefore, it can be claimed here that the trouble is stemmed from Tea's lack of specification of the levels and their referents in her instruction at the beginning.

In line 23, Mur confirms the teacher with the token *hu hu* which is overlapped with the teacher's turn in the next line where she goes on her repair with a repair initiation marker (*i mean*) (Schegloff, 1987b, 1992b). The marker *I mean* commonly signals a forthcoming repair sequence (Mauranen, 2010; see Schiffren, 1987 for other uses of the marker). This repair practice is produced differently compared to the other repair examples in this extract as well as the previous one. It is produced by the coordinated use of verbal explanation and hand movement. In other words, the teacher describes each stage more specifically through the use of her bodily action. In line 26, Mur utters a confirmation token (`huhu)` followed by Tea's repetition of Tül's response, which makes her understanding evident. After quite a long pause, in line 30, Tea signals speaker change by asking other students. The lines between 32 and 38 indicate that the understanding problem is resolved and meaning-and-fluency context (Seedhouse, 2004) is restored.

4.3. Extract 3

Extract 3 comes from the 16th week of the term. The interaction that will be analyzed occurs almost at the beginning of the recording. The unit of the coursebook is court and crime. The following extract is significant in two points. First, it illustrates a student contribution subsequently expanded with the teacher's elaboration on the procedure of the task. Secondly, as different from the previous two fragments which demonstrated the use of third-position repair with embodied actions, this extract shows how the teacher draws upon the classroom material to resolve the students' understanding trouble in her reformulation turn. Receiving no correct answer from the students in answer-elicitation phase, the teacher notices the general misunderstanding and engages in elaboration on the original instruction.

Extract 3 includes two segments. Segment 1 displays the teacher's instruction giving phase which also includes a student contribution. Segment 2, on the other hand, explicates the eliciting answer which involves the teacher's reformulation of the instruction by deploying various interactional resources. Before Segment 1, the class has been working on three different listening extracts. The teacher announces that they have 2 different exercises related to the recordings. The first one is filling in the blank exercise that requires the students to complete the sentences given in the coursebook with the missing parts, while the second one is a matching exercise. The students are expected to match the sentences they listen to with the appropriate categories. The categories are prosecution, defense, prosecution or defense, and jury respectively. Prior to the extract the students have just completed listening to the recordings. It starts with the teacher's time allocation to the matching exercise.

Extract 3: both sides - 32/02.01.17 (Segment 1)

1	Tea:	okay (0.3) now one minute to you to match them with the: (.)
2		part c: (0.3) prosecution↑ (.) defense↑ (.) prosecution or the
3		defense↑ or the jury >which expression< could be u:sed in
4		which part of the case or the court
5	Sel:	hocam er: the jury er was sometimes er: defending and er
		teacher
		+ raises his hand + points at the board
6		sometimes against the (0.3) er case
7	Tea:	huhu: something can be both you say at the same [time
8	Sel:	[both
9	Tea:	exactly huhu that's why you know we are doing it >not a kind
		+ nods her head
10		a< black and white exercise
11	Sel:	°yeah°
12	Tea:	okay↓

In line 1 after allocating one minute to the students for matching the sentences with the categories (now one minute to you), Tea issues the instruction of the exercise and utters each category distinctively by waiting for a micro moment between them in lines 2 and 3 (match them with the: (.) part c: (0.3) prosecution↑ (.) defense↑ (.) prosecution or the defense↑ and jury). She ends her turn with the task

question (>which expression< could be u:sed in which part of the case or the court). In line 5, Sel takes the turn with an address term (teacher) accompanied by his hand raising and claims that jury could both defend and be against the case. In the subsequent turn, the teacher produces an elongated acknowledgement token (hu hu:) followed by reformulation of Sel's contribution (something can be both you say at the same [time). Instead of simply accepting Sel's contribution, Tea paraphrases it with an emphasis on the word *both* in the same line. It could be argued that in this case since Tea accepts Sel's contribution, by reformulating and elaborating it, she may want to make his contribution available and more comprehensible for the rest of the classroom (Walsh, 2006).

In line 8, Sel with a rising intonation in turn initial position repeats the word *both* (Svenning, 2004) that is produced with an emphasis by Tea in the previous turn, which displays his recognition (Sacks, 1992). According to Mortensen (2011), students' repeating teachers' highlighted words in the prior turn shows their acknowledgement of what the teacher explicates. In the following line, Sel's turn is acknowledged both bodily (nodding) and with a strong agreement token (exactly) by Tea. She also produces another acknowledgement token (huhu) and provides an account for the activity (that's why you know we are doing it >not a kind a< black and white exercise) in lines 9 and 10. In line 11, Sel utters another acknowledgement token in a soft voice (°yeah°) and the first part of the extract ends with Tea's sequence-closing third (okay↓) (Schegloff, 2007) in line 12. What happens between lines 5 and 12 exemplifies how the typical interactional organization of procedural context (Seedhouse, 2004), which is associated with one single teacher turn, can vary with a student contribution regarding the task content.

Extract 3: both sides - 32/02.01.17 (Segment 2)

34 Tea: perfect thank you very much (0.2) and the (0.2) c this time

35 prosecution or the defense

36 (0.8)

37 Sel: er eight

38 Tea: we choose numbers but two of these numbers (.) one from

+ points at one direction with one of her hands

39 the prosecution area one from the defense area (.) can be used

+ points at another direction with her other hand

40 (0.2) bo:th you know prosecution or the defense

+ brings her hands together

41 (1.1)

+ Tea looks around the students

42 Sel: eight and nine

43 (0.5)

44 Bey: er <one a:nd>

45 (0.8)

46 Bey: [er:

47 Tea: [from a and b actually these expressions (.) look at >you know<

48 those one from number one to number six

49 (0.7)

50 Tea: you will just notice that two of them (0.2) can be use:d (0.2)

51 in b[oth

52 Pır: [one and four=

53 Tea: =one and four (.) ↑exactly number ↑one and number fou[r

+ looks at Pır

54 Bey: [hu:=

55 Tea: =can be used for (.) both situation

56 Sel: huh yes

57 Tea: okay >read them please one more time you'll understand me<

58 better

59 (3.5)

+ the students and Tea look at the book

60 oka:y↑ (0.3) both sides >can make up a< sentence like that
61 that's why one and four (0.2) a:nd (.) for the part d↑ jury (.)
62 which sentences are belonging to the jury part

22 lines (including Tea's eliciting the answers of the first and the second category from the students) between Segment 1 and Segment 2 are omitted (see Appendix 5). Although the participants engage in interaction to complete the activity in teacher-fronted sequences, the revisiting of the instruction only arrives 22 lines later, which also explains the reasons for the omitted lines At the beginning of the second part, after a student's candidate response Tea produces explicit positive assessment (Waring, 2013) which is provided after preferred responses (Pomerantz, 1984; Schegloff, 2007) as the third-turn of the IRF structure (McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Tea announces the transition to the c part (`and the (0.2) c this time`) and names the part (prosecution or the defense). After 0.8 second of silence in line 37, Meh self-selects himself as the next speaker and gives a candidate response (`eight`) with a hesitation marker (`er`) in turn initial position. His candidate response displays his non-understanding of the instruction, since correct answer requires two different numbers from each category; however, Meh's response includes one number from one of the categories. It should be noted that in line 38, Tea attributes this response to student's misunderstanding and initiates a repair. She explains that one of the numbers is chosen from the prosecution category and the other is from the defense category from line 38 to 41. Her verbal explanation is simultaneously embodied by her pointing gesture directed to opposite sides while she indicates the different categories in the following lines. In line 40, she again emphasizes the word *both* and after a discourse marker (`you know`) (Schiffrin, 1978) she utters the category (`prosecution or the defense`). Completing her turn, Tea looks around to establish mutual eye gaze with a student during 1.1 seconds. It is followed by Meh's nominating himself as the next speaker and providing another candidate answer (`eight and nine`), which includes two different numbers this time. Then, in line 44 Bey also self-selects herself and gives another candidate answer (`er <one a:nd>`). Drawing upon lines 42 and 44, it could be claimed that with her verbal explanations accompanied with her multimodal actions, Tea manages to receive learner-response that includes two different numbers. Bey's candidate response is marked with a hesitation marker at the beginning of the turn (`er`). Also, providing answer in a slower pace

and pausing 0.8 second of silence followed by another elongated hesitation marker make her uncertainty evident. Thereupon in line 47, Tea starts to revise her instruction again in an overlapping fashion with Bey's hesitation marker in the previous turn. This time Tea orients to the shared classroom material (look at >you know< those one from number one to number six) in lines 47 and 48 in order to manage understanding trouble. Furthermore, after 0.7 second of silence in an extended turn in lines 50 and 51, Tea goes on with the revised instruction.

In line 52, another student (Pır) provides a candidate answer which overlaps with Tea's last word in line 51. It is latched with Tea's immediate repetition of candidate answer in the next line. After a micro pause, Tea provides explicit positive assessment (↑exactly) (Waring, 2013) delivered with an emphasis and marked suprasegmentally and repeats the student's turn again, which signals her acceptance of the answer. Bey, in the following line, provides an elongated change of state token (hu:) (Heritage, 1984) which is latched by Tea's further explanation including an emphasis on the word *both*. In line 56, Meh claims understanding with an acknowledgement token (yes) (Koole, 2010; Sacks, 1992) preceded by a change of state token (huh) (Heritage, 1984). In line 57, after producing a sequence closing third (okay) (Schegloff, 2007), this time Tea directs the students to read the instruction written on the book (read them please one more time). Also, upon uttering an understanding check (oka:y↑) accompanied by her gaze at the students, she reformulates the written instruction again (both sides >can make up a< sentence like that) with an emphasis on the word *both* which could be considered as the key word for activity accomplishment. The extract ends with Tea's explanation with giving an account for the correct answers (that's why one and four) and transition to the questions of next category (for the part d↑ jury (.) which sentences are belonging to the jury part).

Based on the analysis of this extract it can be observed that after the teacher's procedural information, one of the students (Sel) also engages in the instruction giving process by making a contribution regarding the categories given in the coursebook. Nevertheless, in the subsequent turns, it can be seen that Meh has a trouble in understanding the process, which is evident with his candidate answer that involves only one number. Extract 3 clearly exemplifies the resolution of the students' understanding troubles and its relation to the

teacher's classroom interactional competence (CIC) (Wash, 2006) in that the teacher observably manages to locate the students' understanding trouble based on the candidate responses, then orients to it in the following lines. She engages in revising and reformulation work by drawing upon the classroom material to make her explanation more comprehensible thereby negotiating meaning. Furthermore, she embodies her nonverbal actions in her verbal explanation during her reformulation turns. It is evident in the extract that at the end of the revision of the instruction, the students manage to recognize the required procedure and demonstrate understanding.

4.4. Extract 4

Extract 4 that follows presents interaction from 15th week of the semester. It lasts 1.49 minutes and consists of two segments in succession. The unit of the week is *Art and Media*. The extract consists of two segments following each other without any deduction. In the extract, Tea elicits responses of an information gap activity from the students who work in pairs. One of the students from each pair is assigned to be Student A and the other one Student B. In the coursebook there are two reading passages, one of which is expected to be read by Students As, and the other one is read by Student Bs. After the students read their passage they are supposed to talk about it to their partners. Finally, each student is expected to answer the questions of the passage that they have not read but have told about by their partners. Prior to Segment 1, Tea had provided the task instruction and the students engaged in the activity for almost 10 minutes.

Extract 4: 2 students, 2 texts – 85/28.12.16 (Segment 1)

1	Tea:	in two a the questions were related to which student
2	Meh:	a=
3	Tea:	=a readers
4	Meh:	yes
5	Tea:	okay so↑ a readers (.) you will say nothing in this pa:rt (0.2)
6		only student b will answer this part >because< you already told
7		them (0.2) about the >you know< your ↑text and (.) they are
8		knowledgeable about it (.) i guess (0.2) here we go (.) where
9		was the crime (0.2) student bs↓
10		(0.6)
11	Alp:	[buenos aires
12	Tan:	[buenos air[es
13	Ale:	°[buenos aires°=
14	Tea:	=yes buenos aires thank you very much (0.2) here we go↑ (0.2)
15		what was the total amount of money and which item was stolen
16		(0.3) do you remem↑ber
17	Tan:	yes
18	Tea:	derya
		+ looks at Der
19		(1.0)
20	Der:	er: i will talk about my (0.3) er: (.) or:
21		(1.2)
22		yani=
		i mean=
23	Meh:	=not your text
24	Der:	my partner's=
25	Tea:	=your partner's=
26	Der:	=hu:
27		(0.8)
28		er: sixty-eig[ht million dollars

Extract 4 starts with Tea's display question (`in two a the questions were related to which student`) directed to the students as a pre-announcement (Terasaki, 1976) as a type of teacher informing. In line 2, Meh gives a candidate response (`a`) and provides the second pair part of the question. In the subsequent turn, Tea immediately accepts it by repeating the candidate response (`a readers`), which is followed by Meh' confirmation token (`yes`) in line 4. In line 5, Tea firstly produces a sequence closing third (`okay`)

(Schegloff, 2007), then utters a transition marker (so↑), which signals a transition to a new action, with rising intonation in final position. In the same turn, she uses an address term (a readers) and after a micro pause she delivers the instruction (you will say nothing in this pa:rt (0.2) only student b will answer this part) to A readers. In line 6, she also provides an account for why B readers will answer the questions at that moment (>because< you already told them (0.2) about the >you know< your ↑text and (.) they are knowledgeable about it) with a personal stance marker (i guess) (Kärkkäinen, 2003). Then, after an initiating marker (here we go), she asks the first question of the text to student Bs by addressing them (student bs↓). Following 0.6 second of silence, Tea gets the same candidate response (Buenos Aires) from multiple students (Alp, Tan, Ale) in lines 11, 12 and 13 in an overlapped fashion to one another. In line 14, Tea accepts the candidate response by firstly providing a confirmation token (yes) followed by a repetition of the response (buenos aires) and ends her turn with a sequence closing third (thank you very much). After a short pause she again uses an initiator marker (here we go↑), which is marked with a rising intonation, in order to signal the continuation of the elicitation process. Later, in the same turn, she directs the second questions to student Bs (what was the total amount of money and which item was stolen) and checks whether the students remember the answer with a yes/no interrogative question (do you remem↑ber) (Raymond, 2003; 2010). It is followed with a positive response (yes) provided by Tan in line 17. Although Der does not bid for turn, Tea selects him as the next speaker by gazing at him and using an address term (derya) to get the response. Following 1.0 second of silence which is an indicator of the trouble, Der requests confirmation with a yes/no declarative question surrounded with elongated hesitation markers (er: i will talk about my (0.3) er:) and terminates his turn with an elongated connection marker (or:) projecting an alternative. However, he does not get any response from Tea during 1.2 seconds of silence, then in line 22 he initiates an insert expansion to clarify his question with a Turkish marker *yani* (translation: i mean) Mauranen, 2010) which mostly projects an upcoming repair sequence. It is latched with Meh's repair in line 23 (not your text). In line 24, Der reformulates Meh's response (my partner's), thereby demonstrating his understanding (Sacks, 1992). In line 25, Tea this time provides confirmation (your partner's=) to Der's question he asked in line 20. It is immediately followed by Der's elongated change of state token (=hu:) (Heritage, 1984) that could be

considered to be a display of his understanding (Koole, 2010; Sacks, 1992). After 0.8 of silence, he provides a candidate response beginning with another hesitation marker (`er: sixty-eig[ht million dollars`) in line 28.

Extract 4: 2 students, 2 texts – 85: 28.12.16 (Segment 2)

29	Tül:	[hala hiçbir şey anlamadım ben
		[i still do not understand anything
30	Tea:	sixty-eight million dollars (.) what↑
		+ turns to Tül
31	Tül:	i'm (.) °confused° e[r:
32	Tea:	[you are confu[sed
33	Tül:	°[yeah°
34	Tea:	okay let's make clear it to you (0.2) which text you read↑
35	Tül:	second one
36	Tea:	oka:y (.) so you will answer the questions here (0.3) okay↑
		+ shows the book to Tül and points at the questions
37	Tül:	hu:=
38	Tea:	=huhu i mean because >you know< your partner already told you
39		about the passage and we are trying to test (.) how much do you
40		remember from the you know (0.2) a text that you don't read but
41		your friend mentioned about [it
42	Tül:	[hu °oka[y↓°
43	Tea:	[okay↑ (.)clear↑
		+ bodily orients to the whole class
44	Yap:	=ye[ah
		+ nods her head
45	Tan:	[hu[hu
46	Tea:	[fine↓ (0.2) so↑ (.) what↑ (.) exactly >was stolen<
47	Alp:	er:
48	Sim:	safe=
49	Mur:	=safety
50	Alp:	safety box mı
		is it safety box
51	Tea:	safety box ↑yeap exactly

In line 29, another student from another corner of the classroom (Tül) explicitly states her non-understanding in Turkish (`[hala hiçbir şey anlamadım ben`) (translation: i still

do not understand anything), which overlaps with Der's response given in the previous line. In line 30, Tea firstly accepts Der's candidate response by repeating it, then after a micro pause she produces an open-class initiator (what↑) (Schegloff, et al., 1977) marked with a rising intonation in turn final position and positions her body towards Tül, thus establishes recipiency with her. It should be noted that Tea's repair initiation in line 30 either could be a display of a hearing problem or could be directed to get an English contribution from Tül. Yet, it is still interesting that although Tül states her non-understanding in Turkish in line 29, she states it in English in line 31 (i'm (.) °confused°) marked with an elongated hesitation marker in turn final position (e[r:) which is overlapped with Tea's repetition ([you are confu[sed) in line 32. In line 33, Tül provides a confirmation token (°[yeah°), which is delivered in a soft voice, in an overlapped fashion with Tea's repetition in the previous turn. What happens in line 34 is significant in that it displays how Tea orients to the student's understanding trouble emerged with regard to the task instruction. After uttering an acknowledgement token (okay), she explicitly shows orientation to the resolution of the trouble (let's make clear it to you). In the same turn, she asks a referential question (which text you read↑) (Long & Sato, 1983) in order to learn which text that Tül have read. In line 35, Tül provides response (second one) in the second pair part of the question, which is followed by Tea's another acknowledgment token (o:kay) which serves as sequence closing third. Upon uttering a logical connector (so), Tea makes an indexical reference to the shared resource (here) (Jackson, 2013) in order to show the questions that Tül is supposed to answer and terminates her turn with an understanding check (okay↑), which is followed by Tül's change of state token (hu:) displaying her acknowledgement. For the follow-up, after a confirmation token (huhu), starting with the discourse marker *i mean* she initiates to provides account for the procedure that they follow (because >you know< your partner already told you about the passage and we are trying to test (.) how much do you remember). In line 42, Tül claims understanding through another change of state token (hu) followed by an acknowledgement token (°oka[y↓°) delivered in a soft voice and marked with falling intonation in turn final position. It overlaps with Tea's first understanding check (okay↑) with which Tea addresses the whole class by bodily orienting to them and after a micro pause in the same turn she produces another understanding check (clear↑). Tea's understanding checks receive positive responses (ye[ah) accompanied by bodily action (nodding in line

44), ([hu[hu). Having overlapped with Tan's confirmation token in line 45, Tea provides an explicit positive assessment (fine↓) marked with a falling intonation as a both sequence and case closed device (Waring, 2008) in line 46. Then, in the same turn, using a transition marker (so↑), Tea asks the question again (what↑ (.) exactly >was stolen<) and in lines 48, 49 and 50, the students provide candidate answers (safe), (safety), (is it safety box) that Tea gives feedback (safety box ↑yeap exactly) in line 51, so triadic exchange structure (IRF) starts again. Therefore, the lines between 46 and 51 indicate that the understanding problem is resolved and form-and-accuracy context (Seedhouse, 2004) is restored. It could be stated that differently from the extracts analyzed so far, Extract 4 illustrates how Tea tries to resolve the understanding trouble through asking questions to co-construct the meaning with the student.

4.5. Extract 5

The following extract illustrates how the teacher uses two conflicting words in her instruction regarding how the students will be working (in pairs or groups) (Markee, 2015) to accomplish upcoming task. In Extract 5, it is also demonstrated that after using an understanding check, the teacher immediately initiates the activity without waiting for students to display their understanding or non-understanding. Before the part illustrated in the following extract, the students have worked on the plot of some Turkish TV series. The teacher has displayed the pictures of the TV series on the board one by one, and a volunteer student has taken turn to sum it up to the other students in the classroom. In this example, the teacher changes the activity into pair work version.

Extract 5: tv series - 40/02.01.17 (Segment 1)

```
1  Tea:  okay (0.3) >↑now guys< we will go on like that (0.4) choose a
2        partner to yourself please
3        (0.8)
4  Tea:  it could be >someone next to you it co- could be someone from
5        the other corner of the classroom< (.) choose a partner the
                + points at the back of the classroom
6        to yourself quickly
```

In line 1, after using a closing marker (okay) and uttering a general address term (guys) to gather the students' attention, Tea begins to provide procedural informing (Gardner & Mushin, 2017) and asks the students to have a partner. After 0.8 second of silence, in lines 4 and 5, she gives further information concerning partner choice in a faster pace (it could be >someone next to you it co- could be someone from the other corner of the classroom<). Then, in lines 5 and 6 she repeats the instruction. The 14 lines between the first and second segments of the extract have been omitted. In the omitted lines Tea helps the students find a partner and arranges the pairs (see Appendix 6), They have been considered irrelevant to the phenomenon under investigation as they are not in line with the scope of the present study.

Extract 5: tv series - 40/02.01.17 (Segment 2)

21 Tea: ready↑ (0.4) i will choose some pictures to you again here
22 + points at the board
23 (0.4) for each picture you will take turn to each other (.)if
24 you don't know anything about the you know (.) tv series you
25 may say↑ (0.3) >skip< (0.4) for that part (.) okay↑ you will
+ moves her right hand quickly to a direction
+ Sel nods
26 pass (.) for the activity↓ (0.2) fine (.) each group will do
+ puts her hands forward
27 it on their own you don't have to wait for each other so (.)
28 you will <take tu:rns with your group mate> (0.4) among each
29 other >to summarize< the topic (0.3) okay↑ clear about that↑
+ draws circle with his hand
30 (0.3)
31 so↑ (.) who are the first to start↑ can [i see each group
+ looks around the students
32 Meh: [like clockwise we can
+ draws circle with his hand
33 do this time
34 Mur: her grup kendi [içinde
each group with their group members
35 Tea: [>no no< each group=
+ points at Meh and Tan

36 Meh: =h[u:
37 Tea: [i mean each pair will do it for example you or er[:
+ points at Meh
+ points at Tan
38 Meh: [tansu=
39 Tea: =tansu will go [on
40 Meh: [okay then ladies first
41 Tea: here we go
+ reflects a picture on the board

The second part of the extract starts with Tea's attention gathering marker (ready↑) which is uttered with a word-final rising intonation. After waiting for 0.4 second, Tea issues the instruction (i will choose some pictures to you again here (0.4) for each picture you will take turn to each other (.)if you don't know anything about the you know (.) tv series you may say↑ (0.3) >skip< (0.4) for that part) concerning the procedure of the activity. She says that she will display some pictures on the board, which is simultaneously accompanied with her pointing gesture. In line 23, Tea indicates that the students are expected to summarize the TV series in turns by putting an emphasis on *take*; however, she uses an ungrammatical structure (you will take turn to each other). After a micro pause she provides informing related to what the students will do in the cases that they are not familiar with the series displayed on the board. In line 25, she utters the word *skip* with an emphasis and in a faster pace than the surrounding talk. In order to mark *skip* she also pauses before and after the word. Following this, in the same line Tea produces an understanding check (okay↑), yet without waiting for any response from the students, she reformulates her previous utterance (you will pass (.) for the activity↓), again with an emphasis on *pass* accompanied by a hand gesture. While she is uttering *pass*, Tea puts her hands forward to indicate they will move on. In line 26, Tea produces an understanding check (fine), but she does not wait for any response from the students again and goes on providing procedural instruction. However, although at the beginning Tea have designed the activity as a pair work task, she states *group* in line 26 and *group mate* in line 28 instead of *pair* and *partner*. Also, with her hand gesture, Tea draws a circle by pointing at the students, which implies turning the activity into group work. In line 29, she provides two understanding check questions successively (okay↑ clear about that↑) which are uttered with a rising intonation in

final position; however, they are not responded to by the students. Then, in line 31, Tea wants to see the students who will start first in each pair (who are the first to start↑ can [i see each group), yet she utters the word *group* again instead of *pair*. Her question is overlapped with Meh's contribution in line 32. By self-selecting himself as the next speaker, Meh provides an alternative about the order that they can follow during the activity (like clockwise we can do this time). Meh's contribution is important in that it demonstrates the understanding trouble emerged from Tea's use of conflicting words (pair and group) to describe the activity. It should be noted that with his alternative (like clockwise) that is appropriate for the group work version and with his hand gesture describing a circle, Meh refers to group work. In line 34, Mur who is sitting next to Meh initiates a repair in their mother tongue (her grup kendi [içinde) (translation: each group with their group members), and he also calls the working style as group. Mur' repair is overlapped with Tea's disagreement markers uttered in a faster pace ([>no no<) in line 35. It is immediately followed by Meh's elongated change-of state-token (=h[u:) (Heritage, 1984), which displays the change in his state of understanding. It is overlapped with Tea's turn in line 37 where she initiates a repair. Based on Meh's contribution which indicates the trouble, with third-position repair (Schegloff, et al., 1977; Schegloff, 1987, 1992) Tea replaces the word *group* with *pair* in her next turn which is initiated by a repair proper (i mean) in line 37. Then, Tea goes on providing further explanation with exemplification. By pointing at Meh and his partner Tan, she attempts to resolve the trouble in her example. Finally, in line 40 Meh firstly produces an acknowledgment token (okay) and by giving the first turn to his partner (then ladies first), he clearly demonstrates his understanding (Sacks, 1992). The extract ends with Tea's initiation of the activity by displaying a photograph on the board.

4.6. Extract 6

Extract 6 will present an episode from 16th week of the semester. The present unit is Art and Media. The interaction that is given in the following extract starts almost at the beginning of the lesson and it lasts 2.02 minutes. It illustrates another example of how Tea orients to one of the students' (Tül) questions about the task procedure and through providing example responses that the students are expected to give. It is also demonstrated in the extract that

during issuing the task instruction, Tea makes the procedural context interactive by altering the turn-taking system so that the students can take turns. Prior to the extract, after Tea comes to the classroom and greets the students, she turns on the computer and makes preparation for the upcoming task. After displaying some photographs on the board, she starts to give information about the task. Extract 6 involves two segments. Like extracts 2 and 4, the two segments follow each other without any deduction; that is, in this extract there is no omitted lines between the segments.

Extract 6: logos - 12/19.12.16 (Segment 1)

```
1   Tea:  ↑not a new topic (0.4) er: but a familiar one as you know in the
2         language leader we already covered this topic last week (.)
3         media issue right↑ (.) ↑a:rts and media (0.2) this time a little
4         bit different a little bit same (0.2) do you remember that part↑
5   Tül:  ye[ah
6   Bey:    [yeah
7   Tül:  correspondence
8   Tea:  yeap exactly you know journalism we discussed >a little bit<
9         today we will focus on (.) ↑that part of the issue (0.4) media:
10        interne:t radio: magazine:s newspapers televisions these are all
11        a:ll pa:rt of the (0.2) media and >today we are talking about<
12        all these tools (.) and more actually (0.2) <every single year>
13        you know new products (.) new applications (.) and new (0.2) er
14        sources of information or media <try to:> go: on >and on and on<
15        so↑ (.) i will show you some pictures here (.) ↑ some icons↓
16        (0.6)
17  Tea:  icon mea:ns
18        (1.0)
            + looks around the students
19  Meh:  er[:
20  Tül:    [logo[s
21  Meh:         [logo=
22  Tea:  =logos perfect (0.3) how many of them do you know >you will try
23        to guess< okay these are the logo:s and icons to you
                                  + displays the picture of icons on the board
24        (3.4)
           + Tea shows the icons and the students looks at the board
25  Bey:  °google° (0.3) google
                          + looks at Tea
```

The extract starts with Tea's introducing the topic of the task by making reference to the previous week and establishes a connection with the topic of the coursebook unit (↑not a new topic (0.4) er: but a familiar one as you know in the language leader we already covered this topic last week). In line 4, she ends her turn with a yes/no interrogative question (Mehan, 1979b) to check whether the students remember that part of the unit (do you remember that part↑). As preferred response, in lines 5 and 6, Tea gets confirmation tokens from Tül (ye[ah) and Bey ([yeah) in overlap with each other. In line 7, Tül also enhances her contribution by stating the name of one of the tasks (correspondence) that the class carried out last week. Tül's contribution is followed by a confirmation token by Tea with a strong positive evaluation marker in line 8. Later in the same line, Tea summarizes what they have done and announces the new activity (you know journalism we discussed >a little bit< today we will focus on (.) ↑that part of the issue). After setting the topic, she specifies what the students are supposed to do in this exercise (>today we are talking about< all these tools (.) and more actually) in lines 11 and 12. Laying the way of the theme by introducing the subject of the activity (new products (.) new applications (.) and new (0.2) er sources of information or media), Tea initiates providing the procedural information (i will show you some pictures here (.) ↑ some icons↓). After 0.6 second of silence, she utters a designedly incomplete utterance (icon mea:ns) (Koshik, 2002) by elongating the last word of the question. Designedly incomplete utterance could be identified here as a known information question to check the students' vocabulary knowledge. It should be noted that Tea does not "transmit the procedural informing" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 134) in a monologue format, instead she involves the students in the procedural informing through a DIU. According to Seedhouse (2004) asking questions to students in procedural context is one of the ways that the teachers employ to change the turn taking system of the context which mostly consists of "an unbroken monologue" (p. 134). It could also be claimed that Tea creates opportunities for increasing student participation. In line 18, during 1.0 second, Tea looks around to establish mutual gaze with a student thus expecting a response from them. Then, she receives candidate responses from two different students in an overlapping fashion ([logo[s), ([logo=). In line 22, Tea immediately acknowledges the candidate response by repeating it and produces an explicit positive assessment (perfect) (Waring, 2013). Later, she goes on

giving instruction by producing a question (how many of them do you know >you will try to guess<) and ends her turn by showing the picture of icons on the board (these are the logo:s and icons to you). During 3.4 seconds of silence, Tea shows the icons one by one on the board and the students look at them. Although the students are expected to count the numbers of the icons that they are familiar with after looking at all of them, in line 25 Bey states the name of one of the icons in a soft voice (°google°). After waiting 0.3 second she repeats her previous utterance by looking at Tea this time.

Extract 6: logos - 12/19.12.16 (Segment 2)

26	Tea:	↑try to count the number of (.) logos or icons >you know<
27		(0.3) >what do they< refer to
28		(8.9)
		+ Tea shows the icons
29	Tea:	these are the <co:des o:f toda:y's media tools>
30		(11.8)
		+ Tea shows the icons
31	Tül:	we have to say something↑
		+ Tül and Tea establish mutual gaze
32	Tea:	>no no n[o<
		+ withdraws her gaze from Tül
33	Tül:	[hu:
34	Tea:	guys (.) number i [will looking for
		+ looks around the students
		+ positions her body to whole class
35	Meh:	[eheh heh
36	Tea:	how many of them you [know
37	Tül:	[hum:
38	Tea:	five te:n (0.4) [one
39	Mur:	[thirteen=
40	Tan:	=about fo[urteen
41	Tea:	[thir↑teen↓ (0.4) fourteen=
42	Tül:	°thir[teen°
43	Tea:	[about fourteen thirteen okay↓ (0.4) any↑

In the subsequent turn, Tea initiates a repair and reformulates her previous instruction with an imperative form (↑try to count the number of (.) logos or icons >you know<) and finishes her turn by adding a question (>what do they< refer to). After

Tea's repair, the students continue looking at the board. In line 29, Tea restates what the students are looking at. Following 11.8 second of silence during which the students keeps on looking at the board, one of the students (Tül) takes the turn with self-selection and produces a yes/no declarative question (we have to say something↑) (Raymond, 2003) marked with rising intonation in turn final position. In the following line, Tea produces repair initiation markers (>no no n[o<) in a faster pace and withdraws her gaze from Tül in turn-final position. Tea's last repair initiator utterance overlaps with Tül's elongated change of state token ([hu:) (Heritage, 1984) in line 33. It should be emphasized that although Tea initiates repair only to Tül in line 32, at the end of the turn she withdraws her gaze from Tül and positions herself to the whole class in line 34. Also, by uttering a general address term (guys), Tea assembles the students into a "single audience" (St. John & Cromdal, 2016, p. 254) and makes evident that she addresses all of the students. Treating Tül's question as a general instructional need of the class, she reformulates her instruction one more time (number i [will looking for). In line 35, Tea's reformulation is overlapped with Meh's laughter which could be triggered by Tül's question with regard to the procedure. In line 36, Tea goes on revising previously given question (in line 22) (how many of them you [know), which overlaps with Tül's another change of state token ([hum:) (Heritage, 1984). Furthermore, Tea provides example of possible responses (five te:n (0.4) [one) in order to make clear what she expects to receive as a response.

The analysis of Extract 6 has exemplified two of the variations proposed by Seedhouse (2004). He argues that these variations change the turn-taking system of procedural context. Firstly, as stated earlier Tea makes the students get involved in procedural informing through directing a DIU to them, thus makes the context more interactional. Secondly, in line 31 Tül takes turn by nominating herself as the next speaker and directs a question about the procedure to Tea. With regard to Tea's noticing the understanding trouble, as in Extract 2 and 3, students' questions about the task procedure makes their understanding troubles evident to Tea. Based on Tül's question in line 31, Tea undertakes repair work through interactional resources like reformulating, revising the previously given instruction, and exemplification. In this case, Tea's exemplification seems to be facilitative for the students' understanding of what they are expected to do, since through exemplification Tea manages to get multiple responses from various students given in an overlapped fashion with each other between lines 39 and 42 ([thirteen=), (about fo[urteen), (°thir[teen°). It

should also be noted that in line 42 Tül's response to Tea's question demonstrates her understanding of the instruction and her previous understanding trouble is resolved. Like Extract 5, this extract demonstrates how Tea achieve mutual understanding in instructions by exemplifying the possible responses that the students are supposed to provide. Another interesting observation about this extract is that although in line 31 the question is asked by one individual, Tea reformulates her instruction by addressing all of the students to ensure understanding, which illustrates the nature of multilogue in the classroom.

4.7. Extract 7

So far in the analysis chapter, it has been explored that after locating the students' non-understanding the teacher tries to restore understanding with deployment of diverse interactional resources including revising the instruction, omitting potentially complex grammatical items from her instruction, repetitive use of understanding checks, and embodied actions. Unlike the previous extracts, the following extract illustrates how the teacher employs hint-giving in addition to exemplification after long silences with *no activity initiation* in order to make the meaning clear to the students. Prior to the following extract, the students engage in a reading activity. After completing the activity, Tea chooses some words from the text and explains what they mean and the context in which they are used.

Extract 7: feelings in the past – 17/26.12.16

1	Tea:	so↑ we lea:rned three different new vocabulary
2		(1.2)
3		distress (.) dumfounded (.) and remorseful (0.2) ↑now using this
4		vocabulary please try to find >some situations< that in your pa:st
5		(0.3) .hh you feel in the >same situation for example< (0.2) >tell
6		a partner about a time when< you experience (.) u:hm (.) <distress
7		(.) situation> or when you feel dumfounded or <remo:rseful> (0.2)
8		>try to think about< three situations (0.2) in the <sa:me feeling>
9		(7.3) ((There is no activity initiation.))
		+ All students keep looking at the book and Tea looks around the students
10	Tea:	>for example<↑ <i felt distressed> (.) when >bla bla bla bla bla<
11		happened↓ (0.3) o:r .hh i fe:lt myself (.) really dumfounded when

12 >bla bla bla bla bla< happened (0.2) in my life (0.2) <think about
13 some life experiences you ha:ve (.) and try to> use the <same> feeling
14 expressions (.) in your conversation to your °friend°↓
15 (1.3)
16 Tea: here we go
17 (5.3) ((There is no activity initiation.))
+ Tea walks around the classroom and looks around the students.
18 Tea: you may first think abou:t (.) and then let's start

The extract starts with the marker (so↑) indicating a transition to a new action. In lines 1 and 3, Tea firstly summarizes what they have learned by expressing the target vocabulary items, thereby closing the previous vocabulary activity. In line 3, beginning with a time marker (↑now) which is marked with a rising intonation in utterance-initial position, Tea projects a new action. Between the lines 3 and 5, Tea provides the instruction regarding what they are going to do with the words (↑now using this vocabulary please try to find >some situations< that in your pa:st (0.3).hh you feel in the >same situation). She asks the students to use the vocabulary items in a meaningful context based on their real past experiences. In lines 5 and 6, she indicates that the students will work in pairs (tell a partner about a time). Then, Tea goes on her instruction by describing the required situations that the students will tell each other (when< you experience (.) u:hm (0.2) <distress (.) situation> or when you feel dumfounded or <remo:rseful>). It is remarkable that while making explanation concerning the situations, Tea utters the target vocabulary in a different way than the surrounding talk. She firstly marks the first word with a micro pause before and after it ((.) <distress (.)), and she puts an emphasis on the first syllable of the second one (dumfounded). Then, she produces the last word in a slower pace and with an elongation in its second syllable (<remo:rseful>). In line 8, Tea summarizes her instruction briefly before ending her turn (>try to think about< three situations (0.2) in the <sa:me feeling>). It is followed by 7.3 seconds of silence during which the students do not initiate the activity but they keep looking at the book on their desks and by observing that, Tea treats this no activity initiation as a trouble source and needs to revise the instruction one more time to make it clear to the students. In the following line, it can be seen that Tea orients to the instruction she issued earlier and she provides the student with some example

grammatical items that they can make use of in their task (>for example<↑ <i felt distressed> (.) when >bla bla bla bla bla< happened↓ (0.3) o:r .hh i fe:lt myself (.) really dumfounded when >bla bla bla bla bla< happened (0.2) in my life). After 0.2 second of silence, Tea revises the instruction which is embodied by her looking around the students in order to establish mutual gaze. It should be noted here that this time she provides the procedure in a slower pace compared to her original instruction (<think about some life experiences you ha:ve (.) and try to> use the <same> feeling expressions). Then, in line 16, she explicitly signals the initiation of the activity (here we go) that is followed by a long silence accompanied by some students' bodily orientations to their partners. During the subsequent 5.3 seconds of silence Tea starts walking around the classroom and observes that the students has not started conversation yet. She thereupon gives a hint about the procure that they can follow (you may first think abou:t (.) and then let's start) in a modalized preference form (He, 2000), thereby mitigating the imperative statements. In the data, it is observed that after a short period, the students initiate a conversation with their partners.

This extract demonstrates a typical example of procedural context (Seedhouse, 2004) where the teacher aims to "transmit procedural information" (p. 133) of the upcoming task that the students are supposed to accomplish. Seedhouse (2004) considers this context as the most homogenous one where most of the time the teacher holds the floor. In this extract, procedural information is delivered in a monologue by the teacher without any student interruption, which is treated as a trouble by Tea in this fragment. Similar to the previous extracts, Extract 7 includes examples during which the teacher delivers the reformulated instruction in a slower pace in order to make it more comprehensible for the students. However, unlike the previous ones, this extract has displayed that *no activity initiation* leads the teacher to revise her instruction through reformulation including giving example sentences to the students and providing them with a hint concerning how they will start to the activity.

4.8. Extract 8

Like previous extract, Extract 8 that follows will present a typical example of the teacher's use of hinting and modeling as interactional resources to restore understanding in task

instructions. However, unlike the previous extract in which *no activity initiation* leads Tea to revise her previously given instruction through giving hints and elaborating on the procedure with exemplification, in the following extract what makes the teacher orient to the earlier instruction is the student-contribution and claiming of non-understanding. The extract comes from the 14th week of the semester and it lasts for 2.26 minutes including the omitted lines. The class has been working on the 11th chapter (Arts and media) of the coursebook. The extract comes from the very beginning of the lesson. It starts with the teacher's revision of the instruction that she gave in the previous class-hour before the break-time. The students have read an article on the coursebook and created groups of four for the upcoming discussion activity which is based on the article. The students are supposed to discuss their personal opinions related to the topic of the article with their group mates.

Extract 8: debate - 16/19.12.16 (Segment 1)

1	Tea:	so ladies and gentlemen (0.2) how to start the discussion how to
		+ claps her hands + Ss look at Tea
2		(1.0)
3		start the guidance (0.3) you may choose a leader in the group
4		>who will guide the discussion just like the all discussion
5		programs< on tv
6		(0.5)
7	Tea:	and who will (.) give >you know< turns to people to talk↑ (0.3)
8		or: (0.2) you may altogether start the conversation (.) or you
9		may start individually from you own discussion ↑points↓ (0.3)
10		a:nd (.) try to er <share your points and ask for your friends'>
11		opinion about the parts that you underline and (0.2) you may
12		produce your own opinions you may share your own personal
13		experiences etcetera
14		(0.5)
15	Tea:	don't hesitate to add your own discussion points and make the
16		topics much more >intellectual background< and ↑rich (.)to
17		discuss okay↑ (0.2) ↑here we go
18		+ Ale nods
19		(0.9)

20 Tea: er: you may create your own style=

21 Yap: =°yes°

22 Meh: i remember we did it in high school er like münazara

+ looks at Tea **_debate_**

23 Tea: like münazara (0.2) uhm:

debate

24 (1.0)

25 ↑okay guys listen (0.2) it's a little bit same a little bit

+ walks towards the middle of the classroom

+ faces at whole class

26 different from münazara in münazara there are two: different

debate **_debate_**

+ remove her hands from each other

27 opinion directly and that is a debate actually this is more than

28 debate okay↑

29 (0.4)

30 Meh: hu[:

31 Tea: [now >there are more discussion and there are no side< there

32 is not any side everybody is quite objectively (.) discuss the

33 topics=

34 Meh: =yes=

35 Tea: =here we go

After Tea calls the students attention with address terms (ladies and gentlemen) accompanied with her embodied action (clapping) in line 1, she starts to explicate how the students carry out the discussion activity. From line 3 to line 10, Tea presents permissions while issuing instruction (He, 2004) and she provides alternatives with regard to the procedure of the activity (you may choose a leader in the group), (or: (0.2) you may altogether start the conversation), (or you may start individually from you own discussion ↑points↓) through modalized forms (may). In lines 10 and 11, she goes on giving the instruction in imperative forms (try to er <share your points and ask for your friends'> opinion about the parts that you underline). Finally, she ends her turn presenting a modalized preference/permission statements (He, 2004) (you may produce your own opinions

you may share your own personal experiences etcetera) as if the student had another choice in the discussion activity while in fact there is not another room for students in the discussion. Waiting for 0.5 second of silence, in an extended turn in lines 15 and 16, she reformulates her previous instruction in an imperative form (don't hesitate to add your own discussion points) and then makes addition to it (make the topics much more >intellectual background< and ↑rich (.)to discuss). Her understanding check (okay↑) in line 17 receives a student's nonverbal claim of understanding which is followed by Tea's initiating the activity with a prompt (↑here we go) marked with a rising intonation in initial position. After almost 1 second of silence, in line 20 following an elongated hesitation marker (er:), Tea summarizes through reformulation (you may create your own style=) of her previous turn, which is latched by Yap's acknowledgement token delivered in a soft voice (°yes°). What happens in line 22 is not common to such procedural context (Seedhouse, 2004), since after Tea's informing, one of the students makes a contribution related to his experience with a code-mixed utterance, starting with English and ending with a Turkish word (münazara = debate) (i remember we did it in high school er like münazara). In the following line, Tea firstly repeats the last part of Meh's contribution (like münazara), then inserts an elongated hesitation marker (uhm:) followed by 1 second silence. Tea' hesitation marker and delay in response could be considered to signal her dispreference. However, it is interesting to see that Meh's code-switching is not challenged immediately by Tea who also keep on using Turkish word later on her turn. After 1 second of silence Tea walks towards to the middle of the classroom and uses a general address term and uses a general address term (guys). Facing at the whole class, she starts to address all of the students (Schwab, 2011). Taking an individual student's contribution as a general potential misunderstanding (St. John & Cromdal, 2016) that needs to be clarified, in line 25 she starts to present the difference between debate and discussion. She puts an emphasis on the word *different* and elongates the word *two* and uses multimodal actions at the same time to demonstrate that they are two different things. She ends her turn in line 28 with a confirmation token (okay↑) marked suprasegmentally in final position. In line 30, after 0.4 second of silence Meh utters an elongated change of state token (Heritage, 1984) (hu[:) which is overlapped by Tea in the following turn. Between lines 31 and 32 Tea states that there is no side and more

objectivity in discussion. Her turn is followed by Meh confirmation token (yes) in the subsequent line. It is latched with Tea's activity initiating token (here we go).

Extract 8: debate - 16/19.12.16 (Segment 2)

44	Der:	hocam=
45		***teacher***
		+ establishes mutual gaze with Tea
46	Tea:	sweethe[art
		+ walks towards Der
47	Der:	[we are not (.) sure about what we: discuss about
48	Tea:	so let's do it like that one of you could be group leader to
49		guide the others (0.3) so↑ (.) let's talk about bla bla bla
50		first of all you may go in an order like that
51		(1.3)
		+ looks around the students' desks
52	Tea:	maybe beyza you may start because you have a book and underlined
		+ establishes mutual gaze with Bey + points at Bey's book
53		pa:rts so you may ask your friends >what do you think about bla
54		bla part< that part or paragraph two second line impressed me a
55		lot (0.2) a:nd that makes me create another opinion and i
56		thought like that what do you think (0.3) what can you add or
57		you may create discussion points and guide your friends about
58		that one if you want (0.3) it's okay↑
59	Bey:	huhu
60	Tea:	or you may ask from time to time >what about< your own
61		discussion points anybody to add- wants to add anything like
62		that so it will be fine i guess=
63	Yap:	=okay thank you
64	Tea:	=because you enrich the topic in that way (0.2) and it would be
65		much organized in that way (0.3) having someone guide a topic
66		(2.4)
		+ The students turn to each other
67	Bey:	okay let's talk about er: page (0.3) sixty three
		+ points at a page in her book
68	Tea:	=↑yeap (0.2) good here we go

Between the first and the second segments of Extract 8, 8 lines are omitted (see Appendix 7) since they include interaction that occurs between a student who does not have his book and the teacher, so they are considered to be irrelevant to the analyzed phenomenon. The

second part of the extract starts with Der's Turkish address term (hocam) (teacher) and establishing mutual gaze with Tea. It is followed in the second pair part by Tea's response (sweethe[art) which is accompanied by Tea' positioning herself closer to Der by walking towards him. Tea's response is overlapped with Der's claim of non-understanding ([we are not (.) sure about what we: discuss about) in line 47. Differently from the previous case, Tea this time addresses only Der's group and makes an explicit start to her explanation (so let's do it like that). Firstly, she revises her earlier instruction (one of you could be group leader to guide the others), then after 0.3 second of silence, she models the group leader by giving the example directional sentence (let's talk about bla bla bla) that the students can make use of during their discussion activity. During 1.3 second of silence she looks around the students' desks and in line 52 starting with a possibility marker (maybe) Tea addresses Bey and points at Bey's book that have been underlined parts. The reason why Tea selects Bey as the group leader could be the underlined parts in her book, as the students were supposed to underline the parts that will talk about during group discussion. In line 53, Tea again addresses Bey (so you may ask your friends) and models the questions and directions that Bey can use (>what do you think about bla bla part< that part or paragraph two second line impressed me a lot (0.2) a:nd that makes me create another opinion and i thought like that what do you think (0.3) what can you add) as if she was a group leader between lines 53 and 56. She ends her turn with an understanding check (it's okay↑) marked with a rising intonation in final position after providing another alternative way for carrying out the activity (or you may create discussion points and guide your friends about that one if you want). Tea' understanding check is followed by Bey's acknowledgement token (huhu) through which she claims her understanding (Sacks, 1992). Yet, Tea again goes on modeling the group leader through giving example sentences (>what about< your own discussion points anybody to add- wants to add anything) in lines 60 and 61. In line 63, it is latched with Yap's acknowledgement token (okay). Then, in lines 64 and 65, Tea provides account for why they should have a group leader who will guide the topic in the discussion process (because you enrich the topic in that way (0.2) and it would be much organized in that way (0.3) having someone guide a topic). After (2.4) seconds of silence during which the students in the group turn to each

other and looks at their books, Bey directs the others to a specific page (okay let's talk about er: page (0.3) sixty three) by pointing at the page at the same time. It should be noted here that directing her friends by taking the role of a group leader, Bey clearly demonstrates her understanding (Sacks, 1992) of the process. In the subsequent turn, it is confirmed by Tea in line 68 with an agreement token (↑yeap) marked suprasegmentally in turn initial position and with a positive assessment (good). Note that Segment 1 and Segment 2 have some variations in terms of interactional practices employed by the teacher because of the nature of student contributions. Segment 1 reflects the nature of multilogue in the classroom in that Meh's verbal contributions has reference to more than one addressee (Schwab 2011). In that segment, the teacher performs for all of the students through orienting to whole class rather than for only one of them, so the other students get involved in interaction as listeners. Segment 2; on the other hand, explicates an explicit demonstration of non-understanding. Differently from the first segment, the teacher deals with only one of the group's understanding trouble through various interactional resources including modeling and accounting.

4.9. Extract 9

Extract 9 comes from the 14th week of the semester. It lasts 3.43 minutes in total and it occurs through the end of the class hour (thirty seventh minute). The students work on chapter 11 which is on arts and media. Similar to previous fragments the following analysis explicates how the teacher draws on classroom materials (Extract 3 and 4). It also elaborates on the procedure by providing a hint (Extract 5 and 6) in her reformulation of the previously given instruction based on the students' explicit demonstration of non-understanding. It is also illustrated in the following extract that the teacher takes a single student's clarification request regarding the task procedure as a representative of a potential trouble in understanding the instruction by the whole class. Accordingly, she addresses the rest of the classroom as well for the sake of instructional clarity. Prior to Extract 9, the students have had a vocabulary activity given in the chapter 11 of the coursebook. After completing it, they move to a discussion activity on the same topic. Like previous extracts, the following extract involves two segments. Between the two segments, 52 lines are omitted which includes interaction regarding video watching that is not relevant to the main phenomenon analyzed in this thesis. The first segment of the extract is a typical example of procedural context

(Seedhouse, 2004) in that it consists of a single, extended teacher talk without any student contribution.

Extract 9: a museum collection - 76/19.12.16 (Segment 1)

Tea: ↑so one more vocabulary exercise we will have (.) but i er:
prefer to keep it to end of the lesson (.) no:w i will make you
watch a video
(0.7)
Tea: and then we will find some (.) ↑points to discuss and here is
+ points at the board
our discussion activity (0.2) before video please let's read the
questions and let's try to have some brainstorming what type of
tv and radio programs >books music and films< do you like (0.3)
think about your own preferences (.) can you describe one of
your favourite from each type (0.3) have any documentaries
recently >particularly impress< and which ones if it yes (0.2)
tell your group about your favorite tv series >talk about< the
main characters and the plo:t and <descri:be your favorite
episode> and >one more question< i will add here
+ reflects another question on the board
(0.4)
Tea: >actually this is< another activity just like the kind of task
+ points at the board
activity but i'm taking it as a real question and i want you to
discuss as real question look at the task (0.2) your
+ points at the board + reads the question
organization has just been awarded a grand from arts concert >to
set up a museum collection< imaginary of course for ( )
films (.) books or recorded music for entrainment there is not
enough money and resources to have a collection for a:ll three
<so you will decide> which of them to represent
(0.4)
Tea: films↑ (.) books↑ (.) or music ↑which one is more important
↑which one is better than the other two ↑which one should be
chosen for a museum like that and why
(0.3)
Tea: clear about questions↑ ↑the importance of books films and the
music what is the order i want you to discuss but before that we
will watch a movie here we go

At the beginning of the first part of the extract, Tea announces the new vocabulary activity by putting emphasis on *one* (↑so one more vocabulary exercise we will have). After a contrastive discourse marker (but), she notifies the order of the activities (but i er: prefer to keep it to end of the lesson). From line 2 to 5, although she specifies that they will watch a video at the first stage, in lines 5 and 6 she directs the students to the discussion activity (here is our discussion activity). Her verbal orientation is synchronized with her pointing gesture in line 5. In line 6, providing a sequencing marker (before) Tea issues the instruction of the discussion activity through the use of inclusive language (let's read the questions and let's try to have some brainstorming) in lines 6 and 7. After reading aloud the questions of the discussion activity from the board between the lines 7 and 14, Tea states that she will add one more question (and >one more question< i will add here) with an emphasis on the word *one*. Upon providing information about the new question in lines 14 and 15, through unmodulated format (i want you to discuss) (Markee, 2015) she gives the instruction in lines 17 and 18 (i want you to discuss as real question). Pointing at the board, from line 18 to 22, she reads the question given in the coursebook. After 0.4 second of silence, between lines 25 and 28, she reformulates the written instruction (films↑ (.) books↑ (.) or music ↑which one is more important ↑which one is better than the other two ↑which one should be chosen for a museum like that and why). In line 29, she produces another understanding check question (clear about questions↑); however, without waiting for any student-response, she goes on with the reformulation of the instruction and revises what the students are required to do with another unmodulated form (↑the importance of books films and the music what is the order i want you to discuss). Finally, in line 30 through a sequencing marker (before) she implies that they will watch the video first (we will watch a video). The students watch a video that is almost 15 minutes long and about Andy Warhol's life. Note that the video is not relevant to the discussion activity. It includes the topic of the previous chapter (Chapter 10: Trends), so the students do not make use of the content of the video during their discussion. In the omitted lines, while the students are watching the video, the teacher sometimes pauses it to elaborate on the topic of the video. The omitted part completely consists of an extended teacher turn again. Following the video, the teacher wants the students to form groups of four for the discussion activity.

Extract 9: a museum collection - 76/19.12.16 (Segment 2)

83	Tea:	everybody is done now↑
84	Meh:	ye[s
85	Tea:	[okay go and quickly come together and with your group of
86		people (0.2) lets discuss (.) all: those questions guys
87		(32.5)
		+ The students are working in groups.
88	Tül:	madam
		+ raises her hand
89	Tea:	sweetheart=
		+ walks towards Tül
90	Tül:	=will we discuss these questions or:=
91	Tea:	=↑yes these three question plus (0.3) if you a:re really
		+ points at the questions on the coursebook
92		creating in a museum of collection (0.2) which media tool you
93		think the most efficient one
94		(0.8)
95	Tea:	to show in the museums(.) you will prefe:r >you know< books
96		(0.2) or >you know< (0.2) tv sho:ws (0.3) o:r (0.2) what↑ >you
97		know< (0.3) movies tv ser>ies- or< mu:sic
98		(0.8)
99	Tea:	<which one (.) is the most efficient (.)tool> for the next
100		generation to come there and visit in your museum (0.2) okay↑
101	Yap:	°yeah°
		+ nods
102	Tea:	the mos- the efficiency of the media (0.3) uhm tools you >will
103		discuss actually< in that part (0.2) look at here which is more
		+ points the part in the book
104		important better than the other one and why in a group by
105		compare and contrasting them (0.2) ↑did you understand what to
106		do=
107	Mur:	=yes

The second segment of the extract starts with Tea's question directed to the students to check the formation of the groups (`everybody is done now↑`). In line 84 Meh provides the second pair part of the question (`ye[s`) asked by Tea in the previous line. It is overlapped

with Tea's sequence-closing third ([okay) (Schegloff, 2007) followed by inclusive language form (let's discuss) to initiate the activity. After 32.5 seconds during which the students work in their groups, in line 88, Tül produces an address term (madam) which is accompanied by her hand raising to bid for the floor. In the following line, Tea also uses an address term (sweetheart) and positions herself closer to Tül by walking towards her. In line 90, Tül requests clarification through an incomplete yes/no interrogative (=will we discuss these questions or:=) (Raymond, 2010) including an elongated connector (or:) seeking for an alternative in the final position of TCU. In the second pair part, Tea immediately provides response to Tül's clarification request in line 91. She firstly utters a confirmation token (yes) marked with a rising intonation in turn initial position, then refers to the questions (these three question). Her verbal explanation is simultaneously accompanied by her pointing gesture. Following a short silence, she starts reformulating the instruction in the form of a question (if you a:re really creating in a museum of collection (0.2) which media tool you think the most efficient one). After waiting for 0.8 second, Tea elaborates on the question by uttering the alternatives (to show in the museums(.) you will prefe:r >you know< books (0.2) or >you know< (0.2) tv sho:ws (0.3) o:r (0.2) what↑ >you know< (0.3)movies tv ser>ies- or< mu:sic) in post-expansion turn from (Schegloff, 2007) line 95 to 97. Receiving no verbal and nonverbal response from the students in transition relevance place leads Tea to revise her previous question (<which one (.) is the <u>most</u> efficient (.)tool> for the next generation to come there and visit in your museum) in another post-expansion turn in lines 99 and 100. Tea ends her turn with an understanding check (okay↑) marked suprasegmentally in turn-final position in line 100 and receives a confirmation token (°yeah°) which is embodied by nodding and delivered in a soft voice by Yap in line 101. It could be claimed that receiving a claim of understanding from only one student may lead Tea to make further explanation in an expansion turn. She reformulates the question one more time (the mos- the efficiency of the media (0.3) uhm tools you >will discuss actually< in that part) in lines 102 and 103, and also draws on the classroom material (look at here) by pointing the related part on the book to clarify the instruction. It should also be noted that unlike her previous reformulation turns, Tea ends her reformulation by providing a hint regarding how the student discuss the media tools (by compare and contrasting

them), and she provides an understanding check question in yes/no form (↑did you understand what to do), which is immediately followed by Mur's claim of understanding (=yes) in the subsequent turn.

4.10. Extract 10

The following extract comes from 12th week of the semester and includes three segments. Before Segment 1, the teacher asks the students to evaluate their last classroom presentations which they have given individually. After the students criticize the weak sides of their own and peers' presentations, they talk about the tips of a good classroom presentation and giving a speech. In the following extract, the teacher announces that the students will make another presentation on the topics that will be given by the teacher.

Extract 10: not in full sentences - 17/05.12.16 (Segment 1)

1	Tea:	now i will give you some topics↓ that are >much more enjoyable than<
2		(0.5) than one (.) and .hh i want you to think about the topic >that
3		you are given< a:nd i want you to (.) give me (.) some (0.2) mini
4		presentations> (0.4) but this time you know >it won't be a kind of<
5		ppt presentatio:n (0.3) go and >have some research< this is preparing
6		for a talk [not having a presentation
7	Tan:	[is it group work o:r
8	Tea:	what↑=
		+ establish mutual gaze with Tan
9	Tan:	=group work or in[dividual
10	Tea:	[individual work
11	Tan:	°ok[ay°↓
12	Tea:	[okay↑ (.) but it won't be a kind of ten minutes presentation
13	Tan:	huhu=
		+ nods her head
14	Tea:	=much more sho:rter (0.2) just like (0.2) you'll come here and (.)
15		give us (.) a mini talk (0.2) related to you know a topic >that you<
16		are given (.) you will just take small notes or phrases for
17		preparation

Segment 1 illustrates Tea' instruction giving. The extract starts with Tea's announcement of the new presentation activity. In line 1, she states that she will give presentation topics to the students and indicates that topics are more enjoyable than the topics of the previous presentation activity. In lines 2 and 3, through unmodulated forms (i want you to think about the topic), (i want you to (.) give me (.) some (0.2) mini presentations) which imply the unequal power of teacher talk (Markee, 2015) Tea gives procedural informings (Gardner & Mushin, 2017) of the activity by putting an emphasis on *mini* to signal that it will be a short activity. In the following turn, starting with a contrastive discourse marker (but), Tea provides further explanation by specifying the difference between the current and the previous presentation activity (but this time you know >it won't be a kind of< ppt presentatio:n (0.3) go and >have some research< this is preparing for a talk [not having a presentation). In line 7, Tan self-selects herself as the next speaker and asks a question with an incomplete utterance and marked with an elongation in turn-final position (is it group work o:r). In the subsequent turn, Tea produces an open class repair initiator (what↑) which is considered as the weakest set of initiators (Schegloff, et al., 1977) as they do not specify the nature of the trouble source (Drew, 1997). Nevertheless, Tan treats it as a hearing problem and repeats her last turn, but this time, she utters the other alternative too (group work or in[dividual) which is overlapped with Tea's answer ([individual work) that is marked with an emphasis in turn-initial position. In line 11, Tan produces an acknowledgement token (°ok[ay°↓) in a soft voice with an overlapped fashion with Tea's understanding check in line 12 ([okay↑) produced with a rising intonation. In the same line, after providing a contrastive discourse marker (but), Tea reformulates the informing about the span of the activity (it won't be a kind of ten minutes presentation) by emphasizing the word *ten*. In the following line, Tan claims understanding through an understanding token (huhu) which is embodied by a simultaneous nodding. Tan's claim of understanding is immediately followed by Tea's another reformulation (=much more sho:rter). Also, Tea makes an extension by adding how they are going to do the activity (just like (0.2) you'll come here and (.) give us (.) a mini talk (0.2) related to you know a topic >that you< are given) in lines 14, 15 and 16. Then, in lines 16 and 17, she gives another instruction regarding the preparation

phase of the presentation (`you will just take small notes or phrases for preparation`).

The first segment of the extract illustrates an example of student contribution in a procedural context. Seedhouse (2004) describes procedural context as the most straightforward one consisting of extended teacher talk. However, he also presents some possible variations, one of which is evident in this part of the extract. In line 7, Tan with self-selection takes the turn and ask a question concerning the procedure (`is it group work o:r`). Secondly, it could be taken as an example of the co-construction of instruction which is mostly considered as an individual phenomenon and traditionally associated with noninteractional operations (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004). Therefore, the first part of the Extract 10 displays interactionally complex nature of teacher instructions.

Between Segment 1 and 2 the teacher gives a presentation topic to each student, and upon some students' questions, she provides explanation about the content of their topics. Since the interaction between the two segments are not relevant to the phenomenon analyzed in this study, 122 lines before Segment 2 have been omitted. Moreover, the teacher's instruction revision practice comes only after these omitted lines. Just before Segment 2, the students have made preparation for the activity and started to take some notes on their papers.

Extract 10: not in full sentences - 17/05.12.16 (Segment 2)

139 Tea: don't write you:r things in a very full sentences >if you are
+ touches on Tül's notes + spreads her arms to opposite sides
140 trying to write the speech< (0.4) it will make you >you know<
141 slower (0.2) okay↑ .hh just write some key points (0.2) that
142 you wi:ll need to remember when you are talking it will be
143 enough
144 (4.4)
145 Tea: ready↑=
146 Meh: =no (0.3)
147 Tea: £okay£
148 (21.2)
+ Students keep on writing their sentences and Tea walks around the classroom
149 Tea: while you are taking note:s please (.) avoid full sentences,
150 instead try to write some <key note:s phrases> it will help
151 you better (.) while you are talking
152 (1.1)
153 Tea: because full sentences <you wanna read> whole full sentences to
154 talk
155 (10.3)
+ Tea walks around the classroom and check students' papers

In line 139, Tea initiates a repair after noticing that Tül does not take small notes and provides an account for why Tül should not write full sentences (`don't write you:r things in a very full sentences >if you are trying to write the speech< (0.4) it will make you >you know< slower`). Following an understanding check (`okay↑`) marked in suprasegmental level, in line 141 Tea reformulates her instruction she issued in line 16 (Segment 1) with an emphasis on *key*. After 4.4 seconds of silence, Tea checks whether the students are ready, and gets an immediate negative response from Meh (`=no`) in line 146. It is followed by Tea's sequence-closing third uttered in a smiley voice (`£okay£`). During the next 21.2 seconds of silence, the students keep on writing their notes and Tea walks around the classroom. In line 149, Tea revises her previous instruction, which she has given only to Tül beforehand, to all of the students this time. It reflects the nature of multilogue in the classroom (Schwab, 2011) which is defined as "a

certain form of institutional multi-party activity where participants' verbal and nonverbal contributions have reference to more than one addressee" (p. 7). Instead of addressing to an individual student, Tea addresses whole class by treating all of the students in the classroom as recipients. In her revision, Tea again puts an emphasis on *key* and provides an account for taking short notes. During 10.3 seconds of silence, she walks around the classroom and checks the students' notes.Segment 3 that will be given below follows Segment 2 without any deduction, that is, between Segment 2 and 3 there is no omitted line.

Extract 10: not in full sentences - 17/05.12.16 (Segment 3)

156 Tea: these are full sentences >and most probably< that will make
+ points at Sel's sentences
157 you kind a: (0.3) put in a problem while you are discussing so
158 instead try to write some key notes (0.2) okay (0.3) because
159 >if there is full sentence you wanna say< all this full
+ spread her arms to opposite sides
160 sentence slo:wer
+ moves her hand slowly
161 (4.1)
162 Tea: <you may u:se your dictionarie:s to che:ck> some unknown
163 vocabulary or new vocabulary that you will >most probably
164 ↑need↓<
165 (25.4)
+ Students keep on writing their sentences
166 Tea: instead of writing every single thing in your ↑mind↓ (0.3) try
+ orients to the whole class
167 to have brainstorm more
168 (1.8)
169 Tea: okay (0.2) most probably you know it seems <quite a short
170 time> but you will think >you will just noticing< it is much
171 more longer than you expected (0.2) ↑okay (.) so have (.) more
172 idea production and brainstorming

In line 156, by pointing at Sel's notes Tea initiates repair and after explaining the possible problem that Sel may encounter while presenting, she revises the instruction again (`try to write some key notes`) in line 158. Then, in lines 158 and 159, Tea provides an account

for the necessity of taking short notes one more time (because >if there is full sentence you wanna say< all this) with an emphasis on the words *all* and *slower* which are accompanied by her hand gestures. Following 4.1 seconds of silence, between the lines 162 and 164, Tea provides a suggestion to students through modulated forms (Markee, 2015) (<you may u:se your dictionarie:s to che:ck> some unknown vocabulary or new vocabulary that you will >most probably ↑need↓<). After 25.4 seconds of silence, during which the students keep on writing their notes, Tea bodily orients to the whole class and reformulates her instruction one more time. By targeting all students, Tea creates multiple addressivity (St. John & Cromdal, 2016), which describes how students' nonverbal actions is treated by the teacher as "representative of a possible general misapprehension" (p. 270). In this case, Tea firstly notices that some of the individuals take long notes and initiates repair to those individuals, then she addresses the whole class by treating them as a whole body and revises her instruction again in order to repair the trouble. Between the lines 166 and 172, Tea makes an extension to her original instruction and she gives a hint regarding how the students are expected to do the notetaking (instead of writing every single thing in your ↑mind↓ (0.3) try to have brainstorm more), (have (.) more idea production and brainstorming).

4.11. Extract 11

Extract 11 will present an episode from the 12th week of the semester. The topic of the present unit in the coursebook is popular culture and new trends. The students discuss the effect of pop culture on people's life and engage in a skimming activity based on an article given in the coursebook. The article includes both a skimming and a scanning exercise as a pre-reading task. Prior to the beginning of the extract, the students have completed the skimming exercise and the teacher has elicited the answers of the skimming part from the students. Also prior to the extract, the class has just proceeded to the scanning task at the beginning of which the teacher specifies two steps that the students are required to perform for accomplishing the task. As illustrated in the previous extract, Extract 11 exemplifies that the teacher notices the potential misunderstanding regarding the task instruction through observing the students while they are working on the task. It is demonstrated in the extract that one of the students does not fulfill the first step of the task but starts with the second

one. The following fragment shows how the teacher addresses the students' potential misunderstanding to ensure the task accomplishment through interactional resources including parsing the task instruction into smaller components and giving an account for the order of procedures that they need to follow.

Extract 11: scanning - 18/06.12.16

1 Tea: now we will have a scanning exercise (0.3) please look at the
2 questions in two b
+ Students look at their books on their desks
3 (1.0)
4 Tea: read the questions first and while you are reading (.) please
+ Students look at their books on their desks
5 don't forget to underline the key points <that you will loo:k
6 (0.3) for in the text> (0.2) okay↑ (.) here we go
7 (16.3)
+ Students are reading the text
8 Tea: did you read the question↑
+ looks at Bey's book
+ walks towards Bey and points at her book
9 Bey: °huhu°
10 Tea: underline the parts that yo[u
+ touches the question part on Bey's book
11 Bey: [hu=
+ starts to underline
12 Tea: =will look for in the text please
+ walks towards the middle of the classroom
13 so for re- er: >are you done with the questions<
+ looks around the students
14 (1.3)
15 Tea: are you done with the questions↑
16 (0.4)
17 Tea: did you read the questions and underline the key points in the
+ some of the students looks at Tea + shows the text to the students
18 questions↑
19 Pır: °hu:°
20 Bey: °huhu°

```
21  Tea:  do it fi:rst (.) and then you know we will start >reading the
22        text< and you will be given three: minutes (0.4) to read the (.)
23        text okay↑
24  Pır:  okay
25  Tea:  but first of all underline it because you have to understand
26        what you are looking for in the text (.) for a scanning exercise
```

In Extract 11, Tea firstly announces the upcoming scanning activity (`now we will have a scanning exercise`), then she directs the students to a specific part of the coursebook (`please look at the 1 questions in two b)` in lines 1 and 2. After 1.0 second of silence, while all of the students are looking at the books on their desks, in line 4 Tea starts providing the instruction by putting an emphasis on the word *key* (`read the questions first and while you are reading (.) please don't forget to underline the key points <that you will loo:k(0.3) for in the text>`) in line 5. She specifies that the students are firstly to read the questions that are given in the previous page of the text. In line 6, Tea produces an understanding check token (`okay↑`) which is marked with a rising intonation in final position and initiates the activity with a prompter (`here we go`). During 16.3 seconds, Tea observes the students while they are working on the task. After noticing the trouble through observation, in line 8, Tea asks to Bey if she read the questions (`did you read the question↑`) by positioning herself closer to Bey and pointing at the questions on Bey's book. Tea's question is immediately followed by Bey's confirmation token (`°huhu°`) delivered in a soft voice in line 9. Then, Tea touches upon the question part of Bey's book and repeats her previous instruction in line 10 (`underline the parts that you will look for in the text please`). In line 11, Bey produces a change of state token (`hu`) (Heritage, 1984) in an overlapped fashion with Tea's turn and starts to underline the questions, which makes evident that she has not fulfilled the first step of the instruction. It should also be noted that although Tea addresses only Bey at the beginning, towards the end of her revision turn, she walks towards the middle of the classroom and starts to address the other students, too in line 12 (Schwab, 2011). It illustrates Tea's accomplishment of dual addressivity (St. John & Cromdal, 2016) through which she makes the instruction available to the whole group while originally intertwining it to an individual. In line 13, after uttering a transition marker (`so`), Tea firstly repairs herself through abandonment of her first utterance (`for re-`) (Schegloff, 1992)

followed by an elongated hesitation marker (er:). She asks whether they have finished the underlining work (>are you done with the questions<) in a faster pace, while looking around the students at the same time. Seeing no attempt at any responses from the students, she repeats her question in line 15 after 1.3 second of silence. Having received again no verbal and nonverbal response from the students in the second pair part, Tea asks an elaborated question including the two steps of the instruction in lines 17 and 18 (did you read the questions and underline the key points in the questions↑). While she asks the questions, she draws on the classroom material and shows the question part to the students by pointing at it. She synchronizes her pointing gesture with the production of the word *underline*. In line 19, Pır produces an elongated change of state token (°hu:°) (Heritage, 1984) in a soft voice, which is followed by Bey's confirmation token (huhu) in line 20. It can be claimed that receiving a confirmatory response from only one student could lead Tea to orient to the instruction in line 21. With online-decision making, this time she parses the original instruction into smaller components (Lee, 2007) (do it fi:rst (.) and then you know we will start >reading the text<) by using a continuation marker (and) with a sequencing marker (then) between the two steps: (i) underlining the questions; (ii) reading the text. After allocating the time for the second step of the task (you will be given three: minutes (0.4) to read the (.) text), she ends her turn with an understanding check (okay↑) marked at suprasegmental level in line 23, which is followed by Pır's acknowledgement token (okay) in the subsequent turn in line 24. Then, in line 25 Tea firstly produces a discourse marker (but) and sequence marker (first of all) indicating the order of the steps, she provides an account regarding why they are going to do the underlining step initially (because you have to understand what you are looking for in the text (.) for a scanning exercise).

Like the previous extract, extract 11 also exemplifies the teacher's addressing the whole class (Schwab, 2011) by bodily positioning herself closer and constituting one "single audience" (St. John & Cromdal, 2016, p. 254) in order to make the reformulation of instruction available for each student. The teacher firstly manages to locate the trouble by observing an individual's task performance and orients to it by taking it as an instructional need of the whole class. Then, she manages to shape her reformulation turn upon checking the students' performance by asking a number of procedural questions. Although there is no

clear evidence as to whether the teacher's parsing the instruction into smaller components and giving an account for the procedure is facilitative for the students' proper task accomplishment, it can be still argued that by observing an individual student's material, the teacher successfully locates the trouble in task performance and initiates reformulation to negotiate the meaning.

4.12. Extract 12

Extract 12 comes from 14th week of the term. It is divided into two segments to increase the readability although there are no omitted lines between the two segments. The name of unit of the week is *Trends*. The extract illustrates how Tea provides an account to her specific instruction that she left unaccounted before, upon identifying a possible understanding trouble. It is also demonstrated that after an understanding trouble emerges, Tea parses the instruction into smaller components to make it easier for students to carry out the tasks. Before the extract starts Tea has provided the task instruction and wanted the students to work in groups of four. In the coursebook, there are two different texts about two media recluses. In each group, two of the students are supposed to read one of the texts, and the other two students will read the other text, then they are expected to discuss the questions based on a chart in the book. In the following extract the interaction occurs between Tea and Fev, Tül, Yap and Sah, and it should be noted here that these students are members of the same group. After the students form their groups, Tea summarizes the instruction one more time for the students who show up late to the class.

Extract 12: five questions - 79/20.12.16 (Segment 1)

1 Tea: ladies and gentleman (.) for the newcomer (0.3) friend also
+ claps her hands + The students look at the teacher
+ takes Tül's book and comes to the center of the classroom

2 (0.6)

3 Tea: here we have a c↑ha:rt in our material pack (0.5) you are supposed
+ shows the chart

4 to: <fill your own chart>

5 (3.5)
+ Tea looks around some of the students who keep talking

6 Tea: when you are listening to each other and while you are discussing
7 >with your friends< you may also (0.4) fill (.) <the parts> related
8 to <their> passages too (.) okay↑ here we go
+ puts the book back on Tül's desk
9 (116.3) ((Group discussion))
10 Tül: °we are done°
+ established mutual gaze with Tea
11 Tea: you are done (0.2) okay
+ comes closer to Tül's group
+ looks at the students' book
12 (0.5)
13 Tea: why you didn't fill the cha:rts
+ points at the chart in Tül's book
14 (0.7)
15 Sah: er:=
16 Tül: =oh (0.2) yes
17 Tea: these are the answers of the question by the way these five as you
+ points at the book + points at the book
18 see
19 (2.1)
20 + looks around the students
21 fulfilling this chart means that you are er: answering er the
22 questions so >that's why you now i suggested you< to fill it (.) so
23 these five questions are directly related to the chart=
+ points at the questions
24 Tül: =o[kay
25 Sah: [okay

In line 1, using a general address term (`ladies and gentleman`) accompanied with a bodily action (clapping), Tea tries to gets the students' attention. Walking in the middle of the classroom she shows the chart and issues the instruction (`here we have a c↑ha:rt in our material pack (0.5) you are supposed`) also for the students who come to the class late. However, in line 4, she terminates her talk and looks around the students who are talking to each other in line 5. After 3.5 seconds of wait time, she provides the rest

of the instruction from line 6 to 9 (when you are listening to each other and while you are discussing >with your friends< you may also (0.4) fill (.) <the parts> related to <their> passages too). In the same turn, Tea produces an understanding check (okay↑) marked with rising intonation in final position, then without waiting for any response from the students she initiates the activity (here we go). It should be noted here that during 116.3 seconds, the students engage in the task, but unfortunately their voice during the group work could not be recorded properly, so it is not possible to add the interaction between group members into the extract. However, it is not considered a problem for the analysis of the extract, since the focus of this study is the teacher's instruction revisions which comes only after 116.2, which explicates the reason of the omission of the lines. In line 10, one of the students state that they have completed the activity in a soft voice (°we are done°) by establishing mutual gaze with Tea. In line 11, Tea orients to Tül's announcement through both positioning herself closer to Tül's group and repeating her utterance by putting an emphasis on the last word (you are done). She also produces an acknowledgement token (okay) in turn final position which is followed by 0.5 second of silence. It could be claimed that Tea may notice that Tül's group has not completed the task as they are supposed to do. Tea's noticing of the understanding trouble with regard to task instruction is observable with her question in line 13 (why you didn't fill the cha:rts). Moreover, Sah's elongated hesitation marker (er:) and Tül's change of state token (oh) (Heritage, 1984) followed by an acknowledgement token (yes) make their understanding trouble evident. What happens in line 17 is Tea's orientation to understanding trouble. Drawing on the classroom material (coursebook) Tea indicates that by filling the chart the students will also have answered the questions (these are the answers of the question by the way). It is followed by 2.1 seconds of silence during which Tea looks at the students in the group; however, does not get any verbal and nonverbal responses from them, which may lead Tea to reformulate her statement in the following turn (fulfilling this chart means that you are er: answering er the questions). In addition, she also provides an account for filling out the chart (>that's why you now i suggested you< to fill it) and ends her turn with another reformulation (these five questions are directly related to the chart) in line 23. It is followed immediately with Tül and Sah's displays of understanding

(Koole, 2010; Sacks, 1992) through acknowledgment tokens delivered in an overlapping fashion to one another.

Extract 12: five questions - 79/20.12.16 (Segment 2)

26	Fev:	teacher
27	Tea:	yes
		+ walks towards to Fev
28	Fev:	are we going to do this part now=
29	Tea:	=>no no no< not now er: ↑guys (0.3) er you are not expected to do
		+ shaking her head laterally
		+ withdraws her gaze from Fev
		+ faces at the whole class
30		>even vocabulary part< just end of that page
31		(128.2) ((Group discussion))
32	Tea:	were you ↑done by >talking about< your pa:[rt
		+ asks to Fev's group
33	Yap:	[yeah
		+ nods her head
34	Tea:	to each oth[er
35	Tül:	[yes
		+ nod her head
36	Tea:	so and then you may answer the questions all together then this
37		+ points
38		at the part
39		part °>you know<°
40	Yap:	okay
41	Tea:	you shou- >when you doing individually< that means there is no sense
42		in <that one> (0.3) that means my frie:nd already talk about the topic
43		to me so i have everythi:ng so i may answer the <questions> (0.3)
44		so try to answer the questions together

The second segment of Extract 12 starts with Fev's address term (`teacher`) directed to Tea in line 26. It is followed by Tea's orientation to Fev through walking towards her and with the token *yes*. In line 28, Fev directs a question to Tea by pointing at a part of the coursebook (`are we going to do this part now`). Since the part which Fev points at could not

be captured by any of the cameras, it is not possible to know whether what Fev refers to is the task that Tea provides account for in line 22, or it is another activity. However, based on Fev's turn manifesting the understanding trouble in line 29 through a repair initiator component (=>no no no<) delivered in a faster pace than the surrounding talk, Tea undertakes repair work. She states that they will not do the task now (not now) with a special emphasis accompanied by a bodily action (shaking her head laterally). After producing an elongated hesitation marker accompanied by gaze withdrawal from Fev, Tea uses a general address term (↑guys) marked with a rising intonation on the onset of the utterance and positions her body towards the whole class. This is a typical example of how Tea treats an individual's confirmation request as a *general instructional need* of all students. In other words, students' questions or contributions related to the instructions can lay the ground for Tea's addressing the whole class. In lines 29 and 30, Tea provides explanation to the confirmation request directed to her by Fev in line 28, to all of the students in the classroom. However, whether Tea's explanation is facilitative to the students' understanding or not remains unclear because there is no visible student-orientation to it in the following lines. During 128.2 seconds, the students again engage in the activity. In their engagement, there is no teacher revision or reformulation of instruction. It should be noted once again that there are two main task requirements: (1) read the texts and talk about them to each other and (2) answer the questions given in the coursebook together with the other group members. In line 32, Tea directs a yes/no interrogative question (were you ↑done by >talking about< your pa:[rt) (Raymond, 2010) to Fev's group to check whether they have completed the first step of the task (reading the text and talking about it). In the subsequent turn, Tea's question overlaps with Yap's confirmation token ([yeah) which is accompanied with her nodding at the same time. In line 34, Tea produces the rest part of the question (to each oth[er) she initiates in line 32 and ends her turn. It is followed by another confirmation token ([yes) delivered in an overlapping fashion with Tea's turn. The subsequent turns show that by checking the completion of the first step of the task, Tea paves the way for the second step. Drawing on Yap and Tül's responses, in line 36 Tea starts to provide the rest of the instruction. After producing a transition (so) and a continuation marker (and) followed by sequencing marker (then), she issues the rest part of the instruction in a modulated form (you may answer the questions all together then) and specifies the part that she refers to with an indexical reference to the shared

resource (this part) (Jackson, 2013) by pointing at the same time. In line 40, Yap provides an acknowledgment token (okay), which is followed by Tea's accounting for why they are supposed to answer the questions together in an extended turn. In line 41, she firstly self-repairs herself and abandons her original utterance with a cut off (you shou-), then provides accounts for the second step (>when you doing individually< that means there is no sense in <that one> (0.3) that means my frie:nd already talk about the topic to me so i have everythi:ng so i may answer the <questions>). Finally, she ends her turn by providing the instruction one more time (try to answer the questions together).

Based on the analysis of this extract, it is observable in the extract that Tea notices the understanding trouble through looking at the students' material. Students' hesitation marker and change of state token productions preceded by silence make this trouble salient, which leads Tea to provide an account for the instruction. In the following turns, it can be seen that the students produce acknowledgement tokens and engage in the activity. Therefore, it can be claimed that this sequence manifests how Tea employs an interactional resource in order to resolve the trouble with her online decision-making ability. Secondly, it can also be observed towards the end of the extract that Tea checks the procedure through asking questions to the students. Acting upon the students' responses, she issues the second step of the instruction in the subsequent turn. Therefore, it can be understood that Tea parses the instruction into smaller components to make it easier for the students to carry out the task. Finally, as in the resolution of the first understanding trouble, she again accounts why the students are supposed to answer the questions in the book together. Since in the extract it is not possible to see how the students orient to the second accounting, it is not convenient to make any claims on the success of this interactional resource; however, Tea's employing it to negotiate meaning and restore understanding still shows her classroom interactional competence.

4.13. Extract 13

The last extract of this thesis that follows demonstrates a typical example of the interactional resources including asking questions to negotiate meaning, third-position repair, and parsing the instruction into smaller steps. It also illustrates how the task instruction is crafted collaboratively in sequential basis through interaction with the teacher's question (St. John

& Cromdal, 2016). Furthermore, it explicates the teacher's management of the student's understanding trouble through reformulation of the instruction that involves the teacher's question repetition, which results in carrying out the activity in a wrong way. Extract 13 comes from 16th week of the academic term. The class has been working on a unit on the coursebook. The topic of the unit is crime. The students have had a brainstorming activity concerning the duties of jury members in a court. After they have discussed the job of jury as a whole class, the teacher announces the upcoming activity at the beginning of the extract.

Extract 13: jury members - 71/02.01.17 (Segment 1)

1	Tea:	so you understand their position in court after all i think
2		okay↓ (0.3) so↑ (0.2) order the features from the ↑most (0.3)
		+ reflects the features of a jury member on the board
3		that means your number one to the lea:st (0.2) that means
		+ shows one with her finger
4		number five important then with your partner discuss your
		+ shows five with her fingers
5		ordering (.) the reasons >for your choice< (.) you will do it
6		individually (.) i mean (.) this is your list you will decide
		+ points at the list on the board
7		from the most important to least important on your own with
		+ points at herself
8		your own lists↓ (.) and then you will discuss with a person
9		about your choices and your list
10		(0.6)
11	Tea:	over eighteen years old how much it's important (.) for a jury
12		member to be (0.2) well educated↑ (0.2) broad minded >broad
13		minded< mea:ns
		+ spreads her hands
14		(0.4)
15	Tül:	open (.) [open minded
16	Meh:	[open minded
17	Tea:	open minded (0.2) okay↓ (.) ↑so these are the qualities that
		+ shows the list
18		you are given choo:se the most important to the lea:st
19		important(0.2) number one >two three four five< (.) let's
20		decide get a piece of paper or you may use your book >doesn't
21		matter< create your own [list

22 Tül: [we give our list to partners↑

23 Tea: >no no< fir- ↑okay guys (0.3) first of all what will we do↑

24 (0.8)

25 Tea: you will create what↑

26 Sel: we make our list=

27 Tea: =yeap (0.2) you will create your order then↑

28 Nur: dis[cuss

29 Tan: [we discuss with [our partner

30 Der: [with a partner

31 Tea: exactly (.) firstly create your list then discuss your
32 ordering with your partner is it okay↑

33 (0.6)

34 Tea: clear↑

35 Ss: yes

36 Tea: okay (0.3) ↑now create your list firstly and the:n we will
37 start

38 (28.3)

+ The students work individually.

39 Tea: done↑

40 Tül: °ye[ah°

41 Pır: °[yeah°=

42 Tea: =okay (0.2) so↑ (0.3) please choose a partner to yourself and
43 discuss about your choices and see >you know< your choices
44 a:re same with each other or different from each other (0.3)
45 what is your priority what is your friend's priority (0.2)
46 let's discuss some

47 (28.4)

+ The students work with their partners.

In line 1, Tea closes the previous discussion activity in the final unit of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) structure (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) by providing feedback which is followed by a sequence closing third (okay↓) (Schegloff, 2007) in the subsequent line. Reflecting the features of a good jury member on the board, Tea produces a transition marker (so↑) and starts issuing the instruction with a rising intonation at the beginning of *most* and by putting an emphasis on *one* embodied with a hand gesture. Likewise, she puts an emphasis

on the word *least* and makes it visible to the students with her fingers. Embodying her utterances with her fingers Tea wants to make the meaning more concrete for the students. Meanwhile, the students are looking at the features on the board. The students are firstly expected to order the importance of qualities for being a jury member from one to five according to their perceptions, then with a partner they will discuss their order. In line 4, after using a connector (then) Tea goes on providing the rest of the instruction which involves discussing the order in pairs (with your partner discuss your ordering). It is followed by her elaboration on the instruction which is marked with an elaboration marker (i mean) (Mauranen, 2010) by pointing at the list on the board in line 6. Completing the instruction giving, in lines 11 and 12, she reads some of the features from the board. In line 13, she deploys a designedly incomplete utterance (Koshik, 2002) (broad-minded mea:ns) to elicit the meaning of the word *broadminded* from the students by synchronizing her gestures with her talk in an insert-expansion sequence (Schegloff, 2007) that is mostly launched to clarify the meaning which potentially causes interactional troubles. Designedly incomplete utterance (DIU) is defined by Koshik (2002) as "grammatically incomplete sentences, phrases, or individual words to be continues, but not necessarily completed by the students" (p. 288). Tea's DIU elicits responses from two students in line 15 and 16. In the following line, she accepts the student's candidate responses through repeating it. In line 17, after a sequence-closing third (okay) followed by a transition marker (so) signaling a transition to the next, Tea shows the list of the qualities one more time and provides the instruction again with an emphasis on the verb *choose* and the word *least* which is also marked with an elongation. Then, counting the features (>two three four five<) in a faster pace, Tea initiates the activity with a prompt through inclusive language use (let's decide). In line 22, Tül self-selects herself as the next speaker and requests clarification with a yes/no declarative (we give our list to partners↑) (Raymond, 2010) which overlaps with Tea's turn in the previous line. In line 23, Tea firstly produces repeated rejection devices (>no no<) in a faster pace and cuts off her utterance (fir-). Then, using an address term (↑okay guys) to the students she asks a display question (Long & Sato, 1983) with regard to the first step of the procedure (first of all what will we do↑). Upon receiving no response from the students during 0.8 second, in line 25, she poses another question (you will create what↑) which involves a part of the answer she asked with the first question (you will create). It should be noted here that this sequence that

involves Tea's use of different types of questions which gets response from the students in the following turns, points to her ability of online decision-making, thus to her classroom interactional competence. In line 26, Sel provides a response (we make our list=) which is latched with Tea's confirmation token (=yeap) in line 27. After reformulating Sel's response (you will create your order), Tea asks the following step of the procedure that the students will follow with a sequencing marker delivered with a rising intonation in turn final position (then↑). Note that as illustrated in the previous extracts that displays Tea asking question to co-craft the instruction in her reformulation turns, in this extract after receiving a response from the student Tea either repeats the response or reformulates it to make it more comprehensible (Walsh, 2011) for the rest of the classroom (Schwab, 2011). In lines 28, 29 and 30, Tea gets candidate responses from Nur, Tan and Der in an overlapping fashion with one another. What happens between the lines 23 and 31 is quite relevant to the focal phenomenon in that it exemplifies how the teacher applies interactional resources immediately to address instructional need after an understanding trouble . In line 31, Tea accepts the students' candidate responses with a strong agreement token (exactly) which is followed by reformulation of instruction (firstly create your list then discuss your) ordering with your partner. Later on, Tea ends her turn with an understanding check question marked suprasegmentally in line 32 (is it okay↑). After 0.6 second of silence she again checks understanding with the token clear delivered with a questioning intonation in line 34. Tea's understanding check questions uttered successively manage to get a response from some of the students. In line 35, the students claim understanding with a confirmation token (yes) provided in chorus. Then, in line 36, Tea repeats the first step of the procedure and after a continuation marker (and) followed by an elongated sequencing marker (the:n), Tea initiates the activity. It should be noted that although Tea does not check the students' understanding in the first delivery of the instruction, she uses repetitive understanding check questions in her second delivery after an understanding trouble emerges. During 28.3 seconds of silence the students work individually and create their lists. After the teacher checks whether they finish the task in line 39 (done↑) she gets responses delivered in soft voice from Tül (°ye[ah°) and Pır (°[yeah°=). Pır's response is latched with Tea's turn-closing third (Schegloff, 2007) (okay) in line 42. After a transition marker (so↑) marked with a rising intonation in word final position, Tea first revises the second part of the instruction (choose a partner to

yourself and discuss about your choices and see >you know< your choices a:re same with each other or different from each other) then she provides procedural elaboration (what is your priority what is your friend's priority) on what they will discuss with their partners in line 45 and initiates the discussion (let's discuss some) in line 46. During 28.4 seconds the students work in pairs and the teacher sits on her chair.

Extract 13: jury members - 71/02.01.17 (Segment 2)

48	Meh:	heh heh we are done heh heh (0.2) we are done
		+ Tea looks at Meh
49	Tea:	↑really same list same choices↑
50	Meh:	er: not same er: but we decided all of them are er- vital
51		°choices°> (0.2) vi[tal
52	Tea:	[all↑=
53	Meh:	=all of them [er:
54	Tea:	[all of them are vital (0.3) but what is the
55		priority=
56	Meh:	=yes↓
57	Mur:	yes
		+ Meh and Mur turns to each other

At the beginning of Segment 2, Meh indicates that he and his partner finished the discussion activity in line 48. His turn is surrounded with laughter (heh heh we are done heh heh). After establishing mutual gaze with Tea, Meh repeats his previous utterance (we are done) in the same line. Tea expresses her surprise with a surprise marker (↑really) (Lindstrom, 1994; Svenning, 1998) at the beginning of TCU. Note that in the following turns (which are not included in the analysis because of the space constraint) it is observed that Meh and Mur finish their discussion very earlier than the other pairs in the classroom. Therefore, it could be claimed that the reason of Tea's surprise may be the results from Meh and Mur's in that they complete the task in such a short time. In line 49, Tea produces an incomplete utterance including turn final rising intonation (same list same choices↑) to check if they have the same order. In line 50, beginning with an elongated hesitation marker (er:) Meh announces they have considered all of them as crucial. His turn includes several hesitation markers and quietly produced utterances, which may signal his uncertainty about task accomplishment. After a short silence in line 51 he repeats the word vital in an

overlapping fashion with Tea's turn in the following line where Tea requests clarification by repeating Meh's previous turn with a questioning intonation ([all↑=). It is latched with Meh's response in line 53 where by repeating Tea's previous utterance Meh displays his acknowledgement (=all of them [er:). His elongated hesitation marker is overlapped with Tea's turn in line 54. Tea firstly repeats the student's response thereby showing acknowledgement ([all of them are vital), then after the marker *but* she asks their priority through repetition of her previous question (what is the priority). In the following two turns, after Meh and Mur utters acknowledgement tokens (yes) successively, they start to discuss again by turning to each other, which displays their understanding of what they are expected to do.

4.14. Conclusion

This chapter illustrated the use of interactional resources as an attempt to resolve troubles in understanding of teacher instructions in an intermediate level EFL classroom. The analyses of extracts in this chapter explicated sequential organization of emergence and resolution of the troubles, noticing and locating non-understanding, and certain strategies deployed by the teacher to restore understanding and reach to pedagogical goals of the specific lesson. As will be indicated in Chapter 5 and as can be seen from the analyses, the teacher notices understanding troubles either through the students' explicit demonstration of non-understanding and clarification requests or based on her observation. The extracts clearly illustrate that the teacher treats the students' long silences without no activity initiation, the answers that are incongruent to the requirements of the task and inappropriate students-contributions as a clue signaling the troubles. In this regard, it can be claimed that the students' explicit demonstration of non-understanding is not mere evidence of the problem, which points out more than one sequential organization of management of such troubles. Specifically, as was indicated in the analysis of extracts 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 13 students' clarification requests lead the teacher to revise or reformulate task instruction she provided previously through various resources. Revision and reformulation of task instructions; however, cannot be claimed to facilitate task accomplishment all the time, yet in some cases it can be observed that display and claim of understanding occur at the end of the teacher's second explanation.

The sequential analysis of non-understandings and their resolutions also showed that the students' understanding troubles projects two next actions for the teacher. Firstly, as was illustrated in extracts 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, and 13, the teacher directs her clarification only to the student who requests confirmation and clarification about the procedure. Secondly, as was mentioned in the analyses of the other extracts the teacher reformulates her instruction by targeting the whole group either by orienting bodily to the whole class (as in extracts 6, 8, 12, and 13), or by using a general address term just before her reformulation work to gather the students' attention (as can be observed in extracts 10 and 11). Another observation that should be mentioned here is that in some cases it is the teacher's understanding checks that enable the students to show their (non)understandings. However, it is not the only way to track their comprehension of instructions; on the contrary, in the majority of the cases the students claim their non-understanding or require clarification uninvitedly by self-selecting themselves as the next speaker.

Table 1

Interactional Resources Employed by the Teacher

Interactional Resources	**Extract**
Accounting	Extract 8, 10, 11, 12
Exemplifying	Extract 5, 6, 7
Modeling	Extract 7, 8
Hinting	Extract 7, 8, 9, 10
Third-position repair	Extract 1, 2, 5, 13
Question-asking	Extract 4, 13
Simplification	Extract 1, 7
Parsing	Extract 11, 12, 13
Embodied action	Extract 1, 2, 3
Repetitive understanding-checks	Extract 1, 13
Drawing on classroom material	Extract 3, 9, 12

This chapter has also provided a number of interactional practices (see Table 1 above), namely: accounting, exemplifying, modelling, hinting, third-position repair, question-asking, simplification (omitting potentially complex grammatical items), parsing, embodied actions, repetitive understanding checks, and drawing on classroom material based on video recorded classroom interactional data. It was documented that these resources were generally

used in combination rather than on their own. As can be seen in Table 1 above, while the most employed resources were found to be accounting, hinting, and third-position repair, only two extracts involve an example that illustrates the teacher's modeling (extracts 7 and 8), question-asking (extracts 4 and 13), simplification practice (extracts 1 and 7) and use of repetitive understanding checks (extracts 1, 13). It was also seen that especially complex instructions which consist of multiple steps lead to the teacher to parse the instructions into smaller components which facilitate the students' task engagements as well as task achievements.

All in all, the deployment of such resources requires immediate interactional and contingent acts from the teacher. In this regard, the turn just after the students' demonstration of non-understanding has an extraordinary place which calls a broad array of interpretive actions of teachers who achieve complex analytic works in recognizing troubles. Finding and repairing troubles points out the teacher's Classroom Interactional Competence (Walsh, 2011) which has a facilitative role in "mediating and assisting learning" (p. 158). Although in the present study there are three research, the data analysis chapter was not divided into sections since the phenomena under investigation are interwoven to each other. For this reason, they were handled in one main body, yet the discussion chapter will present them separately for a clear picture of the main aim of this study.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter will present a discussion of findings of the current study in relation to the research questions and relevant research studies in literature. Also, it argues the methodological and pedagogical implications for foreign language education, instructional settings and CIC development. The present chapter is organized into four sections. The first three sections will address each research question. In 5.1., the focus will be on the sequential organization of understanding troubles and their resolutions, which will be presented in response to the first research question (*How are the understanding troubles emerged with regard to task instructions and their resolutions sequentially constructed?*) and four sequential organization formats will be documented through simplified versions of the extracts in Chapter 4. 5.2. provides elaboration on the ways through which the teacher notices and locates the nature of understanding troubles. In addition to the students' verbal claims or demonstration of non-understanding, various sources that the teacher utilizes will be documented. The second research question (*How does the teacher notice understanding troubles?*) will be answered and discussed in this section in relation to the existing literature. The last research question (*What are the interactional resources that the teacher deploys in order to resolve emergent troubles and restore understanding?*) will be discussed in 5.3. where emergent interactional resources will be introduced and presented in detail. As the current study is the first research to investigate students' understanding of teacher instructions and resolution of troubles, the discussion is believed to lay the ground for an extension of existing interactional practices in repairing understanding problem, thus it will fill this research gap. In 5.4. a revision of CIC features and CD will be provided and a new dimension to CIC is offered: issuing clear instructions through interactional resources

detailed in 5.3. Finally, the chapter will be concluded with limitations of the study and pedagogical implications for foreign language classrooms, instructional contexts and classroom interactional development.

5.1. Sequential Organization of Understanding Troubles and Their Resolution

As was presented in Chapter 2, information transfer between speakers is the most typical characteristic of a conversation. Like questions, teacher instructions transmit some kind of information to learners and as Kendrick (2010) puts forward instructions both "establish an asymmetrical relationship between speaker and recipient" (p. 58). However, while teacher-questions have received great attention in Conversational Analytic literature, teacher instruction has recently begun to be focused on. While most of the studies have been conducted on interaction between teacher and learners including turn-taking (McHoul, 1978), and sequential organization of questions (Mehan, 1979b) or compliance to the rules (Machbeth, 1991), some other scholars examine learner-learner interaction in classroom (e.g. Melander & Sahlström, 2009; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004), as well. Instructions, on the other hand, in the sense of teacher directives delivered in order to accomplish a task, have received less attention. Studies mostly have examined the collaborative creation of them (St. John & Cromdal, 2016), problematic directives (Waring & Hruska, 2012), and grammatical organization of teacher directives (He, 2000). Therefore, this study attempts to contribute to the existing literature by describing the sequential organization of actions including the turns from setting up a task to restoring understanding of teacher instructions.

Understanding is a key issue in educational settings based on which pedagogical goals are achieved. In classroom context, students as in mundane talk display understanding of the previous turn. The production of student-turn serves as an indicator of students' (non)understanding to the teacher, so as Lee (2007) suggests "teacher carries out complex analytic work, estimating what students know and what they do not know" (p. 202). In this study, understanding is considered to be a local and interactional matter that the parties of a conversation display to each other in and through their contributions to interaction. In the organization of their turns, "participants are seen to be attending to matters of understanding through the design of their turns" at talk (Hindmarsh et al., 2011), and the concept is dealt

with very situated perspective. Understanding troubles that one party of a conversation has could be anticipated through the formulation of contribution in either an explicit or implicit way. To illustrate it, when a task instruction is delivered by the teacher in a classroom, learners may indicate non-understanding through explicit demonstration (I did not understand). Also, an inappropriate response provided in the turn that follows the task instruction suggests the understanding trouble.

The display of understanding provides teachers with the opportunity to access how or whether or not students have understood what the task requires them to do, and accordingly they employ correctional resources in the third position, thereby maintaining the intersubjectivity. The focus of the present study is on students' understanding troubles and their resolution by the teacher. As in other institutional settings, in educational context, teachers act upon what learners show in terms of the receipt of information. This points out the contingent and sequential nature of understanding which this study aims to investigate rather than cognitive and individual achievement of it.

In this section, the most frequent sequence organization formats beginning from instruction-giving turn and including the part where the mutual understanding is restored will be discussed as a part of teachers' Classroom Interactional Competence (Walsh, 2006a). These organizations seem to follow a certain interactional structure and the analysis of the data showed that there are four sequence organizations, each of which will be illustrated below, in relation to the extracts. Earlier research shows that teachers use a specific three-part format to form discourse units (Koole, 2010):

1: Instruction

2: Informing

3: Understanding check

Koole (2010) points out that teachers use three-part format to create their discourse unit at the end of which teachers invite students to display understanding through understanding check. Alternatively, by acknowledging the teacher's informing, students also claim understanding during the discourse unit. Since this study also includes the parts where an understanding trouble emerges and is managed, the organizational structures that will be given in this section will build on understanding research, too. The first type of sequential format is as follows: The teacher delivers the task instruction before initiating the task or

forming the working style such as in dyads or groups, which is followed by activity initiation (that could be indicated in an explicit way by the teacher through some clauses like *here we go*). It is followed by student's clarification request or explicit demonstration of non-understanding and the teacher's interactional resources. It should be noted here that in some cases between the activity initiation and student's demonstration of non-understanding there is an understanding check directed to the students by the teacher and a claim of understanding. It can also be observed that after the teacher's interactional resources to an understanding trouble, the students optionally claim or demonstrate understanding and engage in the activity again. The first sequential organization format can be formulated as follows:

Type 1

1: (T) Instruction-Giving

(1a: (T) Understanding-Check
1b: (S) Claim of Understanding)

2: (T) Activity Initiation

3: (S) Clarification Request / Demonstration of Non-understanding

4: (T) Interactional Resource

(4a: (S) Claim / Demonstration of Understanding)

This sequence organization is illustrated through a short extract given below:

1: Tea: okay go and quickly come together and with your group of people

2: Tea: let's discuss (.) all: those questions guys

3: Tül: madam we will discuss these questions or:=

4: Tea: =these three questions plus if you a:re really creating in a museum of collection (0.2) which media tool you think the most efficient one

As was illustrated in the short version of Extract 9 (see page 104), after the teacher delivers the task instruction she initiates the activity. Then, one of the students requests clarification

with regard to the process that they are expected to follow in yes/no interrogative question (Raymond, 2003) format seeking an alternative (we will discuss these questions or:=). It is followed by the teacher's revision of the instruction she provided earlier (these three questions plus if you a:re really creating in a museum of collection (0.2) which media tool you think the most efficient one). In the simplified version of Extract 8 given below will also illustrate the last part (Demonstration of Understanding) of the format:

4: Tea: =because you enrich the topic in that way (0.2) and it would be much organized in that way (0.3) having someone guide a topic

(2.4)

4a: Bey: okay let's talk about er: page (0.3) sixty three

It should be noted that as can be seen in extracts 1, 4, 8 and 9, although the task instruction is provided to the whole class at the beginning, from the demonstration of non-understanding to the resolution turn, the first sequential organization format includes interaction that takes place between the teacher and the individual student who requires clarification. The analysis of the extracts also show that the students do not always explicitly show their troubles in understanding to the teacher. In some cases, the teacher notices the potential troubles which include misapprehension of the task instruction resulting in doing the activity wrongly or non-understanding that hinders the task accomplishment either through treating *wrong answers*, *no activity initiation*, as an indicator of understanding troubles or by *observing* the students while they are engaging in the task and noticing the trouble herself. A simplified version of Extract 3 below illustrates how the teacher considers a student's wrong answer an indicator of understanding trouble in elicitation phase.

1: Tea: the (0.2) c this time prosecution or the defense (0.8)

3: Meh: er eight

4: Tea: we choose numbers but two of these numbers (.) one from the prosecution area one from the defense are (.) can be used (0.2) bo:th you know prosecution or the defense

(1.1)

4a: Meh: eight and nine

Differently from type 1, type 2 includes the teacher's notice of interactional trouble through *no activity initiation, wrong answers*, and by *observing* the students. During the elicitation of answers, after the teacher receives a wrong answer as a candidate response from a student (er eight), she treats it as a sign for an understanding trouble, thereby orienting it through various interactional resources (we choose numbers but two of these numbers (.) one from the prosecution area one from the defense are (.) can be used (0.2) bo:th you know prosecution or the defense). Finally, the student demonstrates understanding by providing two numbers (eight and nine) as required in the instruction. This type of the sequential organization format will be illustrated below:

Type 2

1: (T) Instruction-Giving / Teacher Initiation

(1a: (T) Understanding-Check
1b: (S) Claim of Understanding)

2: (T) Activity Initiation

3: (T) Noticing of Understanding Trouble

4: (T) Interactional Resource

(4a: (S) Claim / Demonstration of Understanding)

As in type 1, 1a, 1b and 4a steps are not included in all extracts of type 2; that's why, they are given in the parenthesis above.

Type 2 can be seen in extracts 2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 13. While in Extract 12, the teacher notices the trouble in understanding while walking in the classroom and monitoring the students while they are engaging the activity, in Extract 7 she treats the students' *no activity initiation* as a trouble in understanding. Also, in Extract 2, 3, 5, and 13, what enables the teacher to realize the trouble is the *wrong answers* that the students provide during elicitation phase of the

activity. The issue of no activity initiation, students' wrong answers and observing within the interactional environment of task instructions will be discussed in the following section.

In type 1 and type 2, the interaction takes place between the teacher and the student who has understanding trouble; however, type 3 and 4 given below will illustrate that after the teacher notices that there is an understanding trouble through various ways, she orients to the whole class and starts to clarify the meaning by addressing all of the students, which points out multi-layered nature of classroom discourse that includes "a variety of possible participation structures that may develop" (Schwab, 2011, p. 6). As was discussed in chapter 2, the students are considered to be non-official (Ekberg, 1997) participants and they need to remain a part of the ongoing interaction.

Type 3

1: (T) Instruction-Giving / Teacher Initiation

(1a: (T) Understanding-Check
1b: (S) Claim of Understanding)

2: (T) Activity Initiation

3: (S) Clarification Request /Demonstration of Non-understanding

4: (T) A General Address Term

5: (T) Interactional Resource

[5a: (S) Claim / Demonstration of Understanding]

A simplified version of Extract 13 given below will illustrate how the teacher uses a general address term to whole students before employing an interactional resource to manage the trouble in understanding. As in type 1 and 2, between instruction-giving and activity initiation in some extracts the teacher checks understandings which receive the students' claim of understanding. Similarly, after the interactional resources deployed by the teacher, the students in some cases claim or demonstrate understanding of the explanation.

1+2: Tea: let's decide get a piece of paper or you may use your book >doesn't matter< create your own [list

3: Tül: [we give our list to partners↑

4: Tea: >no no< fir- ↑okay guys

5: first of all what will we do↑

As can be observed in the short extract that upon Tül's clarification request the teacher uses a general address term to establish recipiency with all of the students in the classroom. As opposed to the common consideration in the literature that treats task instructions as "typically individual or as being concerned with noninteractional objects, and objectives" (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004, p. 505), this type of sequential organization emerged from the data of this study clearly shows that the students' questions regarding the procedure or clarification requests makes the task instructions more followable on the part of other students as well, thus the context becomes more interactional. One can also argue that the teacher takes the clarification request as a general instructional need of all students, which supports St. John and Cromdal's (2016) claim offering that "task-instructions are not self-contained monologues but engage the service of other voices in the effort to present and explain tasks meaningfully" (p. 258).

Type 4 presents another sequential organization emerged from the data. It also illustrates the teacher's addressing to the whole class in the resolution turn. Similar to type 2, without an explicit demonstration of non-understanding or clarification request directed by a student, the teacher can detect the trouble by herself through various ways such as no activity initiation, students' wrong answers, and observing the students. The sequential organization of type 4 is as follows:

Type 4

1: (T) Instruction-Giving / Teacher Initiation

(1a: (T) Understanding-Check
1b: (S) Claim of Understanding)

2: (T) Activity Initiation

3: (T) Noticing of Understanding Trouble

4: (T) Orientation to the Whole Class

5: (T) Interactional Resource

⎛5a: (S) Claim / Demonstration of Understanding ⎞

Unlike type 3, this organization structure does not involve an explicit address term, so drawing upon the type 3 and 4, it can be argued that if the teacher detects the trouble by herself, she orients to the other students by positioning her body towards them or establishing mutual gaze with them.

3: Tea: did you read the question↑

+ looks at Bey's book + walks towards Bey and points at her book

Bey: °huhu°

Tea: underline the parts that yo[u

Bey: [hu=

4: Tea: =will look for in the text please

+ walks towards the middle of the classroom

so for re- er: >are you done with the questions<

(1.3)

+ looks around the students

5: Tea: are you done with the questions↑ (0.4) did you read the questions and underline the key points in the

+ shows the text to the students

questions↑

5a: Pır: °hu:°

Looking at the ways that the teacher handles the troubles directs us to consider the role of gaze and body positioning in targeting the recipients. Type 4 clearly demonstrates that without using an explicit address term, the teacher manages to make the clarification salient to the whole body of the students. Drawing upon these four sequential organization types, it can be argued that students' clarification requests and explicit demonstration of non-

understanding project two possible next actions for the teacher: (1) dealing with the understanding trouble without addressing the other students; (2) addressing the whole class with a general address term, then undertaking the resolution work. Likewise, when the teacher relies on some resources to detect the trouble she either (1) makes use of interactional practices directly; or (2) orients to all of the students by looking around them to establish a mutual gaze or positioning herself towards the whole class; and then deals with the trouble.

Providing and following task instructions have been ignored by scholars in ELT, and there is no Conversation Analytic research investigating the sequential organization of instructions and understanding. This study offers four sequential organization formats that include the turns from instruction-giving to the resolution part. The findings are also significant for Classroom Interactional Competence (Walsh, 2006a, 2011) since drawing upon the interactional organization structures one can argue that with interactional decision-making ability the teacher notices the troubles hindering the task accomplishment and orients to them through various resources, which this thesis attempts to add to CIC features as a new dimension.

5.2. Detecting Understanding Trouble

The analyses of the extracts presented in Chapter 4 indicate that the teacher shows orientation to understanding troubles upon noticing the problem through various ways. Extracts 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 13 exemplify the teacher undertaking repair work after the students request clarification/confirmation and demonstrate non-understanding explicitly. To illustrate it, in Extract 1, after the understanding check delivered by the teacher (did you understand what to do), Meh provides a negative marker (no), and thus demonstrates his non-understanding in an explicit way. Extract 4 also presents another noticeable demonstration of understanding trouble. However, unlike Extract 1, Tül states her non-understanding (`i still do not understand anything`) by selecting herself as the next speaker, therefore it can be argued that her demonstration of non-understanding is not preceded by any understanding check. Similarly, in Extract 8, as was demonstrated in the analysis of it, without any understanding check, one of the students (Der) expresses the trouble (`we are not sure about what we discuss about`). Concerning students' clarification request, as can be observed in Extract 6, during activity engagement, the student asks a question with regard to the

procedure of the task (`we have to say something`) in the form of yes/no declarative (Raymond, 2003), then the teacher initiates a repair and tries to resolve the problem through reformulation and exemplification.

The extracts analyzed in previous chapter brought evidence to the claim that students' clarification request and explicit demonstrations of non-understanding is not the only way for the teacher to notice troubles emerged with regard to the task instructions as type 2 and 4 suggest. Extracts 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, and 13 also illustrate that the teacher also detects students' understanding troubles through some sources such as:

- students' silence (no activity initiation)
- wrong answers provided in elicitation phase
- verbal contributions given during activity engagement
- lack of participation

The teacher treats these sources as a sign of understanding trouble that can hinder the activity accomplishment. To illustrate the case of a wrong answer, firstly, after the teacher receives inappropriate responses, she draws on classroom material (extract 3) and asks questions to the students in order to co-construct the meaning (extract 13).

```
34  Tea:   perfect thank you very much (0.2) and the (0.2) c this time
35         prosecution or the defense
36         (0.8)
37  Meh:   er eight
38  Tea:   we choose numbers but two of these numbers (.) one from the
39         prosecution area one from the defense area (.) can be used (0.2)
40         bo:th you know prosecution or the defense
41         (1.1)
42  Meh :  eight and nine (0.5)
```

As can be observed in the analysis of the extract given above, during the elicitation phase of the activity, when the teacher gets a wrong answer which signals the trouble in understanding of what the students are expected to, she needs to deploy interactional resources to handle the problem between the lines 38 to 42. According to Koole (2010) "a speaker concludes from the response to his utterance and thus treats the response as a display of whether or not understanding" (p. 186). In relation to this, it can be argued that in educational settings, based

on the responses provided by learners, teachers can come to a conclusion concerning how the students understand the instructions. In Extract 3, when the teacher receives a wrong response which indicates misunderstanding from the student, she initiates repair in line 38. Her repair work, then, manages to get a response including two different numbers as supposed to do.

The detailed transcription of Extract 2 shows that after the teacher does not manage to get participation, she treats this lack of participation as evidence signaling the trouble and revises her instruction. That is similar to Extract 7 that presents the use of interactional resources upon long silences during which the students do not initiate the activity. The short version of Extract 7 will demonstrate how the teacher treats the students' no activity initiation (silence) as an indicator of the trouble.

```
5          (0.3) .hh you feel in the >same situation for example< (0.2) >tell
6          a partner about a time when< you experience (.) u:hm (.) <distress
7          (.) situation> or when you feel dumfounded or <remo:rseful> (0.2)
8          >try to think about< three situations (0.2) in the <sa:me feeling>
9          (7.3) ((There is no activity initiation.))
            + All students keep looking at the book and Tea looks around the students
10   Tea:  >for example<↑ <i felt distressed> (.) when >bla bla bla bla bla<
11         happened↓ (0.3) o:r .hh i fe:lt myself (.) really dumfounded when
```

Between the lines 5 and 9 the teacher issues the task instruction; however, during 7.3 seconds of silence the partners do not initiate talking to one another, which is treated as a problem by the teacher, thus she starts to provide example sentences that the students can make use of upon looking around and recognizing that there is no activity initiation. As Sert (2015) puts forward the silence (7.3) here could be considered to be a first indicator of the trouble when the student-turn is relevant.

Also, there are instances in the data of this study including the ways making the contingent nature of teacher-turn evident. As stated earlier, understanding is taken as an interactional and local phenomenon in Conversation Analytic perspective. According to Machbeth (2004), understanding is an object " in understanding a prior turn in the projectable course of its construction for what kind of turn it is, what work it is doing, what it calls next" (p. 707), which points out that in and through each contribution, parties to a conversation display

understanding of the prior turns. Students' contributions as a sign of understanding trouble was exemplified in extracts 5 and 8 in which students by self-selection provide contributions regarding the task or procedure; however, since they are not appropriate to the steps that they need to follow, the teacher considers them to be a demonstrator of the trouble in understanding.

28		you will <take tu:rns with your group mate> (0.4) among each
29		other >to summarize< the topic (0.3) okay↑ clear about that↑
30		(0.3)
31		so↑ (.) who are the first to start↑ can [i see each group
32	Meh:	[like clockwise we can
		+ draws circle with his hand
33		do this time
34	Mur:	her grup kendi [içinde
		each group with their group members
35	Tea:	[>no no< each group=
36	Meh:	=h[u:
37	Tea:	[i mean each pair will do it for example you or er[:

The preceding part comes from Extract 5. The teacher issues the instruction between the lines 28 and 31, which is followed by Meh's uninvited contribution through which he offers to follow clockwise direction during the discussion activity, although the students are supposed to work in pairs. Therefore, it can be argued that his contribution suggests his understanding trouble in an implicit way. With regard to educational settings, as Lee (2007) suggests the "teacher carries out complex analytic work, estimating what students know and what they do not know" (p. 202) and accordingly undertakes a repair work in the following turn. The production of the student's contribution delivers evidence of his non-understanding; thus, the teacher can assess it immediately at the same turn. Differently from Hindmarsh et al. (2011)'s study which reveals that students' bodily actions and time of the production of their talk become demonstrators as potential evidence of understanding problems, this thesis offers new evidences of understanding troubles: (i) long silences during which the students do not initiate the activity, (ii) students' inappropriate contributions and (iii) wrong answers they provide during elicitation of the answers. Therefore, it can be argued

that the talk cannot be isolated from multimodal actions of the participants that convey valuable information about the receipt of information.

The inclusion of multimodality in the analysis of the extracts in Chapter 4 enables us to make claim on how the teacher observe the students while they are dealing with the task and detect the potential understanding troubles. These findings are significant for the analysis of the phenomenon in that it contributes to the studies examines the interactional resources that interlocutors draw on to assess understanding. Hindmarsh et al. (2011) focused on local resources including timing of the production of the talk and bodily conduct of the participants by describing the examples drawn from audio-visual recordings including interaction between supervisors and students in a dental clinic. However, the present study is the first to investigate how an EFL teacher treats interactional resources as demonstrators of students' understanding troubles.

In Extract 10, for example, after the teacher issues the instruction between the lines 14 and 17, she initiates the activity, then, while the students are getting prepared for the presentation she walks around the classroom and monitors the students. Through looking at their notes, she manages to detect the understanding trouble, which leads her to provide an account regarding why they need to take short notes in line 153. In the subsequent turns (given below), she keeps on observing the students and after 25.4 seconds of silence, she bodily orient to the whole class and reformulates her instruction one more time.

```
165          (25.4)
                  + Students keep on writing their sentences
166   Tea:   instead of writing every single thing in your ↑mind↓ (0.3) try
              + orients to the whole class
167          to have brainstorm more
168          (1.8)
169   Tea:   okay (0.2) most probably you know it seems <quite a short
170          time> but you will think >you will just noticing< it is much
171          more longer than you expected (0.2) ↑okay (.) so have (.) more
172          idea production and brainstorming
```

This implies that the teacher treats the students' note-taking process, which observably lasts more than the teacher expects, as a "representative of a possible misapprehension" (St. John & Cromdal, 2016, p. 270) by observing them during the activity.

Similarly, in Extract 11 what makes the teacher notice the potential trouble is her observation, which will be illustrated below:

```
4   Tea:   read the questions first and while you are reading (.) please
             + Students look at their books on their desks
5          don't forget to underline the key points <that you will loo:k
6          (0.3) for in the text> (0.2) okay↑ (.) here we go
7          (16.3)
           + Students are reading the text
8   Tea:   did you read the question↑
            + looks at Bey's book
                      + walks towards Bey and points at her book
9   Bey:   °huhu°
10  Tea:   underline the parts that yo[u
                 + touches the question part on Bey's book
11  Bey:                                [hu=
                                          + starts to underline
```

As can be observed in the short version of Extract 11 in which the teacher directs a question to Bey by looking at her book, which suggests that through observing the student's material she recognizes the trouble. The following lines also make this trouble evident to us, since in line 11 Bey provides a change of state token (Heritage, 1984) displaying her acknowledgement of the instruction given in line 10 by the teacher. Similar to Extract 11, the hesitation marker in line 15 and change of state token in line 16 of Extract 12 make it clear that what the teacher orients in line 13 is an understanding trouble.

```
13  Tea:   why you didn't fill the cha:rts
                                      + points at the chart in  Tül's book
14         (0.7)
15  Sah:   er:=
16  Tül:   =oh (0.2) yes
```

In this section, it was discussed that the teacher with some sources manages to notice the potential troubles in understanding the task instruction. Integrating multimodality and drawing upon the fine-detailed transcriptions of the extracts given in chapter 4 make it possible to track how the teacher treats no activity initiation, long silences, students' inappropriate contributions as a sign of non/mis-understanding, which builds the significance of this study in that it is the first research to describe how the teacher pursues the task instructions after she provides.

5.3. Exploring Interactional Resources

In this section, interactional resources emerged from the data of this study will be presented. Interactional resources were employed by the teacher in order to clarify the meaning and restore understanding of teachers' instructions. As was illustrated in the previous chapter (Chapter 4 Data Analysis) various understanding troubles such as misapprehension of the instruction, non-understanding of procedure could emerge within the instructional sequences. Waring & Hruska (2012) argue that in some cases teachers' multiple self-repairs in instruction giving turns, unspecified (or ambiguity in) referents, launching a task without providing any account could results in breakdowns in task achievements. Similarly, in Extract 4, the teacher does not use the pronounces *you* and *they* in a clear way, which may be claimed to cause the trouble in line 20 because of the ambiguity in to whom they actually refer.

Also, extracts show that (see extracts 8, 10, 11 and 12) and as will be discussed below, in some cases the teacher provides account for the procedure of the task that the students have engaged in when an understanding trouble comes out and the analysis showed that it mostly succeeds in developing students' claim or demonstration of understanding. As was stated in review of literature understanding is treated as a social, contingent and embodied action involving turn-taking, repair and adjacency-pair organizations (Lynch, 2011) and achieved collectively and interactively. Taking a turn informs the other speakers about the understanding of the previous turn (Liddicoat, 2007, Seedhouse, 2004). As in other institutional settings, in classrooms teachers treat the second turns provided by students as an evidence of (non)understanding. The sequential and situated nature of understanding has been investigated in different contexts (e.g. call-centers, Baker, Emmission & Firth, 2005; medical centers, Lehtinen, 2005; Peräkylä, 1995; Pilnick, 2003; Sarangi & Clarke, 2002; Silverman, 1997); however, this study focuses on understanding troubles and their resolution within the instructional sequences in a language classroom.

For a clear picture of the discussion of the interactional resources, some definition should be provided briefly once again. Sacks (1992) makes a distinction between claim of understanding and demonstration of understanding. While the former involves repetition of previous turn, change of state token and acknowledgment token in combination or separately, the latter requires interpretation or reformulation of previous turn. All in all, the

data of the present study illustrate how teacher shapes the next actions and undertakes a repair work if it is required.

As was stated above, the teacher employed eleven different interactional resources which are namely accounting, exemplifying, modelling, hinting, third-position repair, question-asking, simplification (omitting potentially complex grammatical items), parsing, embodied actions, repetitive understanding checks, and drawing on classroom material. It should be noted that these interactional practices are mostly used in combination; however, there are several cases that the teacher provided them one at a time. Four of the extracts (Extract 8, 10, 11, and 12) analyzed in the previous chapter illustrate how the teacher provides account to students with regard to the reason of following the certain steps while doing the task after she notices the students' understanding trouble.

A short fragment given below will illustrate account-giving after a student's clarification request.

60 Tea: or you may ask from time to time >what about< your own
61 discussion points anybody to add- wants to add anything like
62 that so it will be fine i guess=
63 Yap: =okay thank you
64 Tea: =because you enrich the topic in that way (0.2) and it would be
65 much organized in that way (0.3) having someone guide a topic
66 (2.4)
+ The students turn to each other
67 Bey: okay let's talk about er: page (0.3) sixty three
+ points at a page in her book
68 Tea: =↑yeap (0.2) good here we go

The preceding part comes from Extract 8 which involves more than one resource. In the preceding lines, one of the students (Der) demonstrates his non-understanding and requires clarification (`we are not sure what we discuss about`) from the teacher, there upon the teacher explicitly orients to the trouble (`so let's do it like that`). Between the lines 60-62, she makes a suggestion concerning carrying out the task and she also provides the students with an account indicating why they should ask questions to each other. As can be seen in the following line, the students manage to engaged in the task, which receives positive assessment from the teacher. Then, it can be concluded that accounting is used to manage the understanding trouble of students. Waring and Hruska (2012) also put

forward that when “the relevance of the specific directive” (p. 295) is left accounted, it can render understanding difficulties, which points out the significance of providing a clear rationale before initiating a task.

Secondly, the analyses of extracts reveal that the teacher parses the instructions into smaller components when an understanding trouble emerges. Lee (2007) also discusses parsing as an interactional resource that teachers utilize while pursuing students’ responses to the questions and he indicates that teachers employ it when they fail to receive a positive response from students, thus divide the original question into smaller elements in their third-turns. Therefore, it can be claimed that teachers’ practice in the third-turn of the international organization is contingent on and tied to what the second turn offers.

```
36  Tea:  okay (0.3) ↑now create your list firstly and the:n we will
37        start
38        (28.3)
            + The students work individually.
39  Tea:  done↑
40  Tül:  °ye[ah°
41  Pır:    °[yeah°=
42  Tea:  =okay (0.2) so↑ (0.3) please choose a partner to yourself and
43        discuss about your choices and see >you know< your choices
44        a:re same with each other or different from each other (0.3)
45        what is your priority what is your friend's priority (0.2)
46        let's discuss some
```

The small fragment of Extract 13 presented above shows that in line 36 the teacher issues the first step of the instruction she has provided together with the second step beforehand. Observing that some students have not filled in the chart, which is the post requirement of the task, she parses it into two parts. Then, after ensuring that students have completed filling out the chart in lines 40 and 41, using a time marker (now) she provides the second component between lines 42 and 46. This extract reveals that the teacher determines her next move through ad hoc decision shaping according to what students offer in previous turn.

Another interactional resource comes into view in the data is asking-questions to students in order to co-construct the meaning. A fragment of Extract 13 given below illustrates how this interactional practice is employed by the teacher. As can be seen in line 22, after one of the

students requires clarification through a yes/no declarative (Raymond, 2010), the teacher directs another question to the whole class treating the understanding problem of an individual student as a general instructional need of all the students, upon addressing them in line 23. In line 25 and 27 with procedural question each of which is related to the different steps of the instruction, then she manages to get positive responses from multiple students, and provides positive assessment followed by a revision of the task directive. One significant observation from Extract 13 is that the teacher asks each question one by one by building on the previous one after receiving students' response, which signals her interactional competence.

```
22  Tül:                          [we give our list to partners↑
23  Tea:  >no no< fir- ↑okay guys (0.3) first of all what will we do↑
24        (0.8)
25  Tea:  you will create what↑
26  Sel:  we make our list=
27  Tea:  =yeap (0.2) you will create your order then↑
28  Nur:  dis[cuss
29  Tan:      [we discuss with [our partner
30  Der:                       [with a partner
31  Tea:  exactly (.) firstly create your list then discuss your
32        ordering with your partner is it okay↑
```

The extracts clearly show that the employment of the interactional resource is highly "contingent on what other participants do" (Young, 2011, p. 430). Incorporating multimodality into the analysis of interaction enables us to scrutinize the teacher's bodily actions. Kupetz (2011) describes multimodality as "the coordinated deployment of nonverbal resources such as gesture, facial expression, gaze, body display, as well as verbal and para-verbal resources such as (morpho-) syntax; lexico-semantics, phonetics, and prosody" (p. 122-123). It can be observed that the teacher combines interactional resources with her bodily actions in most of the cases. The most obvious example including the teacher's embodied actions will be illustrated below:

21 Mur: level one mı (.) good listener
is it level one
22 Tea: >no no< i mean oh okay top one
+ points upward
23 Mur: huhu
24 Tea: you are mentioned (.) okay fine i mean stage one two three
+ raising her hand step by step

The short fragment given above comes from Extract 2 which displays an example of the trouble resulted from the teacher's misunderstanding of what the student refers to with a certain level, which is evident from Mur's question in line 21. In line 22, the teacher employs a typical example of third-position repair which commonly deals with two main problems. Schegloff (1987b) specifies the troubles as incorrect reference and incorrect relevant next action. This fragment includes the first type of problem. However, what is interesting about this extract is the production of the repair by the coordinated use of verbal explanation and hand movement. Incorporating bodily actions into her repair strategy the teacher manages to reach the pedagogical goals of the lesson through restarting meaning-and-fluency context (Seedhouse, 2004) once again. In this regard, it can be claimed that this skill points out teacher's CIC as well as her ability in employing effective repair strategy which is one of the main features of classroom discourse (Walsh, 2011).

Exemplification and modeling are found to be generally used together in an interwoven way. When the teacher realizes that the students cannot initiate the activity or start a discussion, she manages to locate the nature of the trouble and through online-decision making ability (Walsh, 2006a) she provides the students with example sentences which they might utilize in their task or she models the sentences as a sample for the class.

5 Tea: >tell a partner about a time when< you experience (.) u:hm
6 (.) <distress (.) situation> or when you feel dumfounded or
7 <remo:rseful> (0.2) >try to think about< three situations
8 (0.2) in the <sa:me feeling>
9 (7.3) ((There is no activity initiation.))
+ All students keep looking at the book and Tea looks around the students
10 Tea: >for example<↑ <i felt distressed> (.) when >bla bla bla bla
11 bla< happened↓ (0.3) o:r .hh i fe:lt myself (.) really
12 dumfounded when >bla bla bla bla bla< happened

The extract illuminates how the teacher treats 7.3 seconds of silence, during which the students do not engage in the activity, as a sign of trouble in understanding. Nakamura (2004) puts forwards that teachers may enhance their ability "to help students move forward through the silence by giving appropriate support such as rephrasing questions and requests" (p.79). However, it can be seen that between the lines 10 and 12, the teacher uses another interactional resource. She exemplifies what the student can say through modeling the possible sentences. As was claimed by Chilcoat (1989) exemplification when combined with modeling will illustrate and clarify the significant points in an instruction. Through exemplification and modeling teachers can take an abstract idea and place it on a familiar level. Then, it can be asserted that the use of both interactional resources can eliminate misunderstandings emerged with regard to teacher explanation.

In addition to these practices, three of the extracts analyzed in chapter 4 include the use of hinting as an interactional resource. Balaman (in review) defines it as "indirect references to a specific item, providing clues to elicit a response and conveying an action without explicitly stating it" (p. 2). Although there exist some studies on hinting in the conversation analysis literature, it has not been dealt with as a type of social action. In addition to Sacks's (1992) focus on identifying by hinting in talk-in-interaction, hinting has been addressed in different contexts from conversation analytic perspective (Balaman, in review; Bolden, Mandelbaum & Wilkinson, 2012; Schegloff, 1988; Zemel & Koschman, 2011). More recently Radford (2010) treats hinting as providing a verbal clue in order to get a relevant response. What is more relevant to the emerged resource of the present study is Mercer's (1995) work investigating teachers' attempts to elicit a response through verbal and visual clues in educational settings. Similarly, a short version of Extract 9 presented below demonstrates how the teacher elaborates on the procedure by providing a hint in her reformulation of previously given instruction upon students' explicit demonstration non-understanding.

102 Tea: the mos- the efficiency of the media (0.3) uhm tools you >will
103 discuss actually< in that part (0.2) look at here which is more
104 + points the part in the book
105 important better than the other one and why in a group by
106 compare and contrasting them (0.2) ↑did you understand what to
107 do=
108 Mur: =yes

Getting a clarification request from a group of students in previous turns, in line 106 the teacher presents a clue (`by compare and contrasting`) indicating how they carry out the task. Although it is not convenient to claim that the teacher's hint facilitates students' task achievement, this fragment brings evidence to the teacher's attempt to mobilize task engagement with her classroom interactional competence.

The last interactional resource emerged from the data is the teacher's simplification work that is managed by the teacher through omitting potentially complex grammatical items to make the meaning easier to the students and to solve the understanding trouble. Extract 1 that will be given below exemplifies a typical example of this interactional practice:

18 Tea: okay (0.2) ↑so (0.4) guys (0.4) i >will make you listen to< a
19 music (.) and please <try to: (0.4) dra:w or write anything
+ Meh talks to Mur
20 that you: feel or> that the song makes you feel (0.2) okay↑
21 (0.9)
22 Tea: ↑fine↓ (0.4) did you understand >what to do<=
23 Meh: =n[o

Although in the first instruction-giving turn the teacher uses some bold imperatives (Markee, 2015) (`i will make you listen to a music`), after an understanding trouble emerged, she changes this structure to an easier one as indicated below:

41 (0.4) .hh so↑ let's do it like tha:t u:hm: <you will listen to
42 the song and you will try to: dra:w o:r write about how the
43 song (.) make you feel> (0.3) okay↑ (.) this is [all

As can be seen in line 41, the teacher this time uses *you will listen to the song* in order to establish mutual understanding and to resolve Meh's non-understanding. When looking at the rest part of the Extract 1 presented in the previous chapter, it can easily be observed that the teacher's interactional resource manages to increase engagement in the task, therefore it can be claimed that the teacher, through online decision-making ability uses another practice in the second instruction giving turn and is able to restore understanding.

5.4. Conclusion

Classroom interaction has been a focus of interest for a number of researchers for more than sixty years, and the studies depicting the complex relationship between interaction and understanding has been a focus of attention. The concept of CIC (Walsh, 2006a) was introduced and has been developed by many scholars, but professional development of in-service teachers and training of preservice teachers should get the utmost attention to develop interactional competence to ensure more engaged, dynamic classrooms. Given that classroom communication is highly complex and central to the teaching-learning process, all attempts to improve learning should build on classroom interaction. Drawing on the language of the teacher, this study is believed to both identify troubles in understanding and specify various ways to deal with such breakdowns. Teachers influence learning through their talk and interactional decision-making skills. Considering the features of classroom discourse (Walsh, 2011) which are namely control of the interaction, speech modification, elicitation and repair, the present study contributes to the understanding of CIC by documenting and extending interactional resources used by teachers to establish and maintain intersubjectivity.

The short version of extracts presented above in this section illustrates how the teacher controlled the interaction in classroom by managing turn-taking even in instructional sequences through asking display questions to co-construct the meaning when a trouble emerged. (see extracts 4 and 13). It signals the asymmetrical roles of participants in the classroom. It is the teacher who manages the topic of conversation and turn-taking as well as controlling patterns in communication. There are two projected actions on the part of teachers in classrooms: (i) directing questions to the students, and (ii) providing feedback after each student-contribution. Teachers, by asking questions manage to control the

discourse and diminish understanding troubles especially when the meaning is collaboratively created with students. In this regard, this thesis also reveals that the teacher checks and evaluates understanding to make out the extent of apprehension before clarifying meaning while pursuing her previously provided instructions.

Another notable characteristic of classroom discourse is teachers' modification of their speech. The analyses of the representative extracts picture the teacher's use of more deliberate, slower speech as well as the strategical employment of pauses and emphasis. It can also be observed that the teacher makes use of more gestures in her reformulation turn to convey meaning. According to Walsh (2011) "the modification strategies used by teacher are not accidental; they are conscious and deliberate and occur for a number of reasons" (p. 6) as was evidenced with the extracts (see extracts 1, 2, and 3). Developing understanding of practices through which teachers modify their speech for students is evidently crucial in gaining insight into interactional organization of language classrooms. In Extract 1, for example, the teacher omits potentially complex linguistic items and simplifies the instruction through the use of shorter and less complicated utterances in her following turns. Moreover, the same extract displays examples of slower articulations of instructions which also include emphasis on key vocabulary and the discourse markers signaling transitions to a new action and drawing attention of students, thus helps "a class stay together and work in harmony" (Walsh, 2011, p. 7).

Classroom discourse is mostly dominated by teacher-questions and student-responses. Classroom interaction is different from mundane talk in that the answers of the most of the questions directed to students are already known by teacher. Walsh (2011) identifies the function of such questions as "eliciting a response, checking understanding, guiding learners towards a particular response, promoting involvement and concept checking" (p. 12). It should be noted that in most of the cases given in the current study the teacher makes use of display questions in order to check and evaluate understanding and to refer to the students' previous learning. It is also significant that through her choice of questions the teacher results in more student-engagement and understanding of instructions.

The last feature of CD is repair, which is a central issue in instructional settings, as the negotiation of meaning has utmost importance. In educational contexts, certain types of activities lead to certain types of repair, therefore as the micro-contexts vary, so the repair practices being used vary. Repair strategies that are chosen by teachers should be in

conformity with the pedagogical goals of the moment. As was stated in Literature Review chapter, there is no single organization of repair in language classrooms and teaching objectives of a specific lesson determine the repair patters. As Seedhouse (2004) puts forward repair practices are organized differently in different contexts, so the skill of finding the trouble source and with contextual analysis of it, selecting the best repair practice lays in teachers' CIC. In the current study, through an emic perspective, what constitutes trouble and what is repairable was focused on in its own contexts, rather than isolating them from the interactional environments in which they occur. In this thesis, the teacher's repair practices concerning the troubles that are related to misunderstanding or misapprehension of lesson procedures which the students are required to follow were investigated. From various repair strategies, the teacher was found to choose mostly third-position repair through which she clarifies the meaning in task instructions after she notices there is an understanding trouble indicated in the students' second turn. The following subsection will present the possible limitations of this study which lay the groundwork for further research.

5.4.1. Limitations of the Study

The present study is based on a single data set. The video recordings were collected from an intermediate EFL classroom including one teacher, therefore it is not convenient to claim that same or similar findings can be reached in different studies focusing on a similar data. However, as Mackey and Gass (2005) put forward "case studies clearly have the potential for rich contextualization that can shed light on the complexities of this second language learning process" (p. 172). Furthermore, a total of 31 hours classroom interaction video recordings is considered to be more than adequate for conversational analytic classroom research according to Seedhouse (2004) who claims that a micro-analytic investigation of 5 to 10 hours of recording is regarded to be as reasonable. The data set of the current study consists of 31 hours classroom interaction video recordings, which is sufficiently rich to draw conclusions. Also, according to Peräkylä (1997) the generalizability of the research findings can be achieved through enlarging the variations, which could be achieved by future studies. Another potential limitation of this thesis could be the duration of data-collection process. The whole data set was formed in a five-week period; however, the study does not intend to track and report the development of the use of interactional resources in time. The results were reached through the robust methodology of Conversation Analysis that offers

an analytic agenda with evidence-based and data-led methodological standpoints based on meticulously transcribed naturally occurring talk.

The analyses of this study are based on video recordings of classroom interaction and it has the potential to provide quite accurate data in capturing most details in interaction (Peräkylä, 1997). However, CA methodology works on transcription of the interaction. Transcriptions of the recordings were used as a starting point to capture and present the phenomenon under investigation. Yet, they are not taken as a substitute for the recordings, so transcriptions may be claimed not to reflect the actual interaction wholly; for this reason, a standardized and commonly-accepted transcription system (Jefferson, 2004) was adopted to attend detailed aspects of talk. Given that Jeffersonian transcription convention involves various properties of talk including intonation, stress, gaps, pauses, overlaps, pitch, elongations and nonverbal aspects, etc., it can be claimed to be a powerful tool for understanding the ways that language is used by reflecting the complex nature of talk as accurate as possible.

Moreover, CA favors naturally occurring talk, which may give rise to the idea of imposing subjective intentions and interpretations into the analysis process. However, Psathas (1995) specifies the starting point of analysis as unmotivated looking which enables researches to reveal participants' own "orientations, meanings, interpretations, understandings, etc." (Schegloff, 1997, p. 166) by hindering the enforcement of their own interpretations and preoccupations. Furthermore, one of the premise principles of CA methodology is "no order of detail can be dismissed as a priory" (Heritage, 1984, p.241). This evidenced-based methodological standpoint of CA prevents the intrusiveness of researchers through blocking any potential manipulation in the analysis process. Lastly, technical issues can be considered another limitation of the current study. The data were collected through three-digital cameras placed at different corners of the classroom. However, since personal microphones were not used, the interaction between pairs and among group mates could not be captured, so some information that may be potentially important especially for students' understanding could have been missed. Therefore, further research including learner-learner interaction is required to bring more evidence to investigated phenomenon.

5.4.2. Implications and Suggestions for Language Education, Instructional Contexts and Classroom Interactional Competence Development

The main aim of the present study is to reveal interactional resources deployed by an EFL teacher in order to manage understanding troubles about task instructions, which are delivered orally by the teacher, and to restore understanding and maintain intersubjectivity for achieving the pedagogical goals of lessons. The analyses of the representative extracts contributed to a number of research strands; namely understanding in language classrooms, issuing task instructions, Classroom Discourse, Teacher Education and Training, and Conversation Analysis. Considering that understanding troubles emerged with regard to task instructions delivered by teachers is a breakdown that potentially impedes task accomplishment, by documenting efficient ways to overcome these troubles this study has interactional and pedagogical consequences that will inform instructional practices. Drawing upon naturally occurring classroom interaction, the present study picked out various functional interactional practices that can be used to manage non-understanding of task instructions in both foreign language classrooms and all other educational contexts. The emergent resources are exemplifying, hinting, parsing, modeling, drawing on the classroom material, using repetitive understanding check, question asking to co-construct the meaning, third-position repair, using embodied actions, omitting potentially complex grammatical items, and accounting which are believed to contribute to the practice of effective instruction-giving, thus to the concept of Classroom Interactional Competence. Such practices have the potential to increase more participation in classroom tasks and maximize learning opportunities for students. Some of the cases in the data analysis chapter clearly depict that application of these practices results in the demonstration or claim of understanding on the students' part. Although it cannot be wholly possible to make claims on the students' understanding, even in the fragments where the resolution of the troubles is clearly seen, this study brought evidence to the teacher's classroom interactional ability by illustrating her interactional decision-making skills in selecting a specific interactional resource to address understanding troubles. One of the main implications of the present thesis based on the aforementioned practices is the development of greater insight about the utilization of such resources in case of the emergence of such troubles. Since instructions are very familiar and a prevalent practice existing in all instructional settings, the issue of how teachers provide instructions and how students show orientation to them can be a research

interest for scholars from different educational contexts, and as was indicated above, the emergence and management of instructional troubles should also be scrutinized, too.

First of all, the findings revealed four sequential organizations which include the turns of setting up a task through issuing instructions and the turns involving the resolution of understanding troubles. While the first two types exemplify the interaction between the teacher and a particular student who has requested clarification or demonstrated non-understanding, the remaining two types illustrate the teacher's orientation to the whole class by taking the students as a whole body. In this regard, this study has some significant implications for not only foreign language classrooms and teachers, but also for all educational contexts where teachers issue directions to students for accomplishing activities and contributes to classroom interaction. Firstly, once teachers spot the understanding troubles, as the study revealed, they can address all of the students through various ways such as using a general address term, bodily orienting to the class, and establishing mutual gaze to make them stay tuned and move together. According to St. John and Cromdal (2016) the latter practice indicated that teachers treat students' confirmation or clarification requests as "representative of the collective instructional need" (p. 266), and accordingly they need to make it salient to all of the students in the classroom. Both in-service and preservice teachers can utilize the emergent practices (using address term, body orientation, etc.) in the cases that they draw students into their clarifications and explanations.

The current study also informs language teachers about the stage of recognizing understanding troubles. Before the initiation of a task, some troubles in apprehension of the steps of the procedure arise or whole requirements of instruction are not comprehended fully by students. In such cases, the mere resource that teachers rely on to notice the trouble is not student-led all the time. In addition to students' explicit demonstration of non-understanding (I don't understand) or request for clarification; teachers also can interpret some other resources such as long silence, no activity initiation, wrong and inappropriate answers and contributions as a sign of a problem. They also detect non-understanding through observing students upon task initiation. Like the first implication of this study stated above, the implications for detecting non-understanding practices are also valid for all instructional settings, since breakdowns hindering the flow of the interaction (in this case, task achievement) should be eliminated to meet the pedagogical objectives of lessons. Moreover, further research is required to come up with many other resources that teachers make use of

while interpreting the understanding troubles both in foreign language classrooms and other educational research areas.

Another implication based on interaction in procedural context (Seedhouse, 2008) is that this study provides teachers with the awareness of the contingent nature of teachers' third-turn. The third-turn is a particular place that requires a number of interpretive works and contingent actions from teachers. The absence or lack of understanding in the second turn projects a repair, therefore teachers act upon students' second turn through complex analytic work to identify problematic parts and explore alternative interactional organizations. To this end, this study provided language teachers with examples that present both the role of students' questions in informing the teachers regarding instructional incompleteness and the teacher's online decision-making abilities.

Considering that it is easy for students to get confused with regard to activity procedures, the findings of this study shed light on the issue of providing clear instructions to avoid potential chaos in the classroom. Therefore, in this study, it is suggested that task instructions should be issued as fully and explicitly as possible. Likewise, Johnson (1995) proposed that:

> Explicit directions and concrete explanations can help second language students recognize the implicit norms that regulate how they are expected to act and interact in classroom events. Without such explicitness, second language students can become confused about what is expected of them, or how they should participate (p. 163).

In this regard, the findings contribute to the context of development of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC). Walsh (2006a) specifies some features such as maximizing interactional space, shaping learner contributions, effective use of eliciting, and interactional awareness. Then, Sert (2011, 2013) also offers increased awareness of unwillingness to participate, successful management of insufficient knowledge/ code-switching, and effective use of gesture. As was argued above, in order to reach the objectives of a lesson and for task achievement, issuing clear task instructions is a crucial part of teachers' pedagogical repertoire; for this reason, this study also propose it to CIC as a new dimension.

Furthermore, the emergent interactional resources provide some implications for better understanding of the main features of Classroom Discourse. Effective use of repair practices combined with timely speech modifications including slower articulation and simplified grammar is believed to serve as a guideline that helps teachers to overcome emergent problems. It is also expected that the study will bring new insight into the sequential

organization of instructions, which are mostly associated with noninteractional objectives, by describing collaborative and complex creations.

With regard to Teacher Education and Training, as Seedhouse (2008) put forward, preservice teachers cannot always recognize how they deal with such kind of understanding troubles in their initial teaching practices. In order to raise awareness of them in the application of these interactional resources, issuing and pursuing task instructions can be included in methodology lessons in English Language Teaching programs. Moreover, further investigations can be carried out to investigate how preservice teachers deal with such troubles during their micro-teachings and their development in time can be reported through longitudinal studies. Informed about the CIC features and interactional resources that this study revealed, preservice teachers can take part in systematic reflective practice processes aiming professional development. Through such practices, the development of CIC can be traced by utilizing the methodological tools of CA, so that preservice teachers can learn from their own teaching practices and develop language awareness (Andrews 2001). Such an evidence-based reflection process enables preservice teacher to notice their weak and strong sides in providing instruction and in managing emergent troubles, thus they can shape their new teaching practices.

To this end, some suggestions will be provided below. Teachers could consider:

- Allowing wait-time to the students before issuing instructions of the task.
- That the use of discourse markers performs important functions in signaling transition to a new action, therefore in order to draw students' attention, to indicate a change in order and to signal the initiation of task, effective use of them could be required.
- Drawing students' attention to the announcement of the instruction through address terms.
- Avoiding asking questions in a row in instruction-giving turns.
- Emphasizing the activity initiation with distinctive intonation.
- Marking each step of the task through the use of discourse markers uttered in a remarkable way.
- Establishing the nature of focus and pedagogical context clearly.
- Providing explicit instructions by giving each step one at a time.
- Summarizing the task instruction in simpler terms just before the task engagement.

- Setting a time limit at the end of instruction to specify how much time students need to accomplish the task.
- Parsing the instruction into smaller and manageable components in case of the emergence of any understanding trouble.
- Specifying how students will be working (in pairs, groups, or individually).
- Indicating how they will accomplish the task or giving hint with regard to carrying out the procedures.
- Providing an account concerning the relevance of specific directives.
- Exemplifying and modelling the requirements of the task in order to make them familiar and more concrete (Like / as in / for example / such as, etc.).
- Eliminating unexplained concepts that can potentially hinder task accomplishment.
- Including information that is only relevant to the upcoming task in their explanations.
- Drawing on shared classroom materials for better clarification of instructions through deictic gestures.
- Modifying their speech to students with slower articulation, clearer pronunciation, simpler vocabulary and including strategically used shifting markers.
- The fact that the students' long silences with no activity initiation may signal troubles in understanding of instructions.
- Paying attention to the students' wrong answers and inappropriate contributions which flag understanding troubles.
- Drawing all of the students to their clarifications through the use of general address terms.
- Treating a particular student's clarification request or demonstration of non-understanding as a collective instructional need of the whole class.
- Directing display questions or DIUS to students in order to co-construct the meaning in instructions, when an understanding problem comes out.
- Involving the explanations of vocabulary which the students may potentially be unfamiliar with.
- Using embodied gestures in a synchronized way with verbal utterances to make the meaning more concrete.
- Carrying out complex analytic work and acting on the students' second turn with contingent methods of actions.

- Exploring alternative interactional trajectories to repair what is problematic in the second turn.
- Revising instructions especially for long-running activities.
- Reformulating instructions to restore meaning upon students' demonstration of non-understanding and clarification requests.
- Using sequencing markers in instruction-giving to specify the order of the steps that the students are supposed to follow.
- Making the procedural context more interactive by changing the turn-taking system, so that the learners can take turns, through asking display questions instead of simply transmitting procedural information in monologue and through asking a student to verify the procedure.
- Avoiding self-repairs, unspecified or ambiguous referent, conflicting messages and questions that do not limit the range of potential answers in instruction-giving turn.

In-service and preservice teachers, on the other hand, could carry out reflective practices to scrutinize their own teaching performances to:

- Recognize their weak and strong sides providing instruction, so that they can fashion their instructions.
- Eliminate problematic practices they mostly use in instruction-giving.
- Expand their instructional repertoire.
- Explore alternative trajectories to vary their instruction-issuing.
- Gain better understanding in how instructions can be misleading for students.
- Raise their awareness of how problematic practices can hinder students-participation, thus learning opportunities.
- Identify sequences that successful transmission of procedural information takes place.
- Raise their awareness of how they provide instructions and what kind of actions these instructions accomplish.

REFERENCES

Aleksandrzak, M. (2013). Approaches to describing and analyzing classroom communication. *Glottodidactica. An International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *40*(1), 129-143.

Allwright, D. (1984). Why don't learners learn what teachers teach? The interaction hypothesis. *Language learning in formal and informal contexts*, 3-18.

Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Andrews, S. (2001). The language awareness of the L2 teacher: Its impact upon pedagogical practice. *Language Awareness, 10*(2-3), 75-90.

Antón, M. (1999). The discourse of a Learner-Centered classroom: Sociocultural perspectives on Teacher-Learner interaction in the Second-Language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 83*(3), 303-318.

Archer, A., & Hughes, C. (2011). *Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching*. New York: Guilford.

Aşık, A., & Kuru Gönen, S. I. (2016). Pre-service EFL teachers' reported perceptions of their development through SETT experience. *Classroom Discourse. 7*(2), 164-183.

Atkinson, J. M. (1984). *Public speaking and audience responses: Some techniques for inviting applause*.

Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in court.* Delhi: Springer.

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds). (1984). *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Atkinson, J.M. (1990). A comparative analysis of formal and informal courtroom interaction. In P.Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. New York: Oxford University.

Badem, F. & Keleş, T. (2017, October). *Instruction Giving Sequence in EFL Setting.* Paper presented at The 18th International INGED ELT Conference. Aydın University, İstanbul.

Badem, F. (2018, April). *A Micro-Analytic Investigation of Understanding Troubles in Instruction-Giving Sequences in an EFL Classroom.* Paper presented at The 4th Çukurova International ELT Teachers Conference, Çukurova University, Adana.

Baker, C. D., Emmison, M., & Firth, A. (Eds.) (2005). *Calling for help: Language and social interaction in telephone helplines*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands, and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Balaman, U. (2016). *A conversation analytic study on the development of interactional competence in English in an online task-oriented environment.* Doctoral dissertation, Hacettepe University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Balaman, U. (in review). Sequential organization of hinting in online L2 task-oriented interaction.

Balaman, U., & Sert, O. (2017). Development of L2 interactional resources for online collaborative task accomplishment. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *30*(7), 601-630.

Barnes, D. (1992). The role of talk in learning. *Thinking voices: The work of the national oracy project*, 123-128.

Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*, *15*(4), 479-507.

Berger, E., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2015). Direct reported speech in storytellings: Enacting and negotiating epistemic entitlements. *Text & Talk, 35*(6). 789–813.

Bolden, G. B., Mandelbaum, J., & Wilkinson, S. (2012). Pursuing a response by repairing an indexical reference. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 45*(2), 137-155.

Breen, M. P., & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied linguistics, 1*(2), 89-112.

Brock, C. A. (1986). The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(1), 47-59.

Brouwer, C. E., & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 29-47.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language use: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction* (pp. 56–310). New York: Cambridge University.

Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction* (Vol. 59). London: Harvard University.

Burke, P. (2013). *The art of conversation*. Cambridge: Polity.

Campbell, R., & Wales, R. (1970). The study of language acquisition. In J. Lyons (Ed.), *New horizons in linguistics* (pp. 242-260). New York: Penguin Books.

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

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1–47.

Cazden, C. B. (1986). Language in the classroom. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *7*(1), 18-33.

Cazden, C. B. (Ed.). (2001). *The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Chilcoat, G. W. (1989). Instructional behaviors for clearer presentations in the classroom. *Instructional Science, 18*(4), 289-314.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Massachusetts: MIT.

Çimenli, B. (2017). *Rolling the ball back: Topic maintenance in computer mediated English as a lingua franca interactions.* Master's thesis, Hacettepe University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Clayman, S. E. (1992). Footing in the achievement of neutrality: The case of news interview discourse. *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*, 163-198.

Clayman, S. E., & Maynard, D. W. (1995). Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. *Situated order: Studies in the social organisation of talk and embodied activities*, *199*(5), 1-30.

Coughlan, P., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Same task, different activities: Analysis of a SLA task from an activity theory perspective. In J. P. Lantolf, & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 173-193). New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Coulter, J. (2005). Language without mind. In H. Molder & J. Potter (Eds.), *Conversation and cognition*, (pp. 79-92). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Cromdal, J. (2003). The creation and administration of social relations in bilingual group work. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 24*(1-2), 56-75.

Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT journal, 52*(3), 179-187.

Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: The importance of the F-move. *ELT Journal, 56*(2), 117-127.

Drew, P., & Heritage J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work* (pp. 3-65). New York: Cambridge University.

Ekberg, S. (2011). *Making arrangements: Remote proposal sequences and attendant structural phenomena in social interaction*. PhD Dissertation, University of Adelaide, South Australia.

Ellis, N. C. (1998). Emergentism, connectionism and language learning. *Language learning, 48*(4), 631-664.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Ellis, R. (1995). Interpretation tasks for grammar teaching. *Tesol Quarterly*, *29*(1), 87-105.

Ellis, R. (1998). Discourse control and the acquisition-real classroom. *Anthology Series-Seameo Regional Language Centre*, 145-171.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976) 'Is Sybil there?' The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society*, *5*(1), 25–66.

Escobar Urmeneta, C. (2013). Learning to Become a CLIL Teacher: Teaching, reflection and professional development. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 6*(3), 334-353.

Escobar Urmeneta, C., & Evnitskaya, N. (2014). 'Do you know Actimel?'The adaptive nature of dialogic teacher-led discussions in the CLIL science classroom: A case study. *The Language Learning Journal, 42*(2), 165-180.

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. (2014). Beyond "Excellent!": Uncovering the systematicity behind positive feedback turn construction in ESL Classrooms. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 8*(1), 45-63.

Fanselow, J. F. (1987). *Breaking rules: Generating and exploring alternatives in language teaching*. New York: Longman.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3). 285-300.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (1993). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (Vol. 7). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gafaranga, J. (2000). Medium repair vs. other-language repair: Telling the medium of a bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 4*(3), 327-350.

Gaies, S. J. (1983). The investigation of language classroom processes. *TESOL quarterly*, *17*(2), 205-217.

Gardner, R. (2007). The Right connections: Acknowledging epistemic progression in talk. *Language in Society*, *36*(3), 319–341.

Gardner, R., & Mushin, I. (2013). Teachers telling: Informings in an early years classroom. *Australian Journal of Communication*, *40*(2), 63-82.

Gardner, R., & Mushin, I. (2017). Epistemic Trajectories in the Classroom: How Children Respond in Informing Sequences. In A. Bateman & A. Church (Eds.), *Children's Knowledge-in-Interaction* (pp. 13-36). Springer, Singapore.

Garfinkel, H. (1967*). Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garfinkel, H. (2002). *Ethnomethodology's program: Working out Durkheim's aphorism*. Toronto: Rowman-Littlefield.

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

Glew, P. J. (1998). Verbal interaction and English second language acquisition in classroom contexts. *Issues in Educational Research*, *8*(2), 83-94.

Goffman, E. (1964). The neglected situation. *American anthropologist*, *66*(2), 133-136.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.* Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Goldberg, J. A. (1975). A system for the transfer of instructions in natural settings. *Semiotica*, *14*(3), 269-295.

Goodwin, C. (1980). Restarts, pauses, and the achievement of a state of mutual gaze at turn-beginning. *Sociological inquiry*, *50*(3-4), 272-302.

Goodwin, C. (1981). Conversational organization: *Interaction between speakers and hearers.* New York: Academic.

Goodwin, C. (1986). Gestures as a resource for the organization of mutual orientation. *Semiotica*, *62*(1-2), 29-50.

Goodwin, C. (1987). Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social psychology quarterly*, *50*(2), 115-130.

Goodwin, C. (2006). Human sociality as mutual orientation in a rich interactive environment: Multimodal utterances and pointing in aphasia. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction* (pp. 97-125). New York: Berg.

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *19*(1), 283-307.

Goodwin, M. H. (2006a). *The hidden life of girls: Games of stance, status, and exclusion* (Vol. 1). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Goodwin, M. H. (2006b). Participation, affect, and trajectory in family directive/response sequences. *Text & Talk-An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, *26*(4-5), 515-543.

Greathbach. D. (1990). The management of disagreement between news interviewers. *Language Society, 17*(2), 401-430.

Hall, J. K. (1995). "Aw, man, where you goin'?": Classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6*(2), 37-62.

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. (1999). A prosaics of interaction: The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 137-152). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Hall, J. K. (2002). *Teaching and researching language and culture.* Harlox: Pearson Education Limited.

Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*(1), 186-203.

Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output. *TESOL quarterly*, *36*(4), 543-572.

He, A. W. (1993). Exploring modality in institutional interactions: Cases from academic counselling encounters. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, *13*(4), 503-528.

He, A. W. (2000). The grammatical and interactional organization of teacher's directives: Implications for socialization of Chinese American children. *Linguistics and education*, *11*(2), 119-140.

He, A. W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 568-582.

hearers. New York: Academic.

Hellermann, J. & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). On the contingent nature of language-learning tasks. *Classroom Discourse 1*(1). 25-45.

Hellermann, J. (2003). The interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: Teacher repetition in feedback moves. *Language in Society*, *32*(1), 79-104.

Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hellermann, J. (2009). Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: A case study of self-initiated self-repair by an adult learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *53*(2), 113-132.

Hellermann, J., & Cole, E. (2009). Practices for social interaction in the language-learning classroom: disengagements from dyadic task interaction. *Applied Linguistics, 30*(2). 186-215.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.

Heritage, J. (1987). Ethnomethodology. *Social theory today*, 224-272.

Heritage, J. (2012a). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 45*(1). 1-29.

Heritage, J. (2012b). Epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 45*(1). 30-52.

Heritage, J., & Greatbatch, D. (1989). On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews. *Discourse in Professional and Everyday Culture. Linko ping, Department of Communication Studies, University of Linko ping, Sweden*, 47-98.

Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*(1), 15–38.

Heritage, M., & Heritage, J. (2013). Teacher questioning: The epicenter of instruction and assessment. *Applied Measurement in Education, 26*(3), 176–190.

Hindmarsh, J., Reynolds, P., & Dunne, S. (2011). Exhibiting understanding: The body in apprenticeship. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(2), 489-503.

Holmes, J. (1983). The structure of teachers' directives. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 84-98). London: Longman.

Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(1), 25-50.

Hosoda, Y., & Aline, D. (2013). Two preferences in question–answer sequences in language classroom context. *Classroom Discourse, 4*(1), 63–88.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). Conversation Analysis: Principles, practice and applications. *Cambridge, England: Polity*.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity.

Hymes, D. (1971). Sociolinguistics and the ethnography of speaking. *Social anthropology and language, 1*(1), 47-93.

Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Jacknick, C. M. (2009). *A conversation-analytic account of student-initiated participation in an ESL classroom*. Teachers College: Columbia University.

Jacknick, C. M. (2011). Breaking in is hard to do: How students negotiate classroom activity shifts. *Classroom Discourse, 2*(1), 20-38.

Jarvis, J., & Robinson, M. (1997). Analysing educational discourse: An exploratory study of teacher response and support to pupils' learning. *Applied Linguistics, 18*(2), 212-228

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. *Talk and social organization, 1*(1), 86-100.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In. G. Lerner (Ed.) *Conversation analysis, studies form first generation* (pp. 13-34). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jenks, C. J. (2014). *Social interaction in second language chat rooms.* Edinburg: Edinburg University.

Johnson, K. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Jung, E. H. S. (1999). The organization of second language classroom repair. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 153-71.

Kamio, A. (1997). *Territory of information*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(4), 502-530.

Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review, 19*(1), 83-99.

Kasper, G., & Kim, Y. (2007). Handling sequentially inapposite responses. In E. A. Soler & M. S. Jordà (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as social inter-action* (pp. 22-41). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Keevallik, L. (2012). Pragmatics of the Estonian heritage speakers in Sweden. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen, 35*(1), 1-22.

Kendrick, K. (2010). *Epistemics and action formation in Mandarin Chinese*. PhD dissertation, UCLA.

Kidwell, M. (1997). Demonstrating recipiency: knowledge displays as a resource for the unaddressed participant. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 8*(2), 85-96.

Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, (pp. 229-256). Malden: Blackwell.

Koole, T. (2010). Displays of epistemic access: Student responses to teacher explanations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 43*(2), 183-209.

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction. 35*(1), 277-309.

Koshik, I. (2005). Alternative questions used in conversational repair. *Discourse Studies. 7*(1), 193-211.

Koshik, I. (2010). Questions that convey information in teacher-student conferences. In. A. Freed & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *"Why do you ask?" The function of questions in institutional discourse* (pp. 159-186). New York: Oxford University.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(4), 366–372.

Kupetz, M. (2011). Multimodal resources in students' explanations in CLIL interaction. *Novitas-Royal, 5*(1).

Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(7), 1083–1110.

Labov, W. &. Fansel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York: Academic.

Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and the pedagogical imperative in L2 education: Vygotskian praxis and the research/practice divide*. New York: Routledge.

Lee, J. (2011). A Genre Analysis of Second Language Classroom Discourse: Exploring the Rhetorical, Linguistic, and Contextual Dimensions of Language Lessons. In: Applied Linguistics and English as a Second Language Dissertations. Retrieved from http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/alesl_diss/20.

Lee, Y. A. (2006). Respecifying display questions: Interactional resources for language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(4), 691–713.

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

Lehtinen, E. (2005). Information, understanding and the benign order of everyday life in genetic counselling. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 27*(1), 575–601.

Li, H. (2013). Student initiatives and missed learning opportunities in an IRF sequence: A single case analysis. *L2 Journal*, *5*(2), 68-92.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2009). Communication as culturally contexted practice: A view from intercultural communication. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, *29*(1), 115-133.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2011). *An introduction to conversation analysis.* New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Lindwall, O., Lymer, G., & Greiffenhagen, C. (2015). The sequential analysis of instruction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 142-157). New York: John Wiley.

Liu, Y. (2008). Teacher–student talk in Singapore Chinese language classrooms: a case study of initiation/response/follow-up (IRF). *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *28*(1), 87-102.

Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in English as a Second Language, 2*(1). 94-120.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic.

Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 268-285). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Luk, Z. P. S., & Shirai, Y. (2009). Is the acquisition order of grammatical morphemes impervious to L1 knowledge? Evidence from the acquisition of plural-s, articles, and possessive's. *Language Learning*, *59*(4), 721-754.

Lynch, M. (2011). Commentary: On understanding understanding. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(2), 553-555.

Macbeth, D. (2003). Hugh Mehan's learning lessons reconsidered: On the differences between the naturalistic and critical analysis of classroom discourse. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(1), 239–280

Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in society*, *33*(5), 703-736.

Macbeth, D. H. (1991). Teacher authority as practical action. *Linguistics and Education*, *3*(4), 281-313.

Mackey, A. and Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second Language Research.* London: Lawrance Erlbaum Associates.

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

Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(3), 404-427.

Markee, N. (2013). Emic and etic in qualitative research. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 404-427). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Markee, N. (2015). *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.

Markee, N. P. (1995). Teachers' answers to students' questions: Problematizing the issue of making meaning. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6*(2), 63-92.

Martin, C. & Sahlström, F. (2010). Learning as longitudinal interactional change: from other repair to self-repair in physiotherapy treatment. *Discourse Processes, 47*(8). 668- 697.

Martin, C. (2004). *From other to self. Learning as interactional change*. Doctoral Dissertation, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Brno.

Martin, C. (2009) Relevance of situational context in studying learning as changing participation. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 53*(2). 133-149.

Martin, C., & Sahlström, F. (2010). Learning as longitudinal interactional change: From other-repair to self-repair in physiotherapy treatment. *Discourse Processes, 47*(8), 668-697.

Mauranen, A. (2010). Discourse reflexivity-a discourse universal? The case of ELF. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 9*(2), 13-40.

Maynard, D. W., & Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis, doctor–patient interaction and medical communication. *Medical Education, 39*(4), 428-435.

Maynard, D. W., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1984). Topical talk, ritual and the social organization of relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 47*(4), 301-316.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom, *Language in Society, 7*(2), 183-213.

McHoul, A. W. (1985). Two aspects of classroom interaction: Turn-taking and correction. *Australian Journal of Human Communication Disorders, 13*(1), 53-64.

Mehan, H. (1979a). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Mehan, H. (1979b). 'What time is it, Denise?": Asking known information questions in classroom discourse. *Theory into Practice, 18*(4), 285-294.

Mehan, H. (1987). Language and power in organizational process. *Discourse Processes, 10*(4), 291-301.

Melander, H. & Sahlström, F. (2009). Learning to fly - the progressive development of situation awareness. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 53*(2). 151-166.

Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and learners*. Multilingual Matters.

Mondada, L. (2011). Understanding as an embodied, situated and sequential achievement in interaction. *Journal of pragmatics, 43*(2), 542-552.

Mondada, L. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to data collection. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 32-56). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mondada, L. and Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal. 88*(4), 501-518.

Mortensen, K. (2009). Establishing recipiency in pre-beginning position in the second language classroom. *Discourse Processes*, *46*(5), 491-515.

Mortensen, K. (2011). Doing word explanation in interaction. In G. Pallotti, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 Learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives*. Honolulu, HI: NFLRC.

Mushin, I., Gardner, R., & Munro, J. M. (2013). Language matters in demonstrations of understanding in early years mathematics assessment. *Mathematics education research journal*, *25*(3), 415-433.

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

Myles, F., & Mitchell, R. (2004). Using information technology to support empirical SLA research. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2), 169-196.

Myles, F., & Mitchell, R. (2004). Using information technology to support empirical SLA research. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2).

Nakamura, I. (2004). Understanding a Learner's Responses: Uses of Silence in Teacher-Student Dialogues.

Nakamura, I. (2008). Understanding how teacher and student talk with each other: An exploration of how repair' displays the co-management of talk-in-interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*(2), 265-283.

Nassaji, H., & Wells, G. (2000). What's the use of triadic dialogue?: An investigation of teacher-student interaction. *Applied linguistics*, *21*(3), 376-406.

Nguyen, H. (2011). A longitudinal microanalysis of a second language learner's participation. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice:*

conversation analytic perspectives (pp. 17-44). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Nguyen, H. T. (2006). Constructing "expertness": A novice pharmacist's development of interactional competence in patient consultations. *Communication and Medication, 3*(2), 147–160.

Nishizaka, A. (2011). Touch without vision: Referential practice in a non-technological environment. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(2), 504-520.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum: A study in second language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL quarterly, 25*(2), 279-295.

Nystrand, M. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom. Language and Literacy Series*. Williston: Teachers College.

Park, Y. (2013). The roles of third-turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional contexts. *Applied linguistics, 35*(2), 145-167.

Payne, G., & Hustler, D. (1980). Teaching the class: the practical management of the cohort. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 1*, 50–65.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: on language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising learning in applied linguistics* (pp. 105-126). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (eds.) Usage-*Based Perspectives on Second Language Learning* (233-270).

Peräkylä, A. (1995). *AIDS counselling: Institutional interaction and clinical practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Peräkylä, A. (1997). Reliability and validity in research based on tapes and transcripts. *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*, 201-220.

Peräkylä, A. (2004). Two traditions of interaction research. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *43*(1), 1-20.

Pica, T., & Long, M. H. (1986). The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*, *20*(4), 85-98.

Pilnick, A. (2003). "Patient Counselling" by pharmacists: Four approaches to the delivery of counselling sequences and their interactional reception. *Social Science & Medicine, 56*(1), 835–849.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of Preferred/dispreferred turn shaped. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 210-228). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Poole, D. (1990). Contextualizing IRE in an eighth-grade quiz review. *Linguistics and Education*, *2*(3), 185-211.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. London: Sage.

Radford, J. (2010). Adult participation in children's word searches: on the use of prompting, hinting, and supplying a model. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics, 24*(2). 83-100.

Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, *68*(6), 939–967.

Raymond, G. (2010). Prosodic variation in responses: The case of type-conforming responses to yes/no interrogatives. In D. B. Weingarten, E. Reber & M. Selting (Eds.), *Prosody in interaction*, (pp. 109-130). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Richards, J. C. (2006). Materials development and research-making the connection. *RELC Journal*, *37*(1), 5-26.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Robinson, J. (2009). Managing counter informings: An interactional practice for soliciting information that facilitates reconciliation of speakers' incompatible positions. *Human Communication Research, 35*(1), 561–587.

Rowe, K. (2006). Effective teaching practices for students with and without learning difficulties: Constructivism as a legitimate theory of learning and of teaching? *Student Learning Processes, 10*(1), 1-25.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, (pp. 21-27). Melbourne: Cambridge University.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation.* Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson G. (1974). A simplest systematics for organization of turn-taking for conversation, *Language, 50*(4), 696-735.

Sarangi, S., & Clarke, A. (2002). Constructing an account by contrast in counselling for childhood genetic testing. *Social Science & Medicine, 54*(2), 295-308.

Savignon, S. J. (2001). Communicative language teaching for the twenty-first century. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language, 3*(1), 13-28.

Scarcella, R. (1988). Conversational analysis in L2 acquisition and teaching. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 9*(1), 72-91.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Identification and Recognition in Telephone Conversation Openings. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology* (pp. 23-78). New York: Irvington Publishers.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987a). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. *Talk and Social Organisation, 1*(1), 70-85.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987b). Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction. *Linguistics, 25*(1), 201–218.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of pragmatics, 12*(1), 55-62.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 97*(5), 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context?, *Discourse and Society, 8*(1), 165 187.

Schegloff, E. A. (2002). Opening sequencing. In J. E. Katz & M. Aakhus (Eds.), *Perpetual contact: Mobile communication, private talk, public performance* (pp. 326-385). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

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

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks H. (1973). Opening up closings, *Semiotica, 7*, 289-327.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361-382.

Schiffrin, D. (1978). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schwab, G. (2011). From dialogue to multilogue: a different view on participation in the English foreign-language classroom. *Classroom Discourse, 2*(1), 3-19.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

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

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

Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching, 38(*4), 165-187.

Seedhouse, P., (2008). Learning to talk the talk: Conversation analysis as a tool for induction of trainee teachers. In S. Garton & K. Richards (Eds.) *Professional Encounters in TESOL*. (pp. 42-57). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sert, O. (2011). *A micro-analytic investigation of claims of insufficient knowledge in EAL classrooms.* PhD Thesis. Newcastle University, UK.

Sert, O. (2013). *'(Un)willingness to participate as participants' concern: reconsidering research on motivation in applied linguistics'*. Paper presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics 2013 Conference, Dallas, Texas.

Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University.

Sert, O., & Balaman, U. (2018). Orientations to negotiated language and task rules in online L2 interaction. *ReCALL*, *1*(1), 1-20.

Sert, O., & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education, 27*(6), 542-565.

Shamsipour, A., & Allami, H. (2012). Teacher talk and learner involvement in EFL classroom: The case of Iranian setting. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(11), 22-62.

Sidnell, J. (2010). Questioning repeats in the talk of four-year-old children. In H. Garder & M. Forrester (Eds.), *Analysing interactions in childhood: Insights from conversation analysis* (pp. 103–127). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sidnell, J. (2012). Who knows best?: Evidentiality and epistemic asymmetry in conversation. *Pragmatics and Society, 3*(2), 294–327.

Silverman, D. (1997). *Discourses of counselling: HIV counselling as social interaction.* London, England: Sage.

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

Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2007). Making use of bilingualism—construction of a monolingual classroom, and its consequences. *International journal of the sociology of language*, *2007*(187–188), 103-128.

St. John, O., & Cromdal, J. (2016). Crafting instructions collaboratively: Student questions and dual addressivity in classroom task instructions. *Discourse processes*, *53*(4), 252-279.

Stern, H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching.* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education.

Stivers, T., & Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *43*(1), 3-31.

Svennevig, J. (2004). Other-repetition as display of hearing, understanding and emotional stance. *Discourse Studies*, *6*(4), 489-516.

Taguchi, N. (2014). Development of interactional competence in Japanese as a second language: Use of incomplete sentences as interactional resources. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*(2). 518-535.

ten Have, P. (1990). Methodological issues in conversation analysis. *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, *27*, 23-51.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis, a practical guide* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Terasaki, A. (1976). *Pre-announcement sequences in conversation*. Social Science Working Paper, 99. School of Social Sciences, University of California, Irvine.

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1991). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, G. (1997). Training teachers to ask questions. *ELT journal*, *51*(2), 99-105.

Thornbury, S. (1996). Teachers research teacher talk. *ELT Journal*, *50*(4), 279-289.

Toth, P. (2011). Social and cognitive factors in making teacher-led classroom discourse relevant for second language development. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(1), 1-25.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

van Compernolle, R. A. (2011). Developing second language sociopragmatic knowledge through concept-based instruction: A microgenetic case study. *Journal of pragmatics, 43*(13), 3267-3283.

van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.

Wallace, M. J. (1998). *Action research for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace, M. J. (2006). *Action research for language teachers*. Ernst Klett: Sprachen.

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

Walsh, S. (2006a). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routedge.

Walsh, S. (2006b). Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom. *ELT journal*, *60*(2), 133 141.

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

Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL, 6*(1), 1-14.

Walsh, S., & Li L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 23(*2), 247–66.

Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*(4), 577-594.

Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback): A single case analysis. *Language Learning, 59*(4), 796-824.

Waring, H. Z. (2011). Learner initiatives and learning opportunities in the language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, *2*(2), 201-218.

Waring, H. Z. (2012). Yes-no questions that convey a critical stance in the language classroom. *Language & Education, 26*(5), 451-469.

Waring, H. Z. (2013). Managing Stacy: A case study of turn-taking in the language classroom. *System, 41*(3), 841-851.

Waring, H. Z. (2015). *Theorizing pedagogical interaction: Insights from conversation analysis* (Vol. 155). New York: Routledge.

Waring, H. Z., & Hruska, B. L. (2012). Problematic directives in pedagogical interaction. *Linguistics and Education, 23*(3), 289-300.

Waring, H. Z., Creider, S. C., & Box, C. D. (2013). Explaining vocabulary in the second language classroom: a conversation analytic account. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 2*(4), 249-264.

Waring, H. Z., Reddington, E., & Tadic, N. (2016). Responding artfully to student-initiated departures in the adult ESL classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 33*(1), 28-39.

Weeks, P. (1985) Error-correction techniques and sequences in instructional settings: Toward a comparative framework. *Human Studies*, *8*(1), 195–233.

Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, *5*(1), 1-37.

West, C. (1990). Not just doctors' orders': directive-response sequences in patients' visits to women and men physicians. *Discourse & Society*, *1*(1), 85-112.

White, J., & Lightbrown, P. M. (1984). Asking and answering in ESL classes. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *40*(2), 228-44.

Wong, J. (2000a). Repetition in conversation: A Look at first and second Sayings. *Research on language and social interaction*, *33*(4), 407-424.

Wong, J. (2000b). The token "yeah" in nonnative speaker English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *33*(1), 39-67.

Wong, J. (2000c). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*(1), 244–267.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2008). “Very good” as a teacher response. *ELT Journal*, *63*(3), 195-203.

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

Wooffitt, R. (1990). On the analysis of interaction: An introduction to conversation analysis. In *Computers and conversation* (pp. 7-38).

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

Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 426-443). New York: Routledge.

Young, R. F. (2013). Learning to talk the talk and walk the walk: Interactional competence in academic spoken English. *Iberica, 25*(1), 15-38.

Young, R. F. (March 2000). *Interactional competence and validity*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Association for Applied Linguistics, Vancouver, Canada.

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

Young, R., & He, A. W. (Eds.) (1998). *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Zemel, A., & Koschmann, T. (2011). Pursuing a question: Reinitiating IRE sequences as a method of instruction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(2), 475–488.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: ORIGINALITY REPORT



Yüksek Lisans Tezi

ORIJINALLIK RAPORU

%1	%1	%0	%0
BENZERLIK ENDEKSI	İNTERNET KAYNAKLARI	YAYINLAR	ÖĞRENCI ÖDEVLERI

BIRINCIL KAYNAKLAR

1	theses.ncl.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	%1

Alıntıları çıkart	üzerinde	Eşleşmeleri çıkar	< %1
Bibliyografyayı Çıkart	üzerinde		

APPENDIX 2: JEFFERSON TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTION

[brackets]	overlapped speech.
(0.5)	pause in tenths of a second.
(.)	micropause of less than two tenths of a second
=	contiguity between the speech of one speaker or of two different speakers.
.	intonation descent.
?	intonation ascent.
,	continuous intonation.
? ,	intonation ascent, stronger than a comma and less strong than the question mark.
:	sound elongation.
-	self-interruption.
underlined	accent or emphasis of volume.
CAPITALS	strong emphasis.
º	low voice speech immediately after the signal.
ºwordsº	low voice excerpt.
word:	uninflected intonation descent.
word:	uninflected intonation ascent.
↑	sharp ascent in intonation, stronger than the underlined colon.
↓	sharp descent in intonation, stronger than the colon preceded by underline.
>words<	compressed or accelerated speech.
<words>	slowing of speech.
<words	accelerated beginning.
Hhh	audible aspirations.
(h)	aspirations during the speech.
.hhh	audible inspiration.
(( ))	analyst's comments.
(words)	doubtful transcription.
( )	impossible transcription.
...	non-measured pause
"word"	reported speech, reconstruction of a dialogue

Conventions developed by Gail Jefferson and published in Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), the last two symbols were suggested by Schifrin (1987) and Tannen (1989).

APPENDIX 3: DATA COLLECTION CHART

	Date	Duration	Subtotal
Week 12	5th December 2016	1:00:59	1:49:44
		48.45	
	6th December 2016	50:00	2:35:31
		1:01:00	
		44:31	
Week 13	-	-	-
Week 14	19th December 2016	1:01:00	4:22:36
		1:00:58	
		48:17	
		37:14	
		55:07	
	20th December 2016	1:00:58	2:47:40
		53:00	
		53:42	
Week 15	26th December 2016	1:00:59	3:47:13
		54:08	
		1:01:01	
		51:05	
		57:14	
	27th December 2016	44:40	3:06:37
		37:48	
		46:55	
		51:34	2:49:04

Week 16	28th December 2016	57:29	
		1:00:01	
		1:00:59	
	2nd January 2017	53:34	4:36:13
		51:04	
		1:00:00	
		50:36	
	3rd January 2017	54:22	2:47:01
		1:00:57	
		51:42	
	4th January 2017	1:01:00	2:44:01
		53:34	
		49:27	
			Total: 31:25:50

APPENDIX 4: EXTRACT 1 OMITTED LINES

10 Tea: >okay hurry up please< (0.6) ↑get a piece of empty paper↓ (0.5) and
11 large paper >will be appreciated because< it's not note taking
12 okay↓ (1.8)
13 Bey: is i:t eno[u:gh
+ shows a paper to the Tea
14 Tea: [yeah this is okay but >you know< the mini paper is a
15 er: this is my mistake <i said< piece of paper (.) get a la:rge
16 sheet of paper (0.3) as much as possible of course you know↓
17 (2.4)

APPENDIX 5: EXTRACT 3 OMITTED LINES

13 Tea: tülay let's start with you

14 Tül: the evidence clearly shows that the manager at the book shop

15 Tea: huhu a:nd sevgi

16 Sev: innocent because

17 Tea: because the manager didn't give bla blab la bla and nine

18 Pır: er i'm not certain he is guilty be- because guilty

19 Tea: beyza next one

20 Bey: it's clear to me that

21 Tea: it's clear to me that exactly and the three: b exercise
22 let's try to match them together related to the prosecution
23 which of those sentences can be used in the prosecution you
24 think

25 Alp: six

26 Tea: number six certainly can be used what else

27 Bey: five

28 Tea: number five certainly can be used (3.5) one mo:[re

29 Tan: [four=

30 Tea: =and number four (.) exactly↓ ↑ number four five six (.) can
31 be used as a part of the <prosecution> in the court (0.4).hh
32 <re↑lated to defense> which of the: (.) numbers can be used=

33 Meh: two

APPENDIX 6: EXTRACT 5 OMITTED LINES

7 Tea: everybody is too lazy to go and move anywhere okay↓ (.) s[o
8 Tan: [I
9 can choose mehmet (0.2)
10 Tea: okay >go<= =okay (0.4) now mehmet ( ) because no one
11 want to be >a part of the activity< (0.2) like ↑that (0.2)
12 okay >why not< £.hh so↑£ (.) you two together (0.2)
+ looks at the two girls
13 >come together selman choose a partner to yourself< (0.2)
14 Sel: °yes°
15 Tea: okay↓ (.) you >did you choose a partner to yourself< (0.3)
+ points at the girls on the front row
16 Bey: yeap yea[h
17 Tea: [okay you two together (.)
18 (1.3)
19 Tea: alev↑ (.) okay you two so (0.2) ↑beyza (0.2) choose a group
20 to yourself now >quickly< (0.3) you may join in ladies okay
+ points at Tül and Nur

APPENDIX 7: EXTRACT 8 OMITTED LINES

36	Yap:	okay let's start
37	Meh:	which topic
38	Tea:	i love this one this position (0.6) so much more clo:ser
		+ points at one of the group
39		sincere here we go you have no book (0.2)
		+ points at Mur
40	Mur:	yeah
41	Tea:	=you may >get my< book (0.6) but unfortunately (0.2) there
42		is no underlined part (.) you may underline (.) any part
		+ gives her book to Mur
43		that you want



GAZİLİ OLMAK AYRICALIKTIR…