
GAZİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Gazi
1926

INSTRUCTION GIVING PRACTICES IN EFL CLASSES

Yeşim Uğurlu Şen

MASTER THESIS

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM

GAZI UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

OCTOBER, 2021

TELİF HAKKI VE TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

Bu tezin tüm hakları saklıdır. Kaynak göstermek koşuluyla tezin teslim tarihinden itibaren .....(….) ay sonra tezden fotokopi çekilebilir.

YAZARIN

Adı : Yeşim

Soyadı : Uğurlu Şen

Bölümü : İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

İmza :

Teslim tarihi :

TEZİN

Türkçe Adı: Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretilen Sınıflarda Yönerge Verme Uygulamaları

İngilizce Adı: Instruction Giving Practices in EFL Classes

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: Yeşim UĞURLU ŞEN

İmza:

JÜRİ ONAY SAYFASI

Yeşim UĞURLU ŞEN tarafından hazırlanan "Instruction Giving Practices in EFL Classes" adlı tez çalışması aşağıdaki jüri tarafından oy birliği / oy çokluğu ile Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Danışman: Prof. Dr. Paşa Tevfik CEPHE

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Gazi Üniversitesi …..…..……

Başkan: Prof. Dr. Abdulvahit ÇAKIR

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Ufuk Üniversitesi ……

Üye: Prof. Dr. Cem BALÇIKANLI

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Gazi Üniversitesi ……

Tez Savunma Tarihi: 30/09/2021

Bu tezin İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda Yüksek Lisans/ Doktora tezi olması için şartları yerine getirdiğini onaylıyorum.

Prof. Dr. Yücel GELİŞLİ

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürü ……

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I had to overcome a lot in this long process, but I guess expressing my feelings here to the ones to whom I will ever be in-debt for their endless support is the toughest part. First of all, I would like to send my heartfelt thanks to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Paşa Tevfik Cephe for his endless motivation and support even in times I felt totally lost and his valuable feedback getting me on the right track. I will be always grateful for his supervision. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Abdulvahit Çakır and Prof. Dr. Cem Balçıkanlı for their comments and contributions to this thesis. I also owe many thanks to Prof. Dr. Kemal Sinan Özmen. In spite of his busy life, he patiently replied to all my questions with his sincere comments and precious thoughts. My thanks also go to all my professors who inspired me by their hard work and made me who I am today.

I gratefully thank my friends and colleagues. I would like to thank Necati Küçükyılmaz. From the very first to the last day of my M.A adventure, he was a true friend, classmate, and colleague, who always helped me with almost everything, and encouraged me to accomplish this study. Also, many thanks go to my former colleagues and friends, Seda Can and İde Aslan. I always felt their support physically and emotionally. I would like to send my heartfelt thanks to my old friend and my hardworking colleague, Kübra Ekşi, for her contributions to this thesis with her mind-blowing ideas. I also would like to thank my beloved friends, Özlem Utku Bilici and Melek Develi Altun, for sharing their professional comments and settling my wavering ideas down with me. I also owe many thanks to Seda Karadeniz who helped me to decide my thesis topic with her constructive feedback to my lessons.

One of my deepest thanks goes to Hakan Şen. He was like a dedicated trainer trying to motivate and encourage me over long talks to conclude my thesis. Every struggle I was facing with and every step I was taking during this process was with him. Without his ever-lasting support and energy, I could not manage to complete this thesis.

Many thanks go to my parents: my father, Atanur Uğurlu and my mother, Günay Uğurlu. Without their endless love and support since I was a little girl, I would not be the person who I am today. I also thank my siblings, my cheerleaders, Yeliz Uğurlu and İrem Uğurlu. I felt their energy and support in this writing process from far away. They were such good listeners who helped me to get all the negativity out of my system over long phone calls.

YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETİLEN SINIFLARDA YÖNERGE VERME UYGULAMALARI

(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)

Yeşim Uğurlu Şen
GAZİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ
Ekim, 2021

ÖZ

Öğrenme görevleri veya etkinlikleri için verilen yönergelerin niteliği bir öğrenme görevi veya etkinliğinin verimliliğini belirlediğinden; bu yönergeler, etkinlikler veya tüm ders kadar dikkate değerdir. Düşük nitelikteki yönergeler, etkinliğin veya tüm dersin başarısız olmasına neden olabilirken (Anderson, 2004; Scrivener, 2011; Sowell, 2017); uygun şekilde verilen yönergeler öğrencinin derse katılımını arttırır (Somuncu ve Sert, 2019), öğrenme sürecini daha etkin kılar (Slavin, 1995) ve öğrencinin bağımsız hareket etmesine olanak tanır (Ur, 1991). Yönerge vermenin bu denli önemli olmasına ragmen; öğretmen eğitiminde göz ardı edilen bir öğretmen becerisi olarak gözlemlenmiştir (Sowell, 2017). Bu nedenle, etkinlik yönergelerinin sınıf içi uygulamalarının gözlemlenmesi önemlidir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, İngilizce öğretimi dersliklerinde etkinlik yönergelerinin nasıl verildiğini ve kontrol edildiğini araştırmak, bu aşamalarda hangi tekniklerin kullanıldığını belirlemek ve öğretim elemanlarının yönergeleri verirken ve kontrol ederken kullandıkları teknikler hakkında fikirlerini toplamak ve son olarak öğretim elemanlarının görüşlerini ve sınıf içi uygulamalarını karşılaştırmaktır. Ayrıca, Covid-19'un patlak vermesiyle dünyadaki okulların çoğu geçici olarak kapatılmış veya çevrimiçi eğitime başlamıştır. 2020-2021 eğitim-öğretim yılı başından itibaren Türkiye'deki vakıf üniversitelerinin çoğu, aynı anda hem online hem de yüz yüze derslere olanak tanıyan hibrit modele geçmiştir. Tüm bunlar göz önünde bulundurularak, yüz yüze ve çevrimiçi derslerde verilen farklı yönerge verme ve kontrol etme uygulamaları da kıyaslanabilinecektir. Bu bağlamda, mevcut çalışmanın bir diğer amacı, hem yüz yüze sınıflarda hem de çevrimiçi oturumlarda yönerge verme uygulamalarını ortaya çıkarmaktır. Bununla ilgili olarak, bu çalışma bir vakıf üniversitesinde yedi İngilizce öğretim görevlisi ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Her bir öğretim görevlisinin sekiz saatlik dersi (dört yüz yüze ve dört çevrimiçi ders) araştırmacı tarafından kayıt altına alınmış ve yazıya dökülmüştür. 56 saatlik yazıya dökülmüş dersler içerik analizi kullanılarak analiz

edilmiştir. Öğretim elemanlarının her bir dersi gözlemlendikten sonra öğretim elemanlarının görüşlerini almak ve sonuçların güvenirliğini artırmak amacıyla öğretim elemanları ile görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Görüşmeler de yazıya dökülmüş ve içerik analizi kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Araştırmada yönerge vermeye yönelik, *ders kitabındaki orijinal yönergeyi okuma, açımlama, ana dile çeviri, gösteri, bir öğrenciye sesli okutma ve öğrencilere yönergeleri bireysel olarak okutma* olmak üzere 6 farklı teknik elde edilmiştir. Öte yandan, öğretim görevleri yönergeleri kontrol etmek için *göstergesel sorular sormak, göndergesel sorular sormak, ana dilde sorulan sorular ve öğrencilerden yönergenin özetini almak* üzere 4 farklı teknik kullanmışlardır. Farklı tekniklerin tercih edilmesini etkileyen faktörler; aktiviteye dayalı faktörler, öğretim ortamına dayalı faktörler, öğrenciye dayalı faktörler, yönergeye dayalı faktörler, zaman yönetimi faktörleri ve öğretim görevlisine dayalı faktörler olmak üzere tespit edildi. Araştırmanın temel amaçlarından biri olması nedeniyle öğretim ortamı (yüz-yüze veya online), öğretim elemanlarının hem yönerge verme hem de kontrol etme tarzlarında etkili bulunmuştur. Araştırma, öğretim elemanlarının görüşlerinden hareketle öğretim elemanlarının yönerge verme ve kontrol etme uygulamalarında davranışlarının altında yatan nedenlere ışık tutmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler : Yönergeler, İngilizce dili öğretimi, hibrit eğitim
Sayfa Adedi : 90
Danışman : Prof. Dr. Paşa Tevfik CEPHE

INSTRUCTION GIVING PRACTICES IN EFL CLASSES

(M.A. Thesis)

Yeşim Uğurlu Şen

GAZI UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

October, 2021

ABSTRACT

Instructions given for learning tasks or activities are as noteworthy as the activities or the whole lesson since the quality of given instructions determines the efficiency of a learning task or activity. While low quality of instructions may lead to failure of the activity or the whole lesson (Anderson, 2004; Scrivener, 2005; Sowell, 2017), properly delivered instructions encourage student participation (Somuncu & Sert, 2019), foster learning process (Slavin, 1995) and promote independent learner activity (Ur, 1991). Despite the great importance of instruction giving, it is a teacher skill being ignored in teacher education (Sowell, 2017). Hence, it is significant to observe classroom practices of activity instructions. The aim of the study is to explore how activity instructions are given and checked in EFL classrooms, to identify which techniques are utilized and to gather the instructors' ideas about the techniques they use while giving and checking instructions, which also enables to compare the instructors' views and actual practices. Furthermore, with the outbreak of Covid-19, most of the schools around the world have been closed temporarily or have begun online education. Most of the foundation universities in Turkey have started the hybrid model; both online and face-to-face classes since the beginning of the academic year of 2020-2021. With all these in mind, this current situation allows to compare different applications of giving and checking instructions regarding face-to-face and online lessons. In this respect, the current study aims to find out instruction giving practices in both face-to-face classrooms and online sessions. Regarding this, the current study was conducted with seven EFL instructors in a foundation university. Eight hours of lessons of each instructor (four face-to-face and four online lessons) were recorded and transcribed by the researcher. The 56-hours of transcribed lessons were analyzed using content analysis. After the observation of each lesson of the instructors, in order to collect the instructors' opinions and increase the reliability of the results, interviews were conducted with the instructors. The interviews were also transcribed and analyzed using content analysis. One of the findings of the study was that there were 6 different techniques to give instructions: reading the original

instruction in the coursebook, paraphrasing, L1 translation, demonstration, making one student read aloud, and reading the instructions individually. On the other hand, the instructors used four techniques to check instructions: asking display questions, asking referential questions, L1 display questions, and getting summary from students. Their choices differentiated based on different reasons: activity-based factors, medium of teaching, student-based factors, instruction-based factors, time management factors, and instructor-based factors. Due to being one of the main aims of the study, medium of teaching was found effective in both instruction giving and checking styles of the instructors. Based on the views of instructors, the study sheds light on the reasons behind instructors' behaviors in instruction giving and checking practices.

Key Words : Instructions, English language teaching, hybrid education
Page Number : 90
Supervisor : Prof. Dr. Paşa Tevfik CEPHE

CONTENTS

TELİF HAKKI VE TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU i

ETİK İLKELERE UYGUNLUK BEYANI ii

JÜRİ ONAY SAYFASI iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

ÖZ vi

ABSTRACT viii

CONTENTS x

LIST OF TABLES xv

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xvi

CHAPTER 1 1

INTRODUCTION 1

1.1. Introduction 1

1.2. Statement of the Problem 4

1.3. Aim of the Study 5

1.4. Research Questions 6

1.5. Significance of the Study 6

1.6. Limitations 7

CHAPTER 2 8

LITERATURE REVIEW 8

2.1. Classroom Discourse and Interaction 8

2.1.1. Classroom Contexts 11

2.1.2. Teacher Talk 13

2.1.2.1. Instruction-Giving 16

2.1.2.2. Instruction Checking 20

2.2. Distance Education 23

2.2.1. Online Education 23

2.2.2. Hybrid Education 25

2.2.3. Using a Video Conferencing Software as a Tool 25

2.3. Conclusion 26

CHAPTER 3 27

METHODOLOGY 27

3.1. Introduction 27

3.2. Research Design 27

3.3. Research Context and The Participants 28

3.4. Data Collection 30

3.5. Data Analysis 31

3.6. Operational Definitions 32

3.6.1. Activity Types 32

3.6.2. Medium of Teaching 33

3.6.3. Structure of Instructions 33

3.6.4. Instruction Giving Techniques (IGTs) 34

3.6.5. Instruction Checking Techniques (ICTs) 34

3.7. Conclusion 34

CHAPTER 4 35

FINDINGS 35

4.1. Introduction **35**

4.2. Interviews **35**

4.2.1. Instructors' views on Instruction Giving Practices **35**

4.2.1.1. Instructors' Views on Pre-Planning of Instructions ***36***

4.2.1.2. Instructors' Views on Securing Their Students' Attention ***36***

4.2.1.3. Instructors' Views on IGTs ***36***

4.2.1.4. Instructors' Views on Instruction Giving Based on the Medium of Teaching ***41***

4.2.2. Instructors' Views on Instruction Checking **43**

4.2.2.1. Instructors' Views on Their Instruction Checking Frequency ***43***

4.2.2.2. Instructors' Views on Instruction Checking Techniques ***44***

4.2.2.3. Instructors' Views on Instruction Checking Based on Medium of Teaching ***46***

4.2.3. Determining Factors in IG and IC **49**

4.2.3.1. Activity-Based Factors ***49***

4.2.3.2. Medium of Teaching Factors ***49***

4.2.3.3. Instruction-Based Factors ***50***

4.2.3.4. Student-Based Factors ***50***

4.2.3.5. Time Management Factors ***50***

4.2.3.6. Instructor-Based Factors ***51***

4.3. Classroom Observations **51**

4.3.1. Instruction Giving Practices **52**

4.3.1.1. Grabbing Attention ***52***

4.3.1.2. Instruction Giving Techniques ***52***

4.3.1.2.1. Repetitive Instructions *53*

4.3.1.3. Determining Factors ***54***

4.3.1.3.1. Activity Types *55*

4.3.1.3.2. Medium of Teaching *56*

4.3.1.3.3. Structure of the Instructions *57*

4.3.2. Instruction Checking Practices **59**

4.3.2.1. Instruction Checking Rate ***59***

4.3.2.2. Instruction Checking Techniques ***60***

4.3.2.3. Determining Factors ***60***

4.3.2.3.1. Activity Types *61*

4.3.2.3.2. Mediums of Teaching *62*

4.3.2.3.3. Structure of Instructions *63*

4.4. Conclusion **63**

CHAPTER 5 ..... **64**

DISCUSSION **64**

5.1. Introduction **64**

5.2. RQ1, RQ2, and RQ3: Instructors' Views on Their Instruction Giving Practices and Instruction Giving Practices in Class in Hybrid Education **64**

5.3. RQ4, RQ5, and RQ6: Instructors' Views on Their Instruction Checking Practices and Instruction Checking Practices in Class in Hybrid Education **69**

5.4. Conclusion **71**

CHAPTER 6 ..... **72**

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS **72**

6.1. Summary of the Study **72**

6.2. Pedagogical Implications **73**

6.3. Suggestions for Further Research **74**

REFERENCES **76**

APPENDICES **87**

APPENDIX 1: The Sample of Transcribed Instructions **88**

APPENDIX 2: The Sample of Interview Questions.....90

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. *Results of the Interviews* 42

Table 2. *Results of Interviews on Instruction Checking Practices* 48

Table 3. *Total Number of Instructions* 52

Table 4. *Instruction Giving Techniques' Rates* 53

Table 5. *Instructions' Repetition Rates* 53

Table 6. *Instruction Rates for Activity Types* 55

Table 7. *IGT Rates for Activity Types* 55

Table 8. *IGT Rates for Mediums of Teaching* 56

Table 9. *Structure of the Instructions* 57

Table 10. *IGT Rates Based on Structures of the Instructions* 58

Table 11. *Instructions Checking Rates* 59

Table 12. *ICT Rates* 60

Table 13. *ICT Rates for Activity Types* 61

Table 14. *ICT Rates for Mediums of Teaching* 62

Table 15. *ICT Rates Based on Structures of the Instructions* 63

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference
EFL	English Language Learning
ELT	English Language Teaching
ICT	Instruction Checking Technique
IGT	Instruction Giving Technique
INT	Instructor
IRF	Initiation-Response-Feedback
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
RQ	Research Question
YÖK	Yüksek Öğrenim Kurumu

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

Regarding the fact that interaction is an indisputably putative component of all educational contexts, it has a vital role in language teaching and learning process targeting communication and interaction in its basis. Emphasizing its importance to language learning, Ellis (2000) puts forward "learning arises not through interaction but in interaction" (p. 209). Interaction in language classes has also been distinguished by virtue of its dual role (Willis, 1992, p. 162) functioning as both medium and aim of teaching and learning activities (Hall & Walsh, 2002; Long, 1983a; Walsh, 2006).

Throughout classroom interaction analyses, a number of scholars have accepted that teacher talk constitutes most of the interaction in classrooms (Atkins, 2001; Cazden, 1986; Chaudron, 1988; Walsh, 2006). Moreover, Cullen (1998) states that teachers' traditionally acknowledged role of being the transmitter of knowledge precludes reducing the amount of teacher talk. In this respect, as being one and preponderant side of classroom interaction, teachers' interaction with their students is of the essence. Having been referred many times (Celcia-Murcia, 1989; Flanders, 1970; Nurpahmi, 2017; Ramirez, 1986; Walsh, 2001), giving instructions constitutes a large part of teacher talk.

Instructions are directives intending to get an individual to do something in a broad sense (Austin, 1975; Goodwin, 2016; Searle, 1976). It is most likely to encounter such instructions in classrooms. These instructions are considered a worthy instrument securing classroom management. Classroom management is referred to as procedural contexts by Seedhouse (1996) and managerial mode by Walsh (2006, 2014), which are the least leading pieces of lessons to interaction among other classroom contexts (see Seedhouse, 1996) or classroom modes (see Walsh, 2006, 2014). This perception of instructions being only short and non-

interactional fillers to maintain continuance of the lessons was not enough to explain instructions occupying two-thirds of the teacher explanations (Ramirez, 1986). Furthermore, Somuncu & Sert (2019) emphasize that instructions also function as a "series in which teachers explain the ways to accomplish a task by introducing, informing, guiding and engaging students" (p. 3) rather than operating only mechanic and non-communicative directives like telling students to open their books. Besides, according to Ur (1991), instructions are "the directions that are given to introduce a learning task which entails some measure of independent student activity" (p. l6). Instructions given before learning activities or tasks will be the focus of the current study.

Instructions properly delivered before a learning activity or task foster independent learner activity (Ur, 1991), engagement of students (Somuncu & Sert, 2019), learning process (Slavin, 1995) and learning outcomes (Ha & Wanphet, 2016). On the other hand, the inefficacy of these instructions is likely to result in failure of the activity or the whole lesson (Anderson, 2004; Scrivener, 2005; Sowell, 2017;Todd, Chaiyasuk, & Tantisawetrat, 2008; Ur, 1996; Waring & Hruska, 2012), negative emotions of students like discouragement, demotivation, or exasperation (Cooper, 1990; Downs-Lombardi, 1996) and distractive behaviors (Matheson & Shriver, 2005).

Bearing in mind that (in) efficacy of instruction has a direct influence on achievement of pedagogical goals, the bulk of studies on giving instructions can be divided into two strands: observing instruction delivery process and suggesting worthy of notice points during delivery of instructions. Substantial research has been conducted to observe instruction delivery; detecting the troubles emerging during delivery of instructions in a young learners' classroom (Glaser, 2020; Lien, 2018; Liruso & Debat, 2003; Margaretha, 2015), occurring problems and teachers' detection of non-understandings of instructions (Badem, 2018), categorizing essential information niched in instructions supplied by teachers (Markee, 2015a) and providing instructions in L1 (Swain & Lapkin, 2000). On the other hand, there have been a good number of studies suggesting useful ways of giving instructions (Gardner & Gardner, 2000; Gower, Prusak, Vincent & Pangrak, 2005; Harmer, 2008; Markee, 2015a; Pesesa, 2016; Scrivener, 2005, 2012; Sowell, 2017; Ur, 1996; Walters & Phillips, 1983; Woodberry & Aldrich, 2000).

In Turkey, there are several studies investigating instructions in language classrooms. Conducting a research on teachers' detection of students' understanding troubles emerging with task instructions in an EFL, Badem (2018) found that the teacher detects problems by

observing students' silence, wrong responses in the elicitation phase, verbal contributions during the activity and lack of participation. She offered some interactional resources to minimize these troubles such as speech modifications and requesting for clarification etc. (pp. 161-163). With the aim of observing students' troubles with task instructions and teacher trainees' techniques to handle them, a similar study conducted with teacher trainees showed that trainees mostly failed to handle display of non-understanding in both instruction giving process sequence and task completion by ignoring students' non-understandings or repeating the same failed instructions (Somuncu & Sert, 2019). Nonetheless, they attested that instructions are not monologues but likely interactional sequences with students' interference in case of non-understandings. Another study searching the influences of L1 and L2 use during instruction delivery for only listening activities resulted in students' L1 preferences for listening activities instructions (Gündüz, 2020). Dinçer (2008) categorized all types of oral instructions of teachers and found that in terms of content category, 98% of instructions are task-related while only 2% of them are non-task related. Korkut (2015) tracking interactional features and pedagogic aims with EFL teachers concluded that the managerial mode fosters interactions with the teacher and students' involvement in communicative tasks. Highlighting the significance of instructions, she stated that there is no explicit information on giving instructions in the recent YÖK program of English Language Teaching.

Another research facet to be explained that illustrates the condition of the current study is hybrid education. With the emergence of Covid-19 outbreak in China, the pandemic had been spread to almost every country by the end of February 2020. The first case in Turkey was officially announced on 11th March 2020. Since then, the whole world has been experiencing closures of schools, postponements or cancellations of important events and keeping social distance. Most of the schools and universities in Turkey have been closed and only a few of them have followed a hybrid model of education because of Covid-19. The subject university in the current study has also been applying a hybrid education model since the beginning of the academic year of 2020-2021.

Hybrid education can be defined as a combination of face-to-face and online education (Nagamine, 2011; Pallof & Pratt, 2007a). According to Badawi (2009), hybrid education is more advantageous since "the combination of the virtual and physical environments should consider the strengths and weaknesses of each environment" (p. 11). Many researchers put forward the strengths of hybrid education; raising students' motivation (Albrecht, 2006),

teachers' positive views on hybrid education (Wilson, 2008), promoting interaction in different modes of teaching (Sharma & Fiedler, 2004), and improving various strategies like active learning or learner-centered strategies (Smelser, 2002).

In this study, teachers' giving instructions before learning activities practices in a hybrid model of education employed by eight EFL instructors are observed and analyzed with regard to differences between the practices in face-to-face classes and online classes. With an interview, their views are gathered to interpret the emerging instructions in EFL classrooms. The study aims to explore how teachers deliver instructions before a learning activity and what teachers' views towards their preferences of giving instructions are. This chapter lays out the background of the study (1.1) in the frame of Classroom Discourse and Interaction, statement of the problem (1.2), the aim of the study (1.3), and significance of the study (1.4) and research questions (1.5) pointing the need of this research. Limitations of the study (1.6) and key terms referred to in this thesis (1.7) will also be presented in this chapter.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The quality of given instructions determines the efficiency of a learning task or activity. Low quality of instruction may lead to failure of the activity or the whole lesson (Sowell, 2017). By means of this, it is a must for teachers to deliver clear and understandable instructions lest students get confused and discouraged to meet task requirements. There have been many steps, ways or techniques recommended to be utilized during instruction delivery in the literature (Gardner & Gardner, 2000; Gower et al. 1983; Harmer, 1995; Markee, 2015a; Pesesa, 2016; Prusak et al, 2005; Scrivener, 2005, 2012; Sowell, 2017; Ur, 1996; Woodberry & Aldrich, 2000); however, despite their significance, those suggestions may sometimes be ignored somehow. Some of the problems observed in empirical studies can be listed as "speech modification, no demonstration, no organization of pairs or groups" (Liruso & Debat, 2003, p. 145), complex and long instructions (Glaser, 2020; Lien, 2018; Margaretha, 2015), monologue types of instructions (Lien, 2018), no engagement of attention (Lei, 2009; Lien, 2018; Liruso & Debat, 2003), no checking understanding (Liruso & Debat, 2003; Margaretha, 2015) or asking only display questions like 'Do you understand?' (Rohmah, 2003), using L1 (Gündüz, 2020; Swain & Lapkin, 2000), and ignoring students' non-understandings or repeating the same failed instructions (Somuncu & Sert, 2019).

It is now well-established that even though giving instruction is substantial, many problems occurring during instruction delivery remain to be solved. No matter how important it is, Sowell (2017) notes "instruction-giving is a skill that is sometimes neglected for preservice and in-service teachers in teacher-training programs" (p. 10). Markee (2015) remarks that there is a lack of empirical research contributing instruction giving and checking process. Moreover, Margaretha (2015) suggests that an interview can be employed with teachers to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon, teachers' reasons for their actions while giving instructions, and compare their thoughts on ideal instruction giving and their practices in their real teaching practices, which will be addressed in this thesis.

Most of the existing studies are either searching for the problems during instruction or giving suggestions. There are only a few studies categorizing instructions (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Dinçer, 2008; Searle, 1969). However, the issue of how teachers give task instructions, which ways they apply, and which factors affect their choice of instruction giving techniques is unprecedented. Regarding the data gathered from hybrid education, the present study is unique and illuminates an entirely new gap by comparing instructions in face-to-face and online classrooms.

Korkut (2015) emphasizes that giving instruction is one of the most prevailing domains promoting interaction in the managerial mode in classrooms. Furthermore, she examined the program of YÖK on English Language Teaching and found nothing explicitly specified on giving instructions. Based on that, the latest program was also controlled; any explicit reference to the issue could not be found in any lessons in the program.

1.3. Aim of the Study

The aim of the study is to explore teachers' instruction delivery practices for tasks in EFL classes. Secondary aims can be to discover the reasons behind their choice of techniques, to find out whether there are instructional differences between face-to-face and online lessons and if there are, what factors play role in these differences. In line with this aim, in total 56-hour lessons (28 hours face-to-face and 28 hours online lessons) of a foundation university in Ankara are audiotaped and analyzed through content analysis. Through an interview with seven EFL instructors, interpretation of the data is objectively sustained.

1.4. Research Questions

Align with the aims of the study, this thesis targets to answer the following devised questions;

1. What are EFL instructors' views about instruction giving in EFL classes?
2. How is instruction giving implemented by EFL instructors in EFL classes?
3. How do instruction giving practices by EFL instructors in EFL classes differ in terms of the medium of teaching?
4. What are EFL instructors' views about instruction checking in EFL classes?
5. How is instruction checking implemented by EFL instructors in EFL classes?
6. How do instruction checking practices by EFL instructors in EFL classes differ in terms of the medium of teaching?

1.5. Significance of the Study

As having been highlighted, efficient transmission of instructions of learning activities is a prerequisite for the accomplishment of the activities and achievement of the pedagogical aims of the lessons (Anderson, 2004; Scrivener, 2005; Sowell, 2017; Todd et al., 2008; Ur, 1996; Waring & Hruska, 2012). Regarding this, there have already been a few studies on (in)effective ways of giving instruction and suggestions for teaching practices. However, it is still a skill that has been neglected in teacher training and classroom practices (Sowell, 2017). Badem (2018) also points out that "instructions in the sense of directives have received less attention" (p. 7).

Margaretha (2015) recommends that an interview should be conducted with teachers to understand instruction giving practices, to get teachers' reasons for their actions while giving instructions and to compare their thoughts on ideal instruction giving and their practices in their real teaching practices. The present study is valuable to search for the nature of instructions, to observe their (in)efficacy, to reflect teachers' practices, and to explain their reasons behind them with the help of a data-driven approach. It will lay out different practices for different aspects of lessons and various steps of instructions. This study will be the first to reflect giving instructions practices by incorporating the instructors through asking their thoughts and preferences, and comparing their applications, which will provide deeper understandings about the issue.

Considering many interactional troubles having been observed in online lessons (Berglund, 2009; Moorehouse, 2020; Trinder, 2016), it is worth observing and analyzing instructions in online lessons. This study will first address this aspect in online lessons. Hybrid modal also will enable to compare both mediums of teaching in terms of activity instructions dimension. Thus, it is anticipated that this study will shed light on giving instructions practices' varieties, instructors' preferences, and instructional differences based on face-to-face and online education.

In Turkish context, Badem (2018) inspected instructional troubles emerging with task instruction and teachers' detection of non-understandings. Somuncu and Sert (2019) aimed to find out non-understandings in instruction-giving sequences and how teachers deal with these troubles. In Turkish context, there is almost no study searching for activity instructions practices by categorizing them based on how teachers give instructions in terms of different language areas, medium of teaching, instructions' structure, and context, and meanwhile comparing the findings with what they think about their practices. In this respect, instruction giving process is the gap addressed by the current study as being one of the first attempts. There are also important implications catering for EFL classrooms, foreign language classrooms, all similar educational settings, and Teacher Training Education.

1.6. Limitations

The results of the study are limited to the participants of the subject university and not aimed to generalize to all EFL instructors in Turkey. Instruction giving process, one of the interactional aspects of classrooms, could have been analyzed by Conversation Analysis supplying a more detailed inspection of classroom interactions. However, online lessons in this study were limited to only voice recordings. Hence, content analysis was used to analyze and interpret the data. Further studies may cover more participants and adopt another method to analyze instructions of instructors.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Classroom Discourse and Interaction

Jocuns (2013) explicates classroom discourse as all kinds of spoken interaction that may take place in every educational context. Interaction in classrooms is in the basis of the whole learning and teaching activities. Teachers convey knowledge, check students' understanding, give feedback and students state their problems and ask questions via interaction in classrooms. Since classroom interaction is "inescapable and inescapably crucial" feature of classroom, it would not be possible to talk about any lessons at all because all classroom pedagogy proceeds through interaction (Allwright, 1984, p. 159). Nonetheless, the interactional patterns in language classrooms are distinguishable from the ones used in other classes since language itself is the aim of a lesson and at the same time the vehicle to achieve that aim (Hall & Walsh, 2002; Long, 1983; Walsh, 2006). Also, Willis (1992) points out that language has a "dual role" in language learning classes to underline language used in the class being the main purpose of the lesson meanwhile a channel for achieving the purpose (p. 162). With this interweaving of the goal and the instrument role of language used in language classes, interaction in language classes has been a subject to many studies due to the fact that understanding interaction in classrooms may also mean finding out the ways in which teaching and learning occur. Regarding its complexity and importance for teaching and learning processes, any attempt for developing teaching and learning must start by searching classroom interaction (Allwright, 1984). Consequently, analyses of classroom interaction may help improving learning and teaching practices (Sert, 2015).

With the aim of analyzing classroom interaction in a secondary school, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) developed a model to analyze spoken language in classrooms. They introduced IRF (Initiation- Response – Follow-up) that comprises of spoken interaction taking place between teachers and students. It has also been referred as IRE (initiation-

response-evaluation) by Mehan (1979) and O'connor and Michaels (1996); IRF (initiation-response-feedback) by Wells (1993); triadic dialogue by Lemke (1990). Hence, not to cause any misunderstanding, "feedback" will be used in this study.

This three-phase interaction starts with initiation by teachers, which may perform as informing, directing, or eliciting. In each one, teacher gives a start for opening a dialogue. Then, this phase is followed by response from students. Showing they are doing an activity, a gesture or a question can be counted as a response since each is a kind of reaction to what teacher has just said. Apart from informings, the response part following any directives or elicitation questions is expected from students every time. Last step, feedback, is provided by teacher if needed; to approve or disapprove what student has just said especially after students respond an elicitation since they need to know if they are on the right track or not. Even a gesture made by teacher may be considered as feedback (Coulthard, 1992).

As it seems, it is a typical dialogue that can be found in each class including L2 classrooms (Edwards & Westgate, 1994). However, it has been causing many arguments in literature since it was very first version. On the one hand, IRF is criticized because of its nature making lessons unable to be learner-centered or more communicative, since it is basically run by the teacher. For instance, Lemke (1990) disagrees that using of this "triadic dialogue" encourages student-participation (p. 168). Because of a similar reason, in a more recent study, Kasper (2001), also criticizes IRF as being too teacher centered so she suggested various ways to change this imbalanced interaction between teacher and students in her work. On the other hand, it also has many benefits. Edwards & Westgate (1994) refers to IRF as "the essential teaching exchange" (p. 124). Also, O'connor and Michaels (1996) emphasize that this triadic structure (initiation-response-feedback) enables teacher to control over the flow of the lesson and advancement of the academic content. In addition to the explanation given above, initiation and feedback parts help the teacher direct the lesson to the intended topic of learning. Furthermore, they also put forward that by the response part following the initiation move, teacher can check 'knowledge, awareness and attention' of student. In a similar vein, IRF is advocated as being an efficient way of "monitoring children's knowledge and understanding," "guiding their learning," and "marking knowledge and experience" (Mercer, 1992, as cited in Wells, 1993 p. 2). With this educationally valuable use, IRF becomes one of the ubiquitous features of classrooms. From much more unifying and compromising point of view, Wu (1998) accepts the importance of IRF, "shedding some light on the mechanism of teacher- student verbal exchanges", though

finds it not being enough to indicate whole dynamic process in the class (p. 530). Moreover, IRF pattern is often accused of not being in a real communication, yet Lei (2009) asserts that IRF can be found in a real communication by attributing IRF pattern to a mother-child dialogue. Despite many criticisms directed to every early study of Sinclair & Coulthard's analysis of classroom interaction throughout years, IRF is seen as valuable and the initial point of classroom interaction analysis (Edwards & Westgate, 1994; Hall, 1998; Mercer, 1992; van Lier, 2000).

IRF has been regarded as the first study but there have been some other analyses on classroom interaction. With the aim of gaining more insight into classroom interaction, Walsh (2006) defines four basic features of classroom interaction selected as "typical and representative" (p. 5); control of patterns of communication; elicitation techniques; repair strategies and modifying speech to learners. Firstly, control of interaction is provided by teachers in the class; they control turn-takings among communicators by asking questions and providing feedback. Cazden (1986) asserts that teachers dominate over the whole classroom interaction; they manage turn-takings, and they have all the right to speak anytime, anywhere and to anybody in the classroom, which creates imbalanced interaction between students and teacher. Secondly, in educational setting, teachers are likely to be obliged to modify their speech aiming to achieve the goal of negotiation of meaning and to give the chance of processing input in their own speed to each and every individual in the class; simpler word choice, simplification of sentences or structures like length of sentences, slower pace, and using intonation and facial expressions may be instances of modification (Chaudron, 1988). To do so, teachers need to figure out when or how to simplify their speech. Lynch (1996) notes that teachers make use of confirmation checks, comprehension checks or clarification requests to understand to what extent they should simplify. Another feature of classroom interaction is elicitation defined as 'strategies used by teacher to get response from learners' (Walsh, 2011). Elicitations are done through asking both display questions the answers of which are already known by teachers and referential questions which are more prone to interactional responses of learners (Seedhouse, 1996). On the other hand, Musumeci (1996) deduces that questions asked in the classroom aim not only to elicit new information but also to get students involved in the interaction taking place at the moment of speaking. Hence, elicitations are beneficial ways of reaching both pedagogical goals and communicational goals of lessons. Finally, repair, also known as feedback, is another part of classroom interaction that helps dealing with language breakdowns. Even though there

are some studies doubting this final phase since students may feel being evaluated (Allwright & Bailey, 1991), Seedhouse (1997) also states that students seemed not to have hard feelings about making errors and being corrected in a language learning environment. Another criticism made for this last step was that correcting students more than needed can damage the interactional organization of the class and students (Waring, 2008). All in all, fine-tuning of repair must be considered.

Hitherto as a couple of times highlighted, in L2 classrooms, interaction portrays itself as being the main purpose not just a bridge to reach the pedagogic goals. Pedagogical goals aim at the production of target language and interaction in the class is designed in accordance with the pedagogical focus. Hence, as pedagogical foci vary, interaction (turn-taking, sequencing, and repair) varies accordingly. In line with this, interaction varieties are divided into different *contexts* (Seedhouse,1996) or *modes* (Walsh, 2006, 2014). These terms will be explained in the following section.

2.1.1. Classroom Contexts

Seedhouse (1996) explains the classroom contexts as "the combination of particular pedagogical goals and particular organization of interaction" (p. 123). According to him, it is not possible to indicate all combinations, so by underlining "illustrative" not a "comprehensive" one, he characterizes six different contexts; (i) form and accuracy context broadly in which linguistic forms aimed to be taught and practiced, (ii) "classroom as a speech community" context in other words; meaning and fluency aiming to maximize interaction by prioritizing the meaningful communication rather than forms, (iii) task-oriented context including learners' aim to accomplish the given task and in the process they are engaged in interaction by using the target language, (iv) "real-world target speech community" context in which learners simulate real world context they may need in the real world like asking for direction, (v) "text-based context" which simply intends learners to comprehend L2 texts and acquire L2 text elements, and (vi) "procedural context" comprising mostly teacher talk like informings or instructions so as to achieve the pedagogic purposes and manage the lesson (Seedhouse, 1996, pp. 127-141).

Later, four different classroom micro-contexts called as also "modes" put forward by Walsh (2006, 2014); *managerial, materials, skills and systems, classroom context*. Each mode has its own hallmarks, to use Heritage and Greatbatch's (1991) very apt term; "fingerprints"; pedagogically and linguistically. To gain more insight, managerial mode comprises

pedagogic goals such as transmitting information, organization of the learning environment or introducing and conducting an activity. To do so, interactional features utilized are teacher's long explanations and instructions, following this confirmation checks and transitional markers. As noted in Walsh (2006), learner contributions are hardly found in this mode. Secondly, materials mode includes, as the name suggests, providing language practice with a material, eliciting answers accordingly, checking, clarifying if needed, or evaluation of students' responses. Teachers follow IRF pattern mostly, use yes-no questions, supply corrective feedback and scaffolds, when necessary, which are interactional features defined within this mode. The other mode, skills and systems, enables learners to practice language with the correct forms and to give corrective feedback accordingly by direct repair, scaffolding, teacher echo, clarification requests, from-focused feedback with extended teacher turns. Finally, classroom context mode differently leaves the stage to the learner with longer learner turns, minimal repair, giving feedback upon the content not the form, scaffolding, asking referential questions (wh questions) aiming to allow learners express themselves in the target language, to set up a context and to promote learners' oral skills.

Some of the modes overlaps with Seedhouse's classroom contexts such as managerial mode corresponding with procedural context whilst some differs in various ways. Within the scope of the current study, teacher instructions operating as a tool to cast the flow of the lesson and taking place under the interactional features of managerial mode or procedural context in words of Seedhouse will be studied. Since learner contributions are hardly found in this mode, only teachers' speech is recorded and analyzed in this study.

Although there are different ideas on classroom interaction in the literature, teachers' roles are preponderant in classroom interaction. Many scholars admit that teachers dominate over the whole classroom interaction (Atkins, 2001; Chaudron, 1988; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). By means of dominance, they either take role as an interactor or conduct classroom interaction by deciding if they may talk, whose turn it is or what topic is being talked. Chaudron (1988) concludes that teacher talk corresponds to almost two- thirds of classroom interaction. The dominance of teacher in the classroom throughout spoken time is one of the reasons why classroom language differs from other spoken discourses (Atkins, 2001). Hence, teacher talk is worthy to examine by owning a pivotal role in classroom interaction and pedagogical performance in the classroom contexts.

2.1.2. Teacher Talk

From classroom interaction patterns (IRF observed mostly), highly having been castigated at one time but found imperiously in almost each and every class (Edwards & Westgate, 1994), till classroom micro-contexts, the study portrays that teacher talk has owned a substantial role executing classroom interaction and simultaneously actualizing pedagogical purposes. As Mercer (2002) discusses the necessity of taking teaching and learning are joint processes, teacher talk must be seen as a bridging component of both. With this in mind, the high ratio of teacher talk to general interaction taking place in an ordinary class has been a stubborn fact. According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), almost two thirds of interaction in each of teacher-fronted lessons is represented by teacher talk, which is a fact also supported by Chaudron (1998). However, this high percentage has been criticized by many scholars (see Lemke, 1990; Kasper, 2001) based on teachers' talk being dominant over students' talk. Therefore, this condition hampers students' involvement in learning process. Cullen (1998) believes that it is almost impossible to reduce the amount of teacher talking time because it is traditionally perceived as the one source of transmitting knowledge and values in some parts of the world. In like manner, Walsh (2002) also criticizes the desire to reduce the amount of teacher talking time for focusing on quantity not quality. On the other hand, he finds both reducing quantity and promoting quality "simplistic and unrealistic". As an unfortunate outcome of being in an institutional setting, learners in EFL classes are exposed to very restricted language by the features which the context necessitates. Some of those features listed as follows:

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).

As being consistent with the issue proffered many times before in the Classroom Discourse and Interaction section and in the list above, teacher talk preponderates over classroom interaction and it is significant as teacher talk is the main resource of input in the class, the sum of teacher talk will eventually impact the output (Mangubhai, 2005). However, Tang (2011) underlines that both quantity and quality are substantial for learners. Having accepted

this fact, it would be more credible to focus on improvement of the quality of teachers' talk rather than only focusing on the quantity of teacher talk.

The content or quality of teacher talk directly affects learning opportunity of learners since it is accepted as a noteworthy source of comprehensible input for students (Krashen, 1981). However, Musumeci (1996) reaches out almost no negotiation found in L2, Italian content-based classes where she investigates negotiation between teachers and leaners with three teachers. Most of the classroom talk and initiation of exchanges belonged to the teachers using display questions mostly. They only modified their speech following student's non-understandings. However, student-initiated exchanges are important since they are signs of involvement required for learning actualization (Slimani, 1989, as cited in Musumeci, 1996).

Walsh (2002) states that through their talk, teachers are likely to both construct and obstruct learners' engagement in classroom communication and consequently their learning. He found that teacher may increase learning potentials and promote learner involvement in classroom activities and communication with the help of error correction, content feedback, confirmation checking questions, extended wait-time, and scaffolding. However, the very same study indicated that teachers may also cause quite the opposite, obstruction in words of Walsh, by compensating for the gaps in a student' speech right after student's turn instead of extended wait-time, teacher echo and interruptions done with a good intention to complete breakdowns in student's utterances but unfortunately ending up with causing more breakdowns. Instead, teachers must "resist the temptation to 'fill silence'" and provide more opportunity for students to take the stage (Walsh, 2006, p. 131). In line with that, Nunan (1989) proved that teachers may facilitate both learning and communicative interaction through their choice of questions, modified speech, and error correction techniques. Akyol (2014) also investigated teacher talk differences between native and non-native teachers. The data showed that even though native and non-native teachers followed the same pattern of IRF, native teachers enhanced interaction opportunities by using more referential questions and longer wait-time. İncecay (2010), analyzing transcribed lesson recordings through Conversation Analysis divided, teacher talk into two categories; construction and obstruction, and the results indicated constructive language choice of teacher promoted students' involvement.

With these in mind, what matters is to look for the ways of notching up 'good' or 'communicative' teacher talk. Some of the features of communicative classroom talk can be listed as (i) using referential questions, (ii) providing content feedback, (iii) wait-time,

(iv) student-initiated talk (Thornbury, 1996, p. 283). First, preferring referential questions, which teachers do not know the answer and create a gap for their students, would be more meaningful and real-like. However, display questions, which teachers already know the answer and aim to check understanding, are inherently far from the real communicative purposes. Secondly, providing content feedback which focuses on students' contributions and messages rather than focusing on form will create more opportunity to maintain a genuine communicative talk. Also, extended wait-time will give time for students to formulate their utterances and sometimes make modifications in their own speech or internalize and ask questions if they need. The third and fourth features are indeed interrelated. Teacher must allocate time for students to initiate a conversation and when they do, teachers should respond with a meaningful or may be a referential question to dig in more rather than simply saying 'OK', which is discouraging. In addition to Thornbury (1996), Cullen (1998) puts forward 'speech modifications' to promote communicative teacher talk. It is necessary for teachers to modify their speech or rephrase themselves while explaining something or giving instructions. Also, he insists on avoiding display questions, form-focus feedback, echoing students' responses, which cannot be found in real world, IRF sequences with giving more chance to student-initiated talk (p. 182).

The significance of teacher talk with its quantity and quality has been highlighted. Another important edge in this issue is functions or categories of teacher talk. Flanders (1970) classified teacher talk in his system-based observation. He found 10 categories; 7 of them to define teacher talk, 2 of the rest to define student talk and 1 for the situations like silence or confusion. Teachers (i) accept feelings, (ii) praise or encourage, (iii) accept or use ideas of pupils, (iv) ask questions, (v) lecture, (vi) give directions or instructions, (vii) criticize or use authority. On the other hand, students only (i) respond and (ii) may initiate a conversation. The following six categories which Bowers (1980) suggested, cited in Malamah-Thomas (1987), related to teacher verbal behaviors were obtained from lesson recordings and classroom observation. They are (i) questioning/eliciting, (ii) responding to students' contributions, (iii) presenting/explaining, (iv) organizing/giving instructions, (v) evaluating/correcting, (vi) establishing and maintaining classroom rapport. Celcia-Murcia (1989), with a similar aim to analyze teacher talk functionally, scrutinizes teacher talk in two junctions: indirect and direct teacher talk. Whereas indirect teacher talk includes (i) accepting learners' feelings, (ii) using their feelings or ideas, (iii) increasing learners' motivation, (iv) asking questions; direct teacher talk covers (v) informing, (vi) giving

directions, and (vii) justifying learners' authority. Similarly, Nurpahmi (2017) observed the types of teacher talk and found different categories as (i) greeting student, reviewing the previous material, (ii) introducing the new material, (iii) giving directions and instructions, (iv) encouraging and motivating, and (v) giving advice and losing the class.

As being one of the commonly referred functions of teacher talk, instruction giving has an important effect on language learning. In the following section, the importance of instructions and the ways to deliver them correctly will be discussed in detail.

2.1.2.1. Instruction-Giving

The definition of "instruction" in the literature varies in multiple ways such as instructions in a manual guiding us how to fix something or in a book how to cook something; vocabulary instruction or grammar instruction for teaching vocabulary or grammar; or instructions for getting the hearer to do something. Basically, instructions are directives attempting to get someone to do something (Austin, 1975; Goodwin, 2006; Searle, 1976). Such instructions are inevitably integrated into teachers' talk in educational contexts. As aforementioned in the section of "classroom interaction", instructions are referred in procedural contexts by Seedhouse (1996) and managerial mode by (Walsh, 2006, 2014) and they are utterly seen as directives to manage the lessons. From that angle, instructions seem as if they were only short fillers to provide continuance of the lessons. However, they constitute of most of the teacher explanations; Ramirez (1986) observed that two-thirds of the teacher explanations in the class are related to procedural knowledge. Moreover, instructions being the utterances initiated by teachers and delivered by only teachers as a tool to maintain the lesson are mostly considered non-interactional expressions. Nevertheless, as Somuncu and Sert (2019) underline that instructions are not only mechanic and non-communicative directives such as telling students to open their books, but they also function as "series in which teachers explain the ways to accomplish a task by introducing, informing, guiding and engaging students" (p. 3). In the words of Ur (1996), instructions are "the directions that are given to introduce a learning task which entails some measure of independent student activity" (p. l6). Within the scope of the current study, instructions given before learning tasks will be studied.

As in the definition by Ur (1991), and Somuncu and Sert (2019), task instructions operate as requests for learners to take an action in order to accomplish a learning task, which affects the "learning process" (Slavin, 1995, p. 167) and eventually "learning outcomes" (Ha &

Wanphet, 2016, p. 138). The way of giving instruction really matters as students require to understand what to do prior to a task; otherwise, the activity or even the whole lesson is likely to be a failure (Anderson, 2004; Margaretha, 2015; Scrivener, 2005; Sowell, 2017; Ur, 1996). In like manner, Pesesa (2016) conducting a study with student teachers to explore the source of problems following the instructions puts the emphasis on the quality of instructions in order to affect learning activities directly. The success of these activities and of the pedagogical aims dwells on the effectiveness of previously given instructions (Todd et al., 2008; Waring & Hruska, 2012). Moreover, it is found that when students do not understand what to do, they feel like they lose time by asking for help and as a result, they might feel frustrated and give up trying to understand the instructions (Cooper, 1990; Downs-Lombardi, 1996). Matheson and Shviner (2005) also agree that it is waste of time to handle students' inappropriate behaviors resulted from non-understandings of ineffective instructions, which also steals from teachers' teaching time and students' task completion time. In accordance with these, it can be said that for a learning task to be accomplished properly and to reach its pedagogic aim, the instruction delivered before the task has a pivotal role.

Empirical studies describing instruction giving processes in classroom and suggestions for successful delivery of instructions are two distinct strands comprising literature on instruction-giving, which will be presented, respectively. Liruso and Debat (2002-2003) aimed to explore the problems emerging while giving instructions to young learners. The problems ranging from the highest percentage to the lowest as follows; "speech modification, no demonstration, no organization of pairs or groups, no engagement of attention, no checking understanding, and students' asking for clarification before hearing whole instruction" (p. 145). They emphasized that even though last three problems inspected had the lower percentages, they should not be ignored. Markee (2015a), displaying the complex nature of instruction giving, identified six components that teachers inform about in their instruction giving process: "(i) how they will be working (in dyads or small groups), (ii) what resources they will need, (iii) what tasks they have to accomplish, (iv) how they will accomplish the task, (v) how much time they have to accomplish these tasks, (vi) why they should do something" (pp. 120-121). Margaretha (2015) observes a few problems such as complex and long instructions with inappropriate word choice and not checking the given instructions regarding instruction giving. Drawing on conversation analysis, Lien (2018) searched the interactional patterns in instruction giving processes and found two types;

instructions including students' contributions and monologue type instructions. The former type fosters the students' engagement to the activity and ensures that they comprehend what to do. However, the latter type shows that the teacher's only occupying the stage without getting students' attention and lacking concept-checking questions prevented the students' engagement to the activity.

Glaser (2020) aimed to detect likely effective factors in (in)efficiency of instruction giving. She illustrated both success and failure delivery of them. While grabbing students' attention before delivery, breaking instructions into steps, using effective comprehension questions and preplanning of instructions resulted in successful delivery of instruction, starting a new instruction without resolving the previous non-understanding troubles, and complex instructions caused failed instructions. L1 or students' repetition of the instruction was found an ineffective way of instruction delivery. However, Swain and Lapkin (2000) concluded that the students prefer to use L1 in moving task along. On the other hand, a large number of researchers also agree that L1 use may or must exist in L2 classrooms (Atkinson, 1987; Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2016; Meyer, 2008). A righteous concern verbalized by Sowell (2017) is that students may have troubles in understanding even simple instructions due to overuse of L1.

Regarding the importance of task instructions, there are numerous studies recommending ways of efficient delivery of task instructions for pre-service and in-service teachers (Gardner & Gardner, 2000; Gower et al. 1983; Harmer, 1995; Scrivener, 2005; Ur, 1996). Prior to augmentations for instruction giving, it would be better to provide insight about the instruction delivery process which covers three stages; (i) preparation stage in which teacher considers the additional aids, language to use, or when to hand out the materials, (ii) delivery stage in which instruction is uttered by teachers, and (iii) post-delivery in which the teacher monitors the class and detects non-understandings (Sowell, 2017).

Ur (1996) offers six steps for teachers to give instructions: (i) preparing beforehand, (ii) grabbing students' attention, (iii) presenting more than once, (iv) being brief and clear, (v) presenting through examples, and (vi) getting feedback. First, getting prepared for instructions in advanced; writing them with a clear mind and choosing correct words is worthy to try to provide more understandable instructions. Teachers may also find some useful illustrations and visuals if needed beforehand. Secondly, before giving instructions, full attention of the class should be taken as if they get distracted, it is possible for them to miss some parts of the instruction. Thirdly, presenting instruction more than once is likely

to help students to catch the information they missed in the first time. Moreover, while giving instruction one more time, using different words, separating into steps, or even using different intonation will make a difference. Another advice is that making instructions brief and clear since they are likely to be understood more easily by students. To accomplish brief and clear instructions, teachers must opt for shorter sentences and simple words. The fifth suggestions is *presenting through examples*; it can be done with examples by relating to students' personal lives or various contexts. Inasmuch as students sometimes may have troubles in understanding even the simplest instructions, demonstrating them by doing one example will help them to understand better (Gower et al., 1983; Scrivener, 2005). Demonstrating with whole class or a student will clear the question marks about the task away. Likewise, TPR (Total Physical Response) is advised to use for instructions depending on the age of the students (Gardner & Gardner, 2000). Finally, getting feedback is a way of making sure whether students really understand what they are supposed to do or not. Even though students think that they have understood, they may totally misunderstand. Asking them checking questions, or getting one student to repeat the instruction is likely to overcome misunderstandings.

In like manner, Scrivener (2005) also suggests that five points should be considered by teachers; observing their own instructions to improve themselves, preplanning of instructions if needed, setting the stage before giving instruction such as making eye-contact or using an effective tone of voice, demonstrating if possible and checking the instruction given.

Similarly, Gower et al. (1983) also offer series of advices; getting students' attention, using simple language, being consistent about the word choice for a similar activity, using visuals and written clues, demonstrating, breaking instructions into smaller pieces, being decisive and checking the instructions.

Markee (2015a) states that non-verbal aspects of language like gaze or gestures are also valuable parts of instructions. In terms of content of the instructions to be supplied, Harmer (1995) emphasizes that a task instruction should cover the steps that learners are supposed to do during the task.

Prusak et al. (2005) put the emphasis on length of instructions; they categorized instructions into two groups: short instructions lasting in a minute, and long ones taking time more than one minute. In need of a long instruction, giving the instruction in a couple of stages, waiting for the first stage to be achieved and giving the next step later on would make a big

difference. Therefore, it is important to keep instructions short or to split long instructions into pieces and give one step at a time.

Woodberry and Aldrich (2000) proposed that giving also written instructions on the board is timesaving and throughout the task students will have the opportunity to check instructions if they need.

Checking the given instructions -may be considered as the last step of successfully planned instructions- is one of the highly suggested common steps that should not be ignored. Since one of the main arguments of this study is to find out the experiences of teachers about checking instructions; aiming to provide deeper understanding of the matter, instruction checking will be encapsulated in the following section.

2.1.2.2. Instruction Checking

Even though instruction checking is mainly seen as the last step after every method is tried to convey the requisite information for a task to be completed, it is generally ignored by teachers due to their being too focused on the giving phase or worrying about time management. Nonetheless, teachers may deliver instructions incomplete or too complexed for learners to follow. Scrivener (2005) proposes that "even the clearest instructions can be hard to grasp" by pinpointing the significance of checking instructions (p. 76). Therefore, instruction checking should be a prerequisite for passing on to the activity not to cause any misunderstandings and chaos during the activity. In contrast with the generic view that 'asking questions', instruction checking or getting feedback from the students based on a task is likely to be implemented in various ways. For example, Halliwell (1992) states that observation of students' faces, movements and attitudes would work to check their understanding of instructions. Moreover, asking understanding check questions, asking students for a repetition or a summary upon what they really obtain from the instruction given (Scrivener, 2005) or a small stretch demonstrating what they are expected to do (Ur, 1996) are also more explicit ways to check their understanding of instructions. Asking display questions like "Have you understood?" or "Is everything clear?" is a ubiquitous way to check for understanding; however, it cannot count for an effective one since most of the students respond as "yes" not to be humiliated in front of the whole class (Scrivener, 2005; Ur, 1996). Instead, eliciting steps by asking more open-ended questions like "Who is in group B?" "Who is going to be the customer?" will force them to answer more than a "yes" so as to understand whether they understand or not. Thornbury (2000) states that asking only

display questions, which are totally suitable for other subjects like ‘geography or math classes’, build a barrier between learner and ‘opportunities for real language use’ (p. 28). On the other hand, Brock (1986) studied relationship between referential questions and ESL classroom discourse. The result was that referential questions (wh- questions or open questions) were responded with longer and grammatically more complex replies when compared to display ones. Regarding that, checking the instructions through referential questions will provide more hint about students’ understandings. Repeating the instructions is another way of checking instruction working in two ways; by teacher and by student(s). While teachers’ repeating the exact instruction given previously does not make a huge difference, summary made by a student using simpler language may help the other students. Scrivener (2005) suggests that teachers can ask a student to repeat instructions before they engage in the activity if they are at a certain level. Depending on the task, demonstration is one way of checking instruction (Ur, 1996). Demonstration can be sufficed by both teacher and students. To exemplify, a task including role-play can be demonstrated. Using illustrations also can help them to visualize the activity/task and understand what to be done better.

Badem (2018) investigated students’ understanding troubles emerging with task instruction and teachers’ detection of non-understandings. Throughout the teacher’s observation, students’ silence, wrong responds in elicitation phase, verbal contributions during the activity and lack of participation are the indexes of non-understandings troubles emerging. Along with the aim of the study, some interactional resources to diminish these troubles offered are speech modifications, requesting for clarification and a long list of suggestions to intercept these troubles (see Badem, 2018, pp. 161-163). Somuncu and Sert (2019) administrated a study to reveal the ways of students’ display of their non-understandings of instructions and teachers’ tackling with them. They analyzed 13 EFL classes taught by teacher trainees during their internship in a secondary school. They found that the trainees mostly failed to observe students’ displays of their non-understandings and the trainees repeated their same failed instructions. However, efficient strategies utilized were multimodal demonstrations including whiteboard use or materials prepared beforehand. Throughout the study, they proved that instructions are not monologues driven by only teachers but interactional sequences with students’ interference in case of non-understandings. Gündüz (2020) conducted a study on the impacts of L1 and L2 use while giving listening activities instructions and gathered the students’ views. Students preferred

L1 to be utilized for listening activities instructions. Investigating third position repair turn for resolving the problems emerging in teacher instructions, Badem-Korkmaz and Balaman (2020) stated that the troubles in teacher instructions may be detected in two ways; students' explicit statements of non-understandings and teachers' deduction without students' explicit statements such as absence of expected embodied alignment with the activity or incorrect/irrelevant answers. The teacher's interactional awareness and monitoring the activity enables him/her to resolve the troubles.

Although not being directly the main argument of studies, giving instruction has been referred or found in the findings of many studies searching classroom interaction. To exemplify, Sali (2011) administering a research on L1 use in English teaching classrooms and teachers' perceptions on L1 use found that giving instruction in L1 is the third mostly observed function. In a similar study of L1 use in EFL classes, Taşçı and Aksu-Ataç (2020) observed that teachers are likely to utilize L1 for giving instructions the most. Dinçer (2008) identified all types of teachers' oral instructions in the class and the results displayed that 98% of instructions are task-related while only 2% of them are non-task. Korkut (2015) purposed to track interactional features and pedagogic aims with EFL teachers and observed that the managerial mode paved the way for interactions with the teacher and engagement in communicative tasks. Because of giving instruction being one of the most prevailing domains promoting interaction in managerial mode, she highlighted the significance of it. To the extent that, she lays out the English Language Teaching program of YÖK and found nothing explicitly specified on giving instructions.

To depict a wide picture of the context of the present study, as in every corner of the world, most of the schools in Turkey has been closed and only a few of them has followed a hybrid mode of education because of Covid-19. The university in the current study also has been applying hybrid education since the academic year of 2020-2021. Therefore, in this study, instruction giving practices are observed by means of both face-to-face classes and online classes. One of the aims of this study is to detect whether these instructions vary depending on the medium of teaching; face-to-face and online classes. Aiming that, first distance education, and then hybrid education combining face-to-face and online education will be presented in detail.

2.2. Distance Education

Distance education dates back the 1800s (Moore, 2003). Some of the onus that distance education is expected to fill are listed as; eliminating the inequalities between learners, maintaining information and education for larger groups of learners, providing information for new locations, educating target groups like soldiers rapidly and efficiently, or accessing geographically unreachable areas (Ljosa, 1992). It was implemented by delivering learning materials to the learners who were distantly uncapable of formal learning.

With the emergence of computerized technology, education has had its share as every aspect in our lives and distance education has been reshaped by computer assistance with the intention of doing its duties. This new form of education depending on internet and network technologies has been referred as online education (Volery & Lord, 2000), e-learning (Downes, 2005; Horton, 2011), online learning/teaching (Anderson, 2004), virtual learning (Dillenbourg, Schneider & Synteta, 2002), and digital learning (Lin & Chen, 2017; Peters, 2000).

However, types of courses are named by the percentage of technology use in the courses; no technology use found in traditional courses in which the content is only presented in written or spoken language without any help of technology; up to 29 % technology use found in web facilitated classrooms in which the teacher benefits web-based technology only to facilitate face-to-face course by using basic features like web pages to post homework; between 30 and 79% technology use found in hybrid/blended courses in which instruction is given both in online and face-to-face classes playing the same role; and over 80% technology use found in online lessons in which most or all of the lessons are delivered online without any face-to-face meetings. These rates and explanations are determined by the report on online education in United States by Allen and Seaman (2008). In line with the scope of the current study, online education, hybrid model of education and their pros and cons will be enucleated.

2.2.1. Online Education

Online education is the system in which learning is actualized with the help of technology; through network, online materials, video lessons and etc. Regarding the variety of these materials, online education can be implemented in two ways; synchronous in which the teacher and students have the chance of interacting, asking, and answering questions in real

time through any video conferencing software and asynchronous in which students make use of previously prepared material (videos, ppts etc.) whenever they want and progress at their own pace. In comparison with asynchronous, synchronous one is more preferred. Yamagata-Lynch (2014) remarks that "synchronous online whole class meetings and well-structured small group meetings can help students feel a stronger sense of connection to their peers and instructor and stay engaged with course activities" (p. 189). Interestingly, in Nurieva and Garaeva's study (2020), students showed higher percentage of attendance to synchronous lessons than the one to traditional lessons. Keegan (2013) also emphasized the significance of two-way communication giving students a chance to establish dialogues for both educational and social goals.

Even though online learning has been improved, it is perceived as far from the reality and does not give the same sense of being in the class and interacting with teachers and peers. Moorhouse (2020) searching for adaptations to online education due to Covid-19 pandemic, found that lessons were more teacher-centered, students were prone to keep quiet or use shorter responses in lessons via video conferencing software. Similarly, Berglund (2009) observed students' interaction which includes "long awkward pauses" (p. 200) and "long monological turns" (p. 202). Trinder (2016) concluded that to improve their English fluency, 78% of the participants preferring communicating face-to-face to video or video chat pointed out the main problems of being "less personal" or "less spontaneous". Nurieva and Garaeva (2020) found out teachers' ideas about online lesson; getting prepared for online lessons and checking homework take more time than traditional lessons and students' initiatives or maintaining communication lacks in online lessons.

To eliminate these downsides, success factors defining the efficiency level of online education broadly are technology itself, teacher, and students' characteristics (Dillon & Gunawerdana, 1995; as both cited in Volery & Lord, 2000; Leidner & Jarvenpaa, 1993). Sun and Chen (2016, p. 157) posit that "effective online instruction is dependent upon i) well-designed course content, motivated interaction between the instructor and learners, well-prepared and fully-supported instructors; ii) creation of a sense of online learning community; and iii) rapid advancement of technology". Mason (1991) states three main roles for web-based teachers; organizational (including managerial roles like determining deadlines for assignments or tasks), social (including the ability to interact with students), intellectual (including delivering learning material and educational aims and fostering students' learning). Berge (1995) also adds "technical" role of teachers meaning that teacher

should be technically competent so that learners feel comfortable to use the software and focus on the pedagogical material (p. 24). In addition, dividing interaction in virtual learning into three types; instructor-learner, learner-learner, learner-content interaction, Moore (1989) emphasizes that each and every type is significant for learners' motivation and understanding, so they need to be integrated into online sessions. These suggestions are valid for hybrid education since it is a combination of both.

2.2.2. Hybrid Education

Hybrid mode was first established as a solution to the aforementioned pitfalls emerging in online education (Santoso, 2010). However, Badawi (2009) suggests that "the combination of the virtual and physical environments should consider the strengths and weaknesses of each environment" (p. 11). Hence, hybrid learning is the combination of face-to-face or traditional classroom instruction and online learning (Nagamine, 2011; Pallof & Pratt, 2007). With respect to this definition, hybrid and blended learning are considered as synonyms and can be used interchangeably. Nevertheless, underlining their differences, Barenfanger (2005) defines hybrid learning in a similar way except one extra component; self-directed learning or autonomous learning, which is a distinguishing feature from the blended learning. Thanks to this feature, hybrid education promotes learner autonomy by giving most of the responsibility to the students.

Plenty of scholars highlight the robust and convenient outcomes of hybrid education; increasing students' motivation (Albrecht, 2006), teachers' positive views on hybrid education due to its flexibility (Wilson, 2008), increasing EFL prospective teachers' pedagogical knowledge more in comparison to face-to-face learning (Badawi, 2009), promoting communication and interaction in different modes (Sharma & Fiedler, 2004), and improving various strategies like active learning or learner-centered strategies (Smelser, 2002).

2.2.3. Using a Video Conferencing Software as a Tool

Video conferencing software are highly opted for online lessons since they are equipped with a wide set of virtues; audio, video, breakout rooms, chat box, polls, whiteboard with screen share feature enabling the host and the audiences to use jointly these features at the

same time. In conjunction with these features, it may provide the closest experience to the face-to-face classrooms.

Nurieva and Garaeva (2020) conducted a study with EFL students and teachers and found out that teacher preferred a video conferencing program to another video conferencing software with its unique features and found it is easy to install and use. However, they had some troubles with long-lasting homework checking procedure, getting prepared for lessons, students' being prone to keep quiet and unwillingness to communicate. Subsequently, Nurieva and Garaeva (2020) listed some didactic principles accordingly; (i) students and teachers should be digital literate, (ii) lesson should be scheduled to the same time every week, (iii) students should be introduced to the learning material, (iv) checking students' presence should not be neglected, (v) visual material should be included to get and hold students' attention throughout the lessons, (vi) with the same reason, lessons should be more interactive engaging students to hold them active.

In Xhaferi and Ramadani's research (2020) administering a study to search for EFL teachers' views on online education practices via a video conferencing software during Covid-19, some of teachers shared that learning through computer technology is more exciting than the traditional way and all of them found the software as a practical tool to give lessons online. They still stated that both online and face-to-face lessons have their own benefits; however, never believed that face-to-face lessons can be never fully replaced by online lessons, which leads the researchers to think "if teachers do a combination of both online and face-to-face teaching methodologies, it is the best combination ever done!" (p. 148).

2.3. Conclusion

This chapter has provided in-depth information about the related literature shedding light on the phenomenon investigated in this thesis under two main sections. In the first section Classroom Discourse and Interaction have addressed the major issues; Classroom Contexts, Teacher Talk and Instruction Giving to supply profound insight to provide deeper understanding of the study. In the second section, hybrid education mode has been scrutinized under Distance Education to depict the context of the data collected from. The next chapter will introduce the methodology of the present thesis.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter demonstrates the design and implementation of the methodology of the study. The research design, research context and participants, data collection, data analysis, and operational definitions will be presented in detail.

3.2. Research Design

Researchers have been exploiting the techniques of three main research designs to carry out their studies: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods. Quantitative method is associated with scientific methods or experimental designs. A quantitative researcher observes a problem and builds hypotheses and aims to test them empirically. The data gathered is indicated numerically or statistically. It aims to figure out relationships between variables and eliminate any bias caused by researchers. However, it presents superficial and limited findings about the reasons behind the correlation between the variables (Dörnyei, 2005). On the other hand, in qualitative designs, there are no pre-determined hypotheses or set questions in the beginning. The whole process of data collection and analysis are amenable to newly emerging questions (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The main purpose of this kind of design is to collect richer data and deeper insights to understand the phenomena better (Creswell, 2012). However, in qualitative designs, it is inevitable for a researcher to reflect his/her subjectivity during data interpretation and the data cannot be generalized for other contexts or people. To prevent this, a twofold data collection process was employed; therefore, the findings gathered from these two different data helped the interpretation of the phenomenon. This would not let the judgement made by the researcher, which increases the reliability of the study. Moreover, prior to data collection, a pilot study for interview had

been conducted with an English instructor to suffice the validity; preciseness of the questions was discussed, and some follow-up questions were created with the instructor.

While collecting classroom data, the researcher did not attend the session not to disturb the natural flow of the lessons. Furthermore, the instructors were informed neither the aim nor the focus of the study not to manipulate them or direct their focus during the lessons, which also increases both validity and reliability of the study.

No predetermined categories or codes were used to analyze the data. Hence, to diminish subjectivity in interpreting the data, two experts in the field analyzed the data separately first and their findings were compared. After this process, a professor at a state university was consulted to decide the last versions of categories and codes. This provides inter-rater reliability.

In the present study, only qualitative research design is employed to increase the credibility of the study and to obtain and present more enriched data with an unbiased interpretation. First, the instructions given in the lessons are analyzed and quantified. Then, the emerging interview questions are asked to the instructors to explain the quantified data and get the reasons behind instructors' behaviors and choices.

3.3. Research Context and The Participants

The data was gathered from a preparatory school of a foundation university located in Ankara during the third term of 2020-2021 academic year. Throughout this academic year, it was decided to apply hybrid model education by the school administration due to Covid-19. That is, students in each level attend face-to-face classes for two days (10 hours) and online classes (11 hours) for the rest of the week. One of the video conferencing applications is utilized for online synchronous lessons. Learning is also supported by self-study assignments offered by the online system of the coursebook which provides students to keep track of their progress. Because of the health concerns, attendance to lessons is not an obligation but if they attend, they can get extra points, so many students prefer attending the classes. Exams and quizzes are conducted in face-to-face days.

The students are accepted to the university by taking two-stage central placement examinations; a general proficiency exam assessing students' general knowledge about Turkish, Mathematics, History and Geography, and Science; and a field proficiency test

assessing specific knowledge related to their prospective fields. The students taking general English lessons in this prep school are from different academic departments.

The students are expected to attend an English proficiency exam including listening, reading, language use, and writing before they are placed into different levels. The prep school consists of four different terms in which students' level vary depending on their achievement. There are five distinct levels; D (starter), C (elementary), B (pre-intermediate) and A (intermediate) and one pre-fac (pre-faculty) level which is optional. In the first four levels, the main coursebook used in the lessons is Empower set and the complementary skill book used is Unlock set both designed based on Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). After being placed into their levels in the first term, they need to pass their levels successfully each term until passing A level. Passing A level is the requirement for passing the prep school. Also, the last level, pre-fac, offers a compound of different English lessons aiming to prepare students for the academic English and offers them academic reading and presentation lessons.

The data was obtained in the third semester of the prep school and the study group involves seven English language instructors teaching B level and 180 B level students. The reasons behind instructors' and B level students' selection are based on twofold sampling: convenience and purposive sampling. First, since the most crowded level was B in the third semester and the number of the classes was the highest, the data was collected from B level aiming to get richer data in the number. Then, purposive sampling was carried out; B level instructors, who teach both face-to-face and online lessons to the same class, were selected to make comparison between two different mediums of teaching of the same instructor.

The coursebook taught is Empower B1 including twelve different thematic units each of which is constituted of four subparts covering reading, listening, speaking, and writing with grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and useful language parts. The book has desktop and e-book versions, and students can use e-books on their tablets. This implementation made online teaching for both instructors and students easy to orient to the new hybrid system because they have already got used to e-book version. To continue to the next level, students have to successfully take three quizzes, two midterms with two speaking examinations and prepare a portfolio including their assignments.

The participant instructors' group consists of six female and one male instructors whose experiences range from 2 years to 15 years. Only two of them graduated from ELT program and two of them had a master's degree on ELT. The others took pedagogical formation which

is a compact program taken to obtain teacher competencies by the ones who do not graduate from the Faculty of Education of universities. However, regardless of their department, no one stated that he/she took a lesson on how to give instruction specifically at university. They emphasized that vocational courses or workshops they attended touched upon the issue. Hence, they were knowledgeable about instruction delivery. They were willing to participate in this study and showed a great responsiveness during the interviews.

Since the current study aims to observe instructors' instructions, students are passive participants and none of their speech is analyzed. However, both the instructor's and the students' written consent were taken before the data collection process.

3.4. Data Collection

As aforementioned, the data was obtained from a preparatory school of a foundation university located in Ankara during the third term of 2020-2021 academic year. Aligning with the aim of the study, seven EFL instructors' lessons; four hours for face-to-face lessons and four hours for online lessons for each instructor were recorded. Audio recording was enough in line with the aim and the analysis of the present study and less salient which is important for keeping the flow of the lesson. Seedhouse (2004) states that 5 to 10 hours data from a class is enough to make generalization on a phenomenon. Hence, eight hours for each instructor is suitable for having an idea on that instructor's certain attitude towards a certain phenomenon which is giving task instructions in the present study. In total, 56 hours of lesson were transcribed and analyzed.

The recordings of the online lessons were easily done thanks to the functionality of the video conferencing software, "record only as an audio" option, while the face-to-face lessons were recorded by smartphones of the instructors. The researcher herself did not record the lessons not to disturb the flow of the lesson and to get the most natural process. Also, instructors were not informed about the aim of the study not to cause any manipulations in their teaching. The recorded data was transcribed before being analyzed.

After the recordings were gathered, the instructors were interviewed by using a semi-structured interview form in order to supply more objectivity to interpret the classroom data. The interviews are also recorded and transcribed to be analyzed. The interview questions were unique and designed to explain instructors' behaviors while giving instructions and their reasons for the ways they gave instruction, which leads more enriched data.

3.5. Data Analysis

The sum of the raw data gathered from the audio recordings was 56 lesson-hours. Content analysis was used to analyze the data coming from both the lesson recordings and the interviews. Content analysis is a research way that examines written or oral communication (Insch, Moore & Murphy, 1997). It is rather advantageous to utilize content analysis to gain deeper details from the context recorded.

Content analysis systematically examines the transcribed data by coding and creating themes respectively regarding occurrence of key words of concepts. Berelson (1971) as cited in Insch et al. (1997) proposes the purposes of a content analysis:

"(a) to audit communication content against objectives; (b) to identify intentions and other characteristics of the communicators; (c) to reveal the focus of individual, group, institutional, or societal attention; (d) to describe trends in communication content; (e) to construct and apply communication standards; (f) to examine attitudes, interests and values of population groups; (g) to code responses to open-ended questions in surveys". The purposes stated here indicates that content analysis corresponds the aim of the study.

The data was first transcribed; however, since full transcription of only one hour recording may take 5-7 hours, a partial transcription was preferred. Dörnyei (2007) offers that the data may not require full transcription regarding "research methodology is often a balancing act between goals and resources" (p. 249). In line with that, regarding the aim of the present study, all the audio recordings were listened delicately and only instructions given before learning tasks were included and transcribed.

Coding frame can be done in three ways: "in a concept-driven way, i.e. based on what you already know; in a data-driven way, i.e. by letting the categories emerge from your material; by combining the two strategies" (Schreier, 2012, p. 84). The present study adopted the third way by starting with a concept-driven approach based on the related literature, then continuing in a data-driven way as new codes arise. Therefore, prior to the analysis of the data, pre-coding was done. In the light of the literature, a basic coding scheme had already been attained and was used for analyzing sample lessons. By making use of memos and note-taking techniques, the codes and categories reshaped and then, reviewed by two experts to increase validity and reliability of the study. Nonetheless, the categories and codes prepared in detailed were amenable to be reshaped as the data was being analyzed; new categories and codes were added.

In the current study, English language instructors' instruction giving and checking processes were examined. The techniques were categorized out of 56 hours of lesson with the help of two experts in the field. Then, the instructors are given the floor to express their ideas and reasons behind their behaviors throughout a semi-structured interview. During the interviews, the instructors were asked what factors are effective in their instruction giving and checking processes. Accordingly, the data gathered from the lessons was analyzed one more time to observe the reflection of the instructors' views on their lessons. Generated codes and categories were constituted from concurrently analyzed data. Moreover, quantified results of the lessons are supported by direct quotations of the instructors to illustrate the reasons (Schreier, 2012).

3.6. Operational Definitions

In this study, as the result of the transcription of 56 hours of lessons; 298 in total, 126 of which are face-to-face and 172 of which are online instructions are analyzed and categorized according to different themes; activity types, medium of teaching, content, and structure. In this part, operational definitions of codes and categories will be given.

3.6.1. Activity Types

Another classification was made based on activity types. Accordingly, 28 and 30 distinct activities are observed in face-to-face and online lessons, respectively. However, since the tabulation of so many types would be hard to present in this thesis and there would not be any meaningful difference among each and every kind of activities, categorization of activities was done according to the demands or requirements of the tasks or activities: 3 basic activity types were treated throughout the lessons: mechanical, meaningful and communicative activities.

Mechanical activities do not entail so much effort for learners to accomplish; they need to perform a limited sort of linguistic operations but not to truly understand the meaning. These activities are restricted and generally designed to have only one correct response. Fill-in-the blanks activities for grammar practices, choose the correct answer or repetition of pronunciations of some words are the instances of mechanical exercises.

The second kind of activities was *meaningful activities* which are less restricted and permit learners to use various sort of language structures. Students are free to choose their own

answers among possible correct options. “Describing a photo by using a certain structure like adjectives or prepositions of place”, “rewriting sentences by using conjunctions” in a meaningful way or “filling some sentences based on a reading text by using correct alternatives of words are eminent samples of meaningful activities.

The last but not the least activity type was *communicative activities.* These activities give the control to the learners to use different variants of language pieces to have real information exchange in a real communicative context, which is freer hence not predictable. Students are the ones to choose what to say, when to contribute or how to express. The most important determinant factor is having a real informational gap to be asked or replied by students. Some examples of communicative activities can be “discussing on a common issue”, “making guesses upon a picture”, or “sharing their own experiences about a topic” (Kameen, 1978).

3.6.2. Medium of Teaching

As aforementioned, the subject university has decided to have a hybrid education mode because of the pandemic. Thereby, the lessons transcribed in the current study are both from face-to-face and online lessons. The medium of teaching corresponds to the way of teaching: face-to-face or online.

3.6.3. Structure of Instructions

The structure of instructions can be a determinant in the way of delivery or post-delivery of instructions. Since complex and long instructions can be problematic (Margaretha, 2015), instructors should avoid using them and simplify their language in accordance with their students’ level. Therefore, to understand the instructors’ preferences truly, it is necessary to categorize instructions based on their complexity and length. The given instructions in the present study are also categorized as level appropriacy, language complexity, and length.

Since complex instructions have not been addressed by any certain definition in the literature, the unclear instructions or the instructions covering several steps are subjectively decided to be named as “complex instructions” by two researchers. Moreover, during the interviews, these unclear instructions or the instructions covering several steps were also presented to the instructors and their opinions were asked about the complexity of these instructions.

The categorization of Prusak et al. (2005) in terms of length of instructions is implemented in this study; short instructions last in a minute, and long ones take time more than one minute.

3.6.4. Instruction Giving Techniques (IGTs)

As aforementioned in Chapter 2, there are lots of techniques suggested to deliver clearer instruction. However, the instructors mainly preferred 6 different techniques to give instructions: paraphrasing the instruction in the coursebook, using the exact same instruction in the course book, reading the instruction individually or aloud by student, only exercise name or page number, L1 instruction, demonstration. Most of the instructions given with these techniques were promoted by a second instruction using other techniques like repetition, further explanation, giving examples, L1 translation and dividing into steps.

3.6.5. Instruction Checking Techniques (ICTs)

After the delivery stage, three main behaviors were observed: asking elicitation questions, getting examples from students, and not checking the given instruction at all. To check the instructions, the instructors chose to ask display questions and referential questions, L1 display questions and getting a summary of the instruction from the students or they preferred not to check the instructions.

3.7. Conclusion

This chapter explains the design and implementation of the methodology used in the current study. The research design, research context and participants, data collection, data analysis, and operational definitions are respectively introduced. The methodology pursued for analyzing the data is reasonably explained in detail. The results of the gathered data will be presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the data gathered from the interviews and the lessons will be presented in twofold phases; the findings of interviews and the findings of classroom observations.

Even though the lesson recordings had been collected before the interviews aiming not to manipulate the instructors' behaviors in the lessons, interview findings will be presented in the first place. The audio recordings were analyzed dwelling on both the literature and the interviews.

4.2. Interviews

This section will lay out the instructors' views on their instruction giving and checking practices. The instructors to be referred will be abbreviated (Instructor1= Int1; Instructor2= Int2; Instructor3=Int3; Instructor4=Int4; Instructor5=Int5; Instructor6=Int6; and Instructor7=Int7).

4.2.1. Instructors' views on Instruction Giving Practices

During the interviews, the instructors' views on their instruction giving practices were gathered and they can be defined under 4 different categories regarding both suggested steps in the literature and the salient varieties in their instruction giving process:

- Pre-planning of instructions
- Securing students' attention
- Instruction giving techniques
- Factors affecting instruction giving

Pre-planning of instructions and securing students' attention are emphasized in the literature to deliver instructions more successfully. Moreover, it was observed that the ways of giving instructions were varied from one instructor to another. Hence, the category of "instruction giving techniques" emerged during the content analysis. The factors determining the choice of techniques were examined. Based on the interviews, it was found that there were several factors influencing the way of instruction giving.

4.2.1.1. Instructors' Views on Pre-Planning of Instructions

Pre-planning of the instructions is very vital especially for activities demanding various steps to accomplish (Scrivener, 2005). Hence, the instructors were asked if they plan their instructions beforehand and the frequency of their preparation. Two of the instructors replied as "No" putting forward "work-load" as a reason: "I do not have time for this (Int2)". However, the others expressed that it was not possible to get prepared for instructions all the time. If they feel that they should get prepared for the instructions, they stated the following statements; "for complicated activities (Int5)", "for new activities (Int4)", "if I feel like my students will not understand that instruction, I prepare, sometimes even rewrite (Int6)". Only one of them stated that she prepares all the instructions beforehand especially when she prepares a lesson using a digital tool for online lessons.

4.2.1.2. Instructors' Views on Securing Their Students' Attention

Before giving instructions, one of the most important suggestions in the literature is securing students' attention. Aligning with that, the instructors were asked if they do something specific to grab their students' attention or not. Most of the instructors stated that they do not use any specific strategies to grab students' attention. They start their instructions using some transitions such as "Okay, now", "Now, we are going to…", or "Well, okay". Only one instructor stated that she endeavors to be sure that the students were with her on the same page.

4.2.1.3. Instructors' Views on IGTs

There have been a number of studies suggesting useful techniques from which instructors can benefit in instruction delivery process (Gardner & Gardner, 2000; Gower et al. 1983; Harmer, 1995; Markee, 2015a; Pesesa, 2016; Prusak et al., 2005; Scrivener, 2005; Sowell,

2017; Ur, 1996; Woodberry & Aldrich, 2000). However, there have been no studies categorizing teachers' using techniques, searching for why they prefer some specific techniques or why they hesitate to apply the others. Hence, first, the recorded lessons were analyzed and the techniques the instructors implemented were categorized and six different techniques were coded:

- Reading the book instruction
- Paraphrasing the book instruction
- Making one student read aloud
- Reading instructions individually
- L1 translation of the instruction
- Demonstration

In addition to these techniques, they also present one instruction more than once using different techniques. The frequency of emergence of these techniques were quite different. There were some techniques often used by some and never chosen by the other instructors. Aiming to identify these differences and scrutinize their strengths and weaknesses, the instructors were introduced to the techniques and asked which one(s) and why they prefer those certain techniques.

Most of the instructors stated that *reading the original coursebook instruction* is the most common technique they utilize. The instructors agreed that reading the book instructions is a good technique to make lessons more followable by serving as a pointer of the activity: "To point out which part we are doing, I am reading the book instruction (Int2)", "I use the book instruction because I want to make sure that students are on the same page (Int3). Moreover, this technique was used in online lessons because students may get lost because of technical problems, showing them the original book instruction, not revising or changing it can help students keep following the lesson: "Because of the connection problems, I read the instructions most of the time in online lesson; this makes the lesson easier to follow for students (Int3)". Only one instructor opposed this technique: "Reading is the least useful. Whenever I read it, they seem like they do not understand. I sound so bookish; they are not interested. They do not pay attention (Int7)".

The second technique was *paraphrasing* as a secondary facilitator. The instructors were positive towards this technique and claimed that when the book instructions are not clear

enough for their students or with the lower-level students, they attempt to paraphrase the instructions in order to make them more understandable: “I paraphrase the book instructions with lower levels, most of the time I read the book instruction. Then if they do not understand, I paraphrase (Int6)”, and “if the book instruction is good enough or understandable enough, I do not need to paraphrase (Int4)”. Some thought paraphrasing is a weakness because it increases teacher talking time, students may get bored and a time-waste: “I paraphrase. However, this can be weakness; I make it longer students may not need it (Int3)”.

Making one student read aloud was applied by only two instructors. There were two opposite views about this technique. The reasons for using this technique were that this technique enables students to be part of classroom and encourages them to be active participants, allows instructors to observe their students’ pronunciation and fluency improvement and constructs more friendly atmosphere for students:

> First of all, it gives me a chance to know the student better, to check whether the student pronounces the words correctly or if the student is fluent, or to see the students’ reading ability. It gives them an opportunity to be part of the lesson and it reduces the teacher talking time. It creates more friendly atmosphere because they hear their friends’ voices (Int5),
> If it is an instruction that is part of the book then I prefer to have one student read it aloud. This is because when a student does this, reads the instruction to the whole class, they all follow their classmate. I have observed that they listen all ears to what is being said by their peers. Also, it makes them actively participate as a whole class (Int7).

On the contrary, the rest of the instructors was reluctant to apply this technique to deliver instructions. They believe that this technique may not be suitable for their students; the students may not feel emotionally comfortable with reading the instructions aloud in front of their classmates: “Definitely, I do not use the last one they do not like to read the instructions aloud. They are too shy or embarrassed when they make mistakes especially in higher levels (Int4)”, “I do not have any students to read the instructions aloud (Int1)”. Moreover, one instructor urged that this technique is not suitable for adult learners; however, it can be used with younger ages: “Making one student read aloud may be suitable for primary school students but we have university students they do not feel okay with it I guess (Int6)”.

A similar technique was *individual reading of students.* Most of the instructors used and held a more positive attitude towards this technique since they think that it promotes students’ autonomy by making them read the instructions and try to comprehend on their own. Hence, they will be able to understand instructions in exams without any help: “Students read the instructions individually is also useful because they need to understand the instruction on

their own in the exams I will not be there. That's to get them more autonomous (Int5)". It is also regarded as being one of the most time-saving techniques; every student reads by themselves: "Students read the instructions individually can be very helpful it will save time if students read the instructions (Int3)". In other respects, some of them have concerns about this technique due to lack of autonomy of the learners; the instructors supposed that their students would not read instructions even if the instructors give them a chance:

> Sometimes I let students read the instructions individually. However, I cannot feel okay when students read the instruction individually. I do not feel comfortable. There are so many students that I cannot trust. Even I explain they could not follow so I cannot let them read the instructions individually (Int1),

Also, one of them stated that when students read the instructions individually, they may get distracted more easily.

L1 translation use is frequently avoided or considered the last way to give an instruction by most of the instructors since understanding instructions in the target language is a part of learning a new language. They emphasized that they try to use everything before giving the instructions in L1 and added that using L1 frequently is likely to result in reinforcement of not using L2 or not trying to understand the target language; they would not bother themselves trying to understand any instructions in L2: "L1 use does not help them to understand, and they will not bother themselves to understand the target language next time (Int5)". However, they apply L1 translation under some specific conditions; when they are doing complex activities, if instructions are hard to understand, if they do not have enough time to explain again, and if they feel tired. The instructors expressed the following explanations: "If they do not understand at all, if it is the last hour of the day, or if it is a complicated activity like communicative activities, I may use L1 but L1 use is the last option that I use (Int2)", "Sometimes I use L1, if the instruction is too complex (Int4)", "I try not to do this, rarely translate the instruction if it is really difficult or really confusing and time is important for us so I may use it because of the timing problems (Int6)". Only one instructor stated that L1 use is one of the most common technique that she uses: "I use the first 3 most: reading the book instruction, L1 translation of the instruction, paraphrasing the book instruction. … I use it because it is time-saving (Int1)".

One final technique was *demonstration.* It was applied as a subsidiary and expositive technique to make the meaning clearer for students. The instructors iterated that they also use modelling, gestures, mimics, pointing, and exemplifying under the demonstration technique. It was one of the most preferred techniques in case of non-understandings of

students or complex activities: “If the exercise is complex, I try to demonstrate (Int2)”, “I make use of demonstration or modelling depending on the activity (Int3)”, “I demonstrate if nothing is working (Int7)”.

Repetition of instructions was observed throughout analysis of lesson recordings; some of the instructions were repeated more than three times using different techniques. Upon this, the instructors were asked if and in what cases they need to repeat their instructions. All the instructors accepted that they repeat themselves by virtue of some reasons: “…The level of students, the level of the classes, the willingness of the students have an effect on that (Int1)”.

They mainly use repetition for correcting their mistakes in their speech and simplifying their speech to provide clearer and more understandable instructions: “…to be more understandable (Int2)”, “if I feel like my voice was not clear enough or I made mistakes (Int3)”, “if it is too complex (Int4)”, “Because our students are not so willing to learn most of the time, we develop a kind of behavior; we want to be sure that they understand (Int6)”, “ I monitor them if they are not ready to start and I give it one more time (Int7)”. Also, it can be deduced that they use repetition instead of checking instructions; they attempt to guarantee their students’ comprehending the instructions in this way.

Only one instructor stated that her mental fatigue affects her repetitive instructions: “If I am too tired, I tend to speak more and explain again and again even though they understand and start doing the activity (Int5)”.

They sometimes read instructions to get the gist of an activity for themselves in cases that they do not get prepared for lessons beforehand; then repeat the instruction for their students by explaining, exemplifying, demonstrating or sometimes repeating exactly the same instruction: “If I start the lessons without much preparation, I read the instruction aloud for myself and then I paraphrase for them (Int1)”.

Furthermore, in online lessons, they emphasized that they desire to make sure that their voice was conducted because of the frequency of connection problems. The instructors had the awareness that if they repeat themselves over and over again, they may bore the students and cause confusion, which is mostly resulted from their mental fatigue.

4.2.1.4. Instructors' Views on Instruction Giving Based on the Medium of Teaching

One question was asked about what the differences are between face-to-face lessons and online lessons: most of the instructors supported that there is no big difference between face-to-face and online lessons. They stated: "Honestly, there is no difference between these two mediums of teaching because the students have the books. Therefore, they can see the instructions, or I can share the instructions (Int6)", "In the beginning, in online classes, I would read and paraphrase but then, I have realized that I can do the same thing as in the face-to-face lessons. I make one student read the instructions aloud (Int7)". However, they expressed some of the limitations of online lessons in terms of techniques. One of the instructors claimed that: "We can use demonstration in face-to-face lessons mostly. In online lessons, we do not have much time, so we use the book instruction or paraphrase that (Int4)"; moreover,

> In my face-to-face lessons, I may give time to my students to read the instruction individually for some activities and use demonstration. …In online classes, I prepare the instruction beforehand with digital tools, I read the instruction to point where we are doing (Int3).

One of them stated her and her students' feelings about online lessons and how they affect her instructions:

> In face-to-face, I am more comfortable with the demonstration technique, so I can use the board and my body language more freely. In online lessons, I think the screen is a barrier between us. I sometimes touch the screen to show something to them, but of course they do not see it. I cannot use the demonstration technique. I am getting used to it. Sometimes because of the poor internet or poor technological devices, the students may easily miss the instruction or the paraphrased form of the instruction during the class. The students may get over stressed and sometimes cannot realize that the online class is a real environment. At the end of the day, they feel exhausted, so sometimes I use L1 translations of the instructions because I do not want to bore them more (Int5).

With all these in mind, some categories emerged throughout the analysis of the interviews about their instruction giving practices. Based on what they stated, the factors affecting the process can be listed as follows:

- Activity-based factors
- Medium of teaching factors
- Instruction-based factors
- Student-based factors
- Time management factors

- Instructor-based factors

These factors will be explicated in detail after the analysis of instruction checking interviews under the part entitled *Determining Factors in IG and IC*.

Table 1

Results of the Interviews

Themes	Categories	Sub-categories	Codes
Instruction Giving	Pre-planning of instructions	I preplan my instructions beforehand.	complicated activities, new activities, while using digital tools
		I do not preplan my instructions	workload, students' familiarity with the book or activities, instructors' familiarity with the book or activities
	Securing students' attention		using transition words, making eye-contact
	Instruction giving techniques	Reading the book instruction	pointer of activities, easier to follow
			not interesting for students
		Paraphrasing the book instruction	simplification for unclear book instructions, with lower-level students,
			Increasing teacher talking time, time-wasting, boring
		Making one student read aloud	encouraging students to be active participants, constructing more active participants, allowing instructors to observe their students' oral skills
			not suitable for adult learners, causing uncomfortable feelings for shy students
		Individual reading of students	promoting students' autonomy, timesaving
			distractive, students' lack of autonomy
		L1 translation of instruction	time-saving, easy
			reinforcement of not using L2 or not trying to understand the target language
		Demonstration	clarifying meaning, visualization of activity
		Repetitive instructions using multiple techniques	simplification, level of students, willingness of students, technical problems, mental fatigue, unpreparedness for instructions
	Factors affecting IG	Activity-based	complexity, novelty or familiarity, importance
		Medium of teaching	face-to-face: physical tiredness, eye contact
			Online: technical problems, virtual environment, distractive, crowded, limited embodied alignment
		Instruction-based	level appropriateness, structure of instruction (length, complexity)
		Student-based	motivation, lower-level students, higher-level students
		Time management	pacing of the syllabus
		Instructor-based	workload, physical tiredness, mental fatigue

4.2.2. Instructors' Views on Instruction Checking

Based on the interview findings, main categories are as follows:

- Instruction Checking Frequency
- Instruction Checking Techniques

4.2.2.1. Instructors' Views on Their Instruction Checking Frequency

The instructors were asked how often they checked their instructions. Most of them stated that they attempt to check their students' understandings most of the time. However, they underlined that there are some factors determining whether to check or not and how to check the instruction.

The instructors are asked if and on what grounds they prefer to check their students' understandings of instructions. Most of them stated that they intend to check students' understandings most of the time. However, their choice of when to check depends on some variables like activity types. The instructors explained the factor as: "I try to ask depending on the activity requirements. In simple activities, I skip checking instructions (Int2)", "If the exercise does not need clarification, I do not check. (Int5)", and

> If the exercise is something done all the time for example mechanical exercises, I am not doing that. They know what they are doing already. … During writing lessons, I control like a freak whenever I give instructions, I walk around and explain everything like a mother (Int1),
> For example, for listening activities, I try to ask these questions because it is difficult to follow. But for grammar activities, I do not check the instructions. … Also, for the students who do not follow the lessons I ask some questions to motivate them (Int6).

One stated that the structure of the instruction is also important: "I check when I feel that instruction is a complex one (Int7)".

Another effective factor mentioned by one of the instructors was classroom climate or students: "Not every time. I do not check verbally not to disturb the others but individually by monitoring, we may help the shy students being afraid of asking questions (Int4)".

One instructor put the emphasis on the timing problem: "The pacing of the syllabus is important; if I have to rush or if the activity takes too much time I do not check (Int5)".

She also put forward that the exam content is also a dominant factor in her instruction check and stated that: "If students are not responsible for some of the topics in the exam, I do not try hard to check whether they understand the instruction or not (Int5)".

On the other hand, only two of them were reluctant to check instructions and they uttered: "Controlling all the time is not something that I personally prefer (Int4)" and "Generally, my students ask when they do not understand. I forget to check because I feel like they understand (Int7)".

The instructors were also asked what kind of techniques they utilize to check students' understandings. The common replies to that question were monitoring, checking their mimics and gestures, instruction checking questions, asking one student to repeat the instruction.

4.2.2.2. Instructors' Views on Instruction Checking Techniques

It has been stated that instruction checking is one of the most substantial facets of instruction delivery (Scrivener, 2005). Therefore, it was asked to the instructors if they opt for checking their instructions. Depending on their replies, some follow-up questions were asked to the instructors such as when and why they opt some certain techniques for checking to understand their views better. All the instructors were quite willing to check their instructions; however, they are not able to manage this based upon distinct reasons. Besides, there were some techniques observed throughout the analysis of the audio recordings of the lessons; hence, the reasons for preferable techniques were asked to the instructors.

To begin with, based on the recorded lessons, most of the instructions were not checked; however, when the instructors checked their instructions, they implemented two main techniques with some sub-techniques:

- Asking elicitation questions
    - Asking display questions
    - Asking referential questions
    - Asking L1 display questions
- Getting cues from students
    - Getting summary from students

Before asking specific questions, a small explanation for these techniques with classroom practices was presented to the instructors during the interview. They were also asked to opine about instruction checking techniques and the instructors' preferences with reasons.

Most of the instructors held a positive attitude towards display questions and uttered that they use display questions to check instruction most frequently. The common reasons they gave for using this type of questions were that they are "less time-consuming (Int1)", "simple and easy to answer (Int2)", "less stressful to answer for students (Int3)", and "helpful to check that we are on the same page (Int5).

On the other hand, there were some instructors stated that they have to use display questions thanks to their practicality in terms of many aspects; however, they also underlined their low credibility. The instructors were aware that most of the replies to display questions are "yes" for many reasons like students" shyness or low motivation. Some of them stated that they use display questions even though they are aware of their limitations by declaring: "I know that display questions have short answers like simply "yes" even though students do not understand. I am aware of that. However, it is less time-consuming, and I feel comfortable that I ask something about the instruction (Int1)", "...because students say only "yes" or "no" to answer display questions, but they do not mean that they understand the instructions (Int3)", and "Generally, we use "do you understand?". I know that is wrong; of course, their answer will be "yes" (Int4)". One instructor admitted that it is a relief to ask something about the instruction even though she knows ineffectiveness of display questions.

Asking referential questions and *getting a summary from one student* were considered in the same category by most of the instructors and were also found very beneficial to check the instructions. The instructors declared the following statements: "Getting a summary from a student is helpful to engage students in the lessons and is always more motivating for students who follow the lesson (Int1)", "Referential questions and getting summary are the most beneficial and to the point technique (Int3), "I try to ask referential questions and get a summary from a student to get more information (Int4)", and "Asking wh- questions and getting a summary are more reliable (Int6)". By referring to the difference between these two distinct techniques, only one instructor stated that "Referential questions are harder to comprehend for students, I prefer getting a summary from them by asking "what are we going to do?" (Int2)".

L1 display questions were not thought to be a beneficial way of checking instructions for most of the instructors and most of the instructors clearly stated that they do not prefer to use L1 questions and do not find them useful. One of them uttered the following statement: "Maybe only for lower-level students". However, one instructor advocated L1 questions

since they are easy, timesaving, more understandable for lower-level students and if the focus is not communication, L1 questions may be useful:

> L1 questions are life-savers, helpful. I know they are not beneficial in term of communicative language teaching. But especially when I am doing mechanical exercises, I do not want to spend time on their communicative language skills. The point of the lesson is to practice one specific grammar point, so I do not prefer to use English questions, so I ask L1 questions (Int1).

One of the remarkable details was that the instructors highlighted the significance of monitoring; they mostly revealed that they can detect understanding troubles through observing students' embodied alignments from their gestures or facial expressions. Thanks to monitoring, the instructors think that they may not need to use these techniques listed above and they opined their ideas about it. The instructors also expressed that monitoring in online lessons is impossible since they are unable to see the students most of whom generally turn their cameras off and when the screen sharing started, it is only possible to see three or four students on the screen. Considering the distractive environment of homeschooling and technical problems, the instructors emphasized that misunderstanding or missing instructions are more common during online lessons, which leads them to check students' understandings more verbally using the listed techniques above. Hence, they thought they are able to check their students' understandings by monitoring and if they sense that the students had some troubles, they interfere with other checking questions or repeat the instructions in face-to-face classrooms; however, they must utilize verbal understanding checking techniques.

4.2.2.3. Instructors' Views on Instruction Checking Based on Medium of Teaching

The instructors' experiences about their instruction checking practices based on the medium of teaching were asked. They remarked that there are some differences in terms of checking instructions between in face-to-face and online lessons. One of the differences between these two mediums of education was the "monitoring" technique which is used to check the instructions. The instructors asserted: "In face-to-face classrooms, I check most of the time by monitoring, but in online lessons I do not need to check because the instructions are written on the screen; if I check them constantly, they may get offended (Int3)",

> In online lessons, you cannot see all of your students, so I cannot monitor them. It is more common for me to ask checking questions in online lessons because in online lessons, we have more students; I cannot see all of them it is harder to reach all students (Int6).

Pointing out the same problem, some of them added the alternative ways of checking instead of monitoring:

> I do not check verbally not to disturb the others but individually by monitoring, we may help the shy students being afraid of asking questions. But in the online lessons we cannot do that. So, we are just asking if they understand, or see when they are doing the task (Int4),
> I walk around and see what they are doing. Sometimes I get their understanding by observing their facial expressions. Hence, I approach them and sometimes explain the instructions in L1. In online classes, I cannot see students, so I do not monitor them. Instead, I do first two or three exercises together (Int5).

On the other hand, regarding the current situation, one instructor stated that monitoring is not possible in face-to-face lessons, too: "In online lessons it is not possible to monitor them, in face-to-face lessons, I do not prefer to get close to them because of the pandemic. Monitoring is a bit hard, so I am asking checking questions (Int2)".

Another difference between these two mediums of teaching models was the frequency of checking. Most of the instructors emphasized that rather than the way of checking, the frequency of checking increases during online lessons: "The frequency of checking increases in face-to-face lessons (Int1 & Int 3) and "In online, we check more because we are not sure about it (Int4)", "In online lessons, I ask more questions, I try to motivate them (Int6)".

On the contrary, one teacher complained about the timing problem in online sessions:

> The types of the questions do not change but I check the instructions less or takes less time. Maybe I should do it more. The timing is a problem for me. We are losing so much time on getting ready for the class like turning on their cameras (Int5).

Only one instructor referred to the differences in terms of instruction checking question types: "In online lessons, I ask more yes-no (display) questions, because it is easier to get replies and students tend to give shorter answers. But in face-to-face lessons, I ask more complex questions (Int7)".

All in all, some categories emerged throughout the analysis of the interviews when the instructors were asked if they check their instructions and if so, why or why not they prefer some certain techniques. The factors affecting the preferences of the instructors were the same as given for instruction giving:

- Activity-based factors
- Instruction-based factors
- Medium of teaching factors
- Student-based factors

- Timing factors
- Instructor-based factors

Table 2

Results of Interviews on Instruction Checking Practices

Themes	Categories	Sub-categories	Codes
Instruction Checking	IC Frequency	IC Frequency	most of the time, not every time, more often in online lessons, based on activities, sometimes to motivate students, for more complicated instructions
	IC Techniques	Asking display questions	strengths: less time-consuming, easy to answer, less stressful to answer for students, practical, providing a relief for instructors
			weaknesses: unreliable
		Asking referential questions	strengths: getting more information about given instruction, reliable, to the point, more motivating for students, beneficial
			weaknesses: harder to understand for students, time-consuming
		Asking L1 display questions	strengths: lower-level students, easy, timesaving, more understandable, mechanical activities
			weaknesses: unreliable
		Getting summary from students	strengths: getting more information about given instruction, reliable, to the point, more motivating for students
			weaknesses: time-consuming
		No checking verbally	observing students' body language, facial expression, activity familiarity, not to bore/control students, pacing of the syllabus, presenting one example, monitoring
	Determining Factors	Activity-based	complexity, novelty or familiarity, importance
		Medium of teaching	face-to-face: monitoring
			online: technical problems, crowded, limited observable embodied alignment forcing verbal checking
		Instruction-based	structure of instruction
		Student-based	asking check questions to motivate students
		Time management	omission of checking due to pacing of the syllabus
		Instructor-based	omission of checking due to workload, physical tiredness, mental fatigue

4.2.3. Determining Factors in IG and IC

Since all the instructions are different and the instructors' styles of giving and checking instruction vary, the key factors affecting their instructions were asked to the instructors. The responses are possible to be categorized as (i) activity-based, (ii) medium of teaching, (iii) instruction-based, (iv) student-based, (v) timing of the syllabus, and (vi) instructor-based.

4.2.3.1. Activity-Based Factors

Activity-based factors taken into consideration while giving and checking instruction are activity complexity, novelty, and importance. Communicative activities were generally evaluated and described by the instructors as complex activities including multiple steps. Hence, the instructors prefer to give these instructions by explaining, dividing into steps, and modelling with an example in communicative activities. On the other hand, mechanical activities like fill in the blanks do not require too much clarification; reading the original instruction in the book can be understandable alone.

Novelty of the activities is also one of the determinants in instruction giving process; if an activity is done for the first time or not familiar to the students, they tend to give slower and clearer instructions by using modelling technique and check the instruction before starting the activity. In the current study, the students were studying a coursebook from the same set they had studied in the first two terms. Therefore, they were familiar with the coursebook itself as well as the activities in it.

The instructors stated that the importance of the activity, in other words, the degree of the possibility of being assessed on that very specific subject in the exam influences the instructors' way of giving instruction. They emphasized that they focus on the instructions more on these kinds of activities. For instance, the tasks of writing skills constitute of 25% of the students' whole achievement grade, so instructors attempt to encourage them to understand written instructions with the aim of advancing students' instruction literacy. One of them said "I will not be around them during the exam, so they need to learn and get used to reading them".

4.2.3.2. Medium of Teaching Factors

The medium of teaching has a great impact on instruction giving and checking. In online lessons, the instructors are not able to use some techniques like demonstration and modelling

and do not have a chance to reach out each and every student in an effort to control their comprehension. Some of them believed that it is impossible, not practical and timesaving to check their understandings during online sessions. The others stated that instruction checking in online classes takes more time and is applied more frequently than in face-to-face classrooms because of the possible technical problems.

Moreover, being at home builds a more distractive environment for students, which may result in problems in the instruction delivery process. Only one instructor is content with the sitting in front of the screen as she felt more focused on the lesson, whereas the others claimed that online sessions are virtual environments and the screen between them and their students is a real barrier for their interaction.

4.2.3.3. Instruction-Based Factors

Instruction-based factors are form or content of instructions that students are not familiar with or above their level, long or complex instructions. Therefore, these instructions with strange forms, unknown vocabulary and including long sentences with confusing explanations entail more teachers' clarification, paraphrasing, simplifying, monitoring and increase in teacher talking time.

4.2.3.4. Student-Based Factors

As student-based factors, motivation and level of the students affect the instruction giving process. Students who do not follow the lesson or can be easily distracted can make the process more challenging. The instructors claimed to try to encourage them to participate in the activity or listen to the instruction by addressing the checking questions to them.

The instructors said especially with lower levels, they use more gestures, mimics, intonation, very short sentences, mostly imperatives and L1 translation if needed. On the other hand, with higher level students, they expect the students to get the instructions, so they feel the need of checking less.

4.2.3.5. Time Management Factors

Pacing of the syllabus has inevitably been one of the most important components in running of lessons. Consequently, as the instructors suggested, they may eliminate some parts of the lessons. Because of the time issue, the instruction checking is one of the omittable element

of the lessons depending on the pacing of the syllabus: “The pacing of the syllabus is important; if I have to rush or if the activity takes too much time I do not check the instructions (Int5)”. Also, timing may affect their way of checking: “I use display questions. They are less time-consuming (Int1)”.

4.2.3.6. Instructor-Based Factors

The instructors stated that their mental fatigue or physical tiredness may affect their preferences in instruction giving process. They may forget to check instructions or give more complicated instructions due to their tiredness. Owing to their workload, they do not own enough time to get prepared for instructions beforehand or record themselves and observe their instruction giving or checking styles.

4.3. Classroom Observations

After the lessons were recorded, they were transcribed and analyzed using content analysis. The ways that the instructors use to give and check instructions were categorized and the emerging codes will be presented under two main themes: Instruction Giving Practices and Instruction Checking Practices. The first presented data here provides only surface information about the process. This data was used for preparing the interview questions to get deep insights about the issue. The rest of the classroom data was analyzed in light of the interviews’ results.

It is observed that instruction delivery lasts in two main phases; instruction giving also known as while-delivery (Sowell, 2017) in which instructors grab their students’ attention to instructions and deliver the instructions through explanations or examples in case of need, and instruction checking also known as post-delivery (Sowell, 2017) in which instructors check learners’ understandings throughout various styles or prefer not to check and start the activity immediately after the instruction. Throughout the classroom findings, qualitative data is converted into percentages to present the frequency of the occurrences of the related data to provide deeper and more meaningful understanding.

4.3.1. Instruction Giving Practices

Table 3

Total Number of Instructions

Face-to-face	Online	Total
126	172	298

A total of 298 instructions were identified, 126 of which were face-to-face and 172 of which were online. All these instructions were analyzed based on the techniques the instructors used. On the grounds of the interviews with the instructors and the related literature, the lesson recordings were analyzed, and the emerging categories can be listed as follows:

- Grabbing attention
- Instruction Giving Techniques (IGTs)
- Determining factors
    - IGTs and activity types
    - IGTs and medium of teaching
    - IGTs and structure of instructions

4.3.1.1. Grabbing Attention

The instructors must prepare their students for the activity, drag their attention to the activity with the aid of a short warm-up activity, shushing, or keeping silence, or a hand-move (Sowell, 2017). According to the data, in only 4,42% of the given instructions, the instructors attempted to grab their attention with a small speaking activity, telling an anecdote, showing pictures or a question like “What do you think you are going to read?”. Apart from these, the instructors aimed to grab their students’ attention to the activity using some transition words harbingering that the activity comes such as “Okay, now, let’s…”.

4.3.1.2. Instruction Giving Techniques

Six different techniques to deliver activity instructions have been observed by adopting a data-driven approach: paraphrasing, using the original book instruction, choosing a student to read aloud, reading instruction individually, L1 translation, demonstration. The

instructions were analyzed and the frequencies of the instruction giving techniques in the classrooms were calculated.

Table 4

Instruction Giving Techniques' Rates

Paraphrasing the coursebook instruction	Using the original coursebook instruction	Making one student read aloud	Individual reading of students	L1 translation	Demonstration
64,26%	26,23%	5,90%	1,64%	1,64%	0,33%

Even though the instructors stated that they use the original coursebook instruction the most, the most used technique observed was paraphrasing the coursebook instruction (64,26%). Following that, the instructors preferred to use the original coursebook instruction (26,23%). The third technique was making one student read the instruction aloud (5,9%) and used by only two instructors. The rate of individual reading of students and L1 translation of the instructions was the same (1,64%), which is surprising since they clearly claimed that they opt for the former technique a lot and avoid the latter. Demonstration was the least observed technique (0,33%). It was used once by one instructor to model a role-play activity.

4.3.1.2.1. Repetitive Instructions

It was observed in the lessons that the instructors gave the instructors more than once using different ways (51,42%). For instance, after reading the instructions, they gave them using examples, explanations and sometimes repeated the same instruction.

Table 5

Instructions' Repetition Rates

activity types			structure of instructions				medium of teaching	
			complexity		length			
mechanical	meaningful	communicative	complex	simple	long	short	face-to-face	online
35,00%	40,00%	56,67%	73,33%	38,89 %	94,74 %	36,68 %	42,06%	45,35%

The instructors repeated their instructions more than a couple of times stating examples, modeling, paraphrasing, iterating exactly the same instructions. Nevertheless, they also follow a pattern in which they prefer to repeat or not. One instructor defined this pattern as a reflex that they give for more complex activities. Accordingly, the repeated instructions were analyzed regarding activity types, structure of instructions (complexity and length) and

mediums of teaching. The most repeated instructions were as follows; for communicative activities (56,67%), complex instructions (73,33%), long instructions (94,74%), and online instructions (45,35%) for each category. As the instructors stated before, the requirements of communicative activities can be intricate, so they may feel the need of repeating more. Complex instructions and long instructions are hard to express since they are concentric; the instructors may need to repeat the instructions because they are too complex or long; otherwise, they may make the instructions more complex or longer by over-repetition. The last group was mediums of teaching; there was a small difference between repetitive face-to-face and repetitive online instructions. Online instructions (45,35%) were repeated a little more than face-to-face instructions (42,06%) because the instructors can witness students' understandings by monitoring in face-to-face lessons. However, since the discrepancy between them is too low, this is likely to be attributable to time management problems that the instructors put the emphasis on during the interviews.

In the interviews, most of the instructors stated that they use repetition to be more understandable. When they feel like their voice did not reach out everybody, or they made a grammar mistake or made a wrong vocabulary choice, they repeat their instructions. The rates given for communicative activities, complex, and long instructions also indicate that the instructors aim to give clearer and more comprehensible instructions to their students by repeating the instructions; they want to be sure that their students get the instructions in that way instead of asking instruction checking questions.

4.3.1.3. Determining Factors

Even though there were six different factors affecting IG and IC in the beginning, the classroom data only enables to compare and observe the effects of three of them. They were the most salient and frequently repeated factors by all the instructors. Also, these factors are amenable to be observed based on the audio-recordings. Hence, the data was also analyzed one more time regarding activity types, mediums of teaching and, structure of instructions in relation to both IG and IC practices.

4.3.1.3.1. Activity Types

Table 6

Instruction Rates for Activity Types

Activity Types		
Mechanical	Meaningful	Communicative
39,34%	31,15%	29,51%

Since the activity type is a determinant factor affecting the process of instruction delivery, the instructions given for different activity types are analyzed and calculated. The most encountered activity type was mechanical activities with the percentage of 39,34%. In pursuit of mechanical activities, meaningful activity rate was 31,15%. With a slight difference, the least practiced activity type was 29,51%.

Table 7

IGT Rates for Activity Types

	Paraphrasing	Using the book instruction	Choosing a student to read aloud	Students' reading instructions individually	L1 translation of the instruction	Demonstration
Mechanical	63,93%	30,33%	2,46%	0,82%	2,46%	0,00%
Meaningful	70,33%	19,78%	6,59%	3,30%	0,00%	0,00%
Communicative	58,70%	26,09%	9,78%	3,26%	1,09%	1,09%

All the instructors stated that activity types have a great impact on the way they give instructions. Hence, it is aimed to see the discrepancies among the techniques based on activity types. Although the frequency of the techniques varies among the activity types, in all kinds of activities, paraphrasing the instruction in the book technique has the highest percentage. The highest percentage of this technique belongs to the meaningful activities. The most salient difference was that the instructors paraphrased the instructions in the book partly less for communicative activities (58,70%) in comparison to the other activity types.

Subsequently, the second most used technique was using the book instruction in all kinds of activities. This technique was used for mechanical activities the most. The instructors also highlighted the importance of novelty of the activities; if the students do the activity for the first time, they attempt to enrich or diversify their giving techniques; otherwise, they give the instructions in a basic way. In the coursebooks and the material pack used for vocabulary and grammar practice, the mechanical activities have no variety, so the students are likely to be getting familiar with these activities since the beginning of the year, which explains the

highest rate for mechanical activities (30,33%). The third highest technique was making one student to read the instruction aloud. This was used for communicative activities (9,78%) the most. Students' individual reading was the fourth technique that has been used for meaningful (3,30%) and communicative activities (3,26%). L1 translation was only used for mechanical activities (2,46%) and communicative activities (1,09%). The demonstration technique had the lowest percentage (1,09%) and this technique was only used once by one instructor for a communicative activity.

4.3.1.3.2. Medium of Teaching

Most of the instructors expressed that medium of teaching is likely to affect their instruction giving practices due to some restrictions emerging in online lessons. Hence, it has an importance to examine their actual uses based on different mediums.

Table 8

IGT Rates for Mediums of Teaching

Medium of teaching	Paraphrasing	Using the book instruction	Making one student read aloud	Individual reading of students	L1 translation of the instruction	Demonstration
Face-to-Face	59,38%	31,25%	4,69%	0,78%	3,13%	0,78%
Online	67,80%	22,60%	6,78%	2,26%	0,56%	0,00%

Regardless of the medium of teaching, the first three most used techniques were the same: the book instruction (face-to-face: 59,38% & online: 67,80%), using the original coursebook instruction (face-to-face: 31,25% & online: 22,60%), and choosing one student to read aloud (face-to-face: 4,69% & online: 6,78%), respectively. However, there was a slight difference between face-to-face and online lessons. The paraphrasing technique was used more during online sessions (67,80%), which was not in concert with what the instructors said during their interviews; in online lessons especially, they try to abide by the original book instructions so that the students can follow the lesson back on the same track in case of technical problems like a short disconnection and students' low motivation. On the other hand, using the book instruction technique was used more in face-to-face lessons (31,25%); the instructors trust on the book instructions more, even though some of them stated that it is the same because they also share their screen with the students.

Another explicit distinction tracked was that the instructors were apt to including students' contributions in instruction giving processes more often (9,04%) during online lessons, which is an indication of the attempts to keep students active and focused participants on the grounds that the students are thought to be distracted in home-schooling environment more.

Although the fourth technique was L1 instruction (3,13%) in face-to-face lessons, it was students' reading individually (2,26%) in online lessons. L1 use was rarer in online lessons (0,56 %). Some instructors agreed that they tend to use L1 more when they feel tired, and in face-to-face lessons, they are likely to be psychically more tired. Hence, they may use L1 more frequently. The demonstration technique was once used in a face-to-face lesson to act out a role-play activity (0,78%). As underlined by the instructors, the demonstration technique is hardly practical in online lessons.

Apart from instruction giving techniques, one notice-worthy difference was that the instructors tended to re-arrange pair or group work activities in online lessons. They preferred to alter these activities into individual activities in online lessons. When the allocated time for students' getting ready for the activity ends, the instructors pick the students one by one and give them a chance to speak, which promotes teacher-student interaction and restricts student-student interaction.

4.3.1.3.3. Structure of the Instructions

Table 9

Structure of the Instructions

Structure			
Complexity		Length	
Simple	Complex	Short	Long
84,80%	15,20%	87,21%	12,79%

One of the commonly given effective elements was the structure of the instructions referred by the instructors as "simple and complex" and "short and long". Hence, the instructions were also categorized depending upon their structures and coded based upon their complexity (simple and complex) and length (short and long). As seen in the table, most of the given instructions were simple (84,89%) and short (87,33%); on the other hand, only 15,11% of all instructions were complex and 12,66% of them were long. However, there were such complex instructions that they are likely to becloud students' understandings of

activity requirements. For instance, there were some instructions including a couple of steps together which the students did not need to know to accomplish the first upcoming activity:

"There is a listening and speaking part. We are going to do this part first then we will do reading part. First of all, let's talk about… Let's discuss some questions here. Are you interested in sports, first of all?"

As seen in the example, almost all of the complex and long instructions were not stemmed from the activities or the instructions in the coursebook. Through interviews, the instructors explained these instructions derived from their mental tiredness or unpreparedness before the lessons. Most of the instructions were short; took less than one minute (87,21%). There were only a few long instructions (face-to-face; 11,72% & online; 13,61). In fact, long instructions were not long in the beginning; however, the original book instructions were extended by the instructors with some explanations, over paraphrasing and repetitions, which makes the instructions hard to process.

Table 10

IGT Rates Based on Structures of the Instructions

Structure of the instructions		Paraphrasing	Using the book instruction	Making one student read aloud	Individual reading of students	L1 translation of the instruction	Demonstration
Complexity	Simple	62,65%	27,71%	5,62%	2,81%	1,20%	0,00%
	Complex	65,22%	21,74%	8,70%	0,00%	2,17%	2,17%
Length	Short	62,35%	27,84%	7,84%	0,78%	1,18%	0,00%
	Long	65,85%	19,51%	0,00%	9,76%	2,44%	2,44%

The instructions have similarities regardless of their complexity and length in terms of techniques. On one hand, simple and short instructions; on the other hand, complex and long instructions were mainly similar in terms of techniques utilized. Irrespective of the structure of the instructions, they used the paraphrasing technique the most (average; 64,01%). The second most used technique was using the original book instruction (average; 24,20%). For simple (5,62%), complex (8,70%) and short (7,84%) instructions, making one student read aloud was the third most used technique; however, they preferred to apply students' reading individually for long instructions (9,76%). There were no meaningful differences among these techniques. L1 use was used for complex (2,17%) and long instructions (2,44%) more than for simple (1,20%) and short (1,18%) instructions. Demonstration was used once for only one complex and long instruction.

4.3.2. Instruction Checking Practices

Instruction checking practices during the lessons were examined, analyzed and collected under a few categories dwelling upon the literature and the interviews with the instructors:

- Instruction Checking Rate
- Instruction Checking Techniques
- Determining Factors
    - ICTs and Activity Types
    - ICTs and Mediums of Teaching
    - ICTs and Structure of the Instructions

Student- based factors, time management factors, and instructor-based factors were also among the factors affecting the process declared by the instructors during the interviews. Inasmuch as the present study is limited to the audio recordings of the lessons, it was not possible to collect any data related to these factors mentioned.

4.3.2.1. Instruction Checking Rate

Table 11

Instructions Checking Rates

Check	No check
26,85%	73,15%

As aforementioned in the Interview Findings part, the instructors expressed that they intend to check most of the instruction based on some variables. However, overall estimation of the table indicates that most of the activity instructions were not checked at all (73,15). Even though the instructors phrased that they have an intention to check their students' comprehension, 26,85% of all instructions were checked verbally, which can be resulted from the instructors' using monitoring as a tool of checking instructions.

4.3.2.2. Instruction Checking Techniques

Table 12

ICT Rates

Instruction Checking Techniques					
Asking Elicitation Questions			Getting examples from students	Multiple Check	No Checking Rate
Asking display questions	Asking referential questions	L1 display	Summarizing		
18,12%	1,34%	0,34%	3,69%	3,36%	73,15%

Regarding the techniques the instructors thought they utilized, all instruction checking attempts were calculated. A similar divergence also emerged between the techniques the instructors used during their classes and the techniques they thought they used. Although the instructors were aware of the weaknesses of display questions, by far the most observed technique to check the instructions was asking display questions (18,12%), which can be associated with the reasons the instructors put forward such as pacing of the syllabus, students' level, or the instructors' mental tiredness. The second most applied technique was summarizing (3,69%). Referential questions (1,34%) and L1 display (0,34%) were rarely used. Getting summary from students and asking referential questions had been chosen as the most appropriate and reliable way of checking instruction. However, the lessons recordings unveiled the opposite. Moreover, the instructors sometimes prefer to check the instructions using multiple checking combinations like display-referential or display-summarizing together (3,36%). There is not any data related to the monitoring technique due to the audio-recordings of the lessons. Furthermore, since this study compares the data between mediums of teaching, even video recordings of the lessons would not give any data for the online lessons eventually.

However, these rates are also partly in incongruity with the findings of the interviews since most of them admitted the insufficiency of display questions by asserting that they ask referential questions or get a summary from their students.

4.3.2.3. Determining Factors

As aforementioned, based on the obtained recordings, the data was also analyzed once more regarding activity types, mediums of teaching and, structure of instructions in relation to IC practices.

4.3.2.3.1. Activity Types

Table 13

ICT Rates for Activity Types

	Asking display questions	Asking referential questions	Summarizing	L1 display	Multiple Check	No check
Mechanical	15,52%	0,86%	1,72%	0,00%	2,59%	79,31%
Meaningful	18,68%	1,10%	2,20%	0,00%	4,40%	73,63%
Communicative	24,14%	2,30%	6,90%	1,15%	3,45%	62,07%

Since the instructors stated that their checking rate and also checking technique preferences vary based on activity types, the instruction checking rate regarding activity types was also calculated. Regardless of the activity types, most of the instructions provided for each activity types were not checked. However, depending on the activities done, checking rates and styles varied. The checking rate of the instructions in different types of activities was ranging from the most checked to the least as follows: communicative activity instructions (39,93%), meaningful activities instructions (26,37%), and mechanical activity instruction (20,69%), respectively. Thereby, it can be interpreted that communicative activity instructions were checked more than the other two activity types and mechanical activities were not thought to be checked most of the time, which aligns with the results of the interviews.

Furthermore, the checking techniques were diversified based on activity types. The most used technique in each activity type was asking display questions. Display questions were used to check communicative activities the most (24,14%), meaningful activities the second most (18,68%), and mechanical activities the least (15,52%). Asking referential questions technique was rarely used regardless of the activity types, so there were no significant differences among activity types. Getting a summary from a student was used in communicative activities the most (6,90%). For other two activity types, it was not preferred to be utilized. A few of the activities were only checked more than once; their rates were; meaningful (4,40%), communicative (3,45%) and mechanical activities (2,59%). L1 question was only used once for communicative activity type (1,15%).

In contrary to the stance the instructors advocated that they checked communicative activity instructions more during the interviews, their instruction checking rate was still low in spite of its having slightly higher percentage among the others.

4.3.2.3.2. Mediums of Teaching

Table 14

ICT Rates for Mediums of Teaching

Medium of teaching	Instruction Checking Rate					
	Asking Elicitation Questions			Getting examples from students	Multiple Check	No Checking Rate
	Asking display questions	Asking referential questions	L1 display	Summarizing		
Face-to-face	16,67%	1,59%	0,00%	3,97%	3,97%	73,81%
Online	19,19%	1,16%	0,58%	3,49%	2,91%	72,67%

Irrespective of the mediums of teaching, the rate of checking instruction in both face-to-face and online lessons was low (26,19% & 27,33%). Most of the given instructions were not checked in both mediums (73,81% & 72,67%). The activities were generally started right after their instructions were given. There were not any meaningful differences based on medium of teaching.

One other discrepancy emerged between instructors' views and the classroom practices; the instructors explicitly stated that checking the given instructions in online lessons are limited to verbal instruction checking techniques since monitoring the students or witnessing their body language is possible. Nonetheless, it was observed that the checking instruction rate in online lessons is slightly lower than the one in face-to-face lessons. Also, whereas the instructors preferred to utilize display questions more (19,19%) in online lessons, they used referential questions (1,59%), getting summary from students techniques (3,97%) and multiple check (3,97%) more in face-to-face classrooms.

As the instructors highlighted a couple of times, due the fact that they have timing problems regarding the pacing of the syllabus, they may eliminate the checking phase in online lessons and to check the instructions, they mostly use display questions because they are easier and quicker to get answers. Moreover, the instructors cannot monitor students' behaviors, so they may not feel the need of checking a couple of times.

4.3.2.3.3. Structure of Instructions

Table 15

ICT Rates Based on Structures of the Instructions

Structure of the instructions		Asking display questions	Asking referential questions	Summarizing	L1 display	Multiple Check	No check
Complexity	Simple	14,90%	1,18%	2,75%	0,00%	1,57%	79,61%
	Complex	37,78%	2,22%	11,11%	2,22%	11,11%	35,56%
Length	Short	15,83%	0,77%	1,93%	0,39%	1,16%	79,92%
	Long	34,21%	5,26%	13,16%	0,00%	21,05%	26,32%

Regarding complexity and length of instructions, simple and short instructions, and complex and long instructions have shown a similarity in terms of instruction checking techniques. Simple (79,61%) and short instructions (79,92%) were not opted to be checked. Moreover, the techniques used to check these kinds of instructions were also similar. The most used technique was asking display questions (simple; 14,90% & short; 15,83%). The use of the other techniques for these instructions was low.

On the other hand, most of the complex (64,44%) and long instructions (73,68%) were checked, which is compatible with the instructors' views. However, they were also checked using predominantly display questions (complex; 37,78% & long; 34,21%). The second most applied technique was getting summary from students (complex; 11,11% & long; 13,16%). Some of them were checked more than once using at least two different techniques (complex; 11,11% & long; 21,05%). For complex instructions, L1 question use was slightly higher in comparison to the others.

4.4. Conclusion

This section lays out the findings of the study under two separate facets: Interview Findings and Classroom Observation Findings. These findings are given in detail in this part. They will be discussed in the following chapter in reference to the research questions and the related literature.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

In this section, the research questions will be argued comparing the data gathered from the interviews and classrooms encapsulating hybrid education effects in relation to related literature. Three research questions (Research Question 1= RQ1; Research Question 2= RQ2; Research Question 3= RQ3) regarding the instruction giving process and the other three questions (Research Question 4= RQ4; Research Question 5= RQ5; Research Question 6= RQ6) regarding instruction checking process will be discussed in detail.

5.2. RQ1, RQ2, and RQ3: Instructors' Views on Their Instruction Giving Practices and Instruction Giving Practices in Class in Hybrid Education

As Margeretha (2015) suggested, teachers' views should be gathered to enlighten the reasons behind their attitudes. Hence, with the aim of reflecting the instructors' ideas and way of thinking upon their instruction giving, their views were gathered to explain certain preferences of them and compared with their actual practices in classrooms. They will be explicated under 4 categories in detail: pre-planning of instructions, securing students' attention, instruction giving techniques, determining factors.

Pre-planning of instructions have been suggested to be prepared for possible problems (Scrivener, 2005; Somuncu & Sert; 2019; Ur, 1996). Instructors can prepare visual aids, simplify instructions, or divide them into steps during pre-planning. In Somuncu & Sert' study, pre-materials prepared before are suggested as an efficient strategy to be utilized. Hence, the instructors were asked if they plan activity instructions beforehand. Most of the instructors explicitly stated that they do not have enough time for planning of instructions

because of their workload; however, they agreed on that pre-planning is a useful way of increasing the efficiency of instructions.

Before giving the instructions, securing students' attention making eye-contact, using some transitions and warming-up through some simple questions are likely to lift effectiveness of the instructions (Glaser, 2020; Gower et al., 1983; Scrivener, 2005; Ur, 1996). Upon this, the instructors were asked if they draw their students' attention to the upcoming activity. The instructors also stated that they do not do anything special to engage their students' attention; however, they use some transition words harbingering the upcoming activity like "Okay, now…", "So", or "Alright". Throughout the lessons, it was observed that the instructors only tried to drag students' attention to the activity instructions by using some brainstorming questions escalating curiosity or showing pictures for 4,42 % of the instructions. However, as having stated, they used signal words like "Okay, now…", instead. Even though it is likely to drag students' attention to instructions even by keeping silence (Sowell, 2017), Glaser (2020) approached these kinds of speech openings like "so, now…" as transitions but not attention-grabbing words, which she supports with classroom noise level and students' embodied alignments. The present study cannot guarantee whether these signal words ensured students' attention or not due to the limited source of audio-recordings from online lessons since all the students muted themselves while their instructor was speaking. Though the utility of these attempts for securing attention is hard to prove, there have been a lot of studies not considering them as attention grabbing expressions. This "no engagement of students' attention" is concurrent with the findings of many studies (Glaser, 2020; Lei, 2009; Lien, 2018; Liruso & Debat, 2002-2003), even though it was proven that grabbing students' attention before instruction delivery is one of the most effective factors resulting in successful delivery of instructions (Glaser, 2020; Gower et al. 1983; Scrivener, 2005; Ur, 1996).

There have been a number of studies suggesting useful techniques which should be benefited from in instruction delivery (Gardner & Gardner, 2000; Gower et al. 1983; Harmer, 1995; Markee, 2015a; Pesesa, 2016; Prusak et al., 2005; Scrivener, 2005; Sowell, 2017; Ur, 1996; Woodberry & Aldrich, 2000). However, there have been no studies categorizing teachers' using techniques, searching for why they prefer some specific techniques or why they hesitate to apply the others. Therefore, the techniques used in the classroom were categorized first; emerging techniques from the lessons were *reading the book instruction, paraphrasing the book instruction, making one student read aloud, reading instructions individually, L1*

translation of the instruction, and *demonstration*. In addition to these techniques, the instructors also present one instruction more than once using different techniques. Then, the instructors were asked a few questions about the reasons why they opt for the techniques they utilized and why they do not use the others. As aforementioned, the instructors' views on IGTs were diversified due to their own reasons. Moreover, it has been observed there were discrepancies between their reflections and their actual practices. Some new techniques emerged from the data in the present study, but there are no specific findings about the techniques that can be compared in the recent literature.

Even though the instructors stated that they apply the coursebook instructions the most, the results of the classroom data revealed that they utilize the paraphrasing technique the most. They clearly expressed that low quality of coursebook instructions, lower-level students, low motivation of students can lead them to paraphrase instructions. Considering the stated reasons of the instructors, it is obvious in this study that they may not need to paraphrase the instructions because of the students' level (B1). Therefore, they claim that they trust on the book instructions. Hence, the reason they paraphrase the instructions is likely to be students' motivation, which aligns with the higher rate of paraphrasing technique during online classes about which the instructors iterated that the students show less interest to the lessons.

There were two distinct techniques integrating students into instruction process; making one student read aloud and students' reading instructions individually. While most of the instructors highly reject the former one, they stated that they favored the latter. Nonetheless, the classroom data indicated that only two instructors attempted to make use of these techniques. The instructors pointed out that one of their aims is to allow and encourage their students to be active participants. The classroom data also supported that there was a slight difference of using these techniques between face-to-face (5,47%) and online lessons (9,04%) during which students are mostly reluctant and show less participation.

These two techniques were quite different from traditional way of giving instruction. First of all, managerial mode of Walsh (2006) and procedural context of Seedhouse (1996) including instructions and informings were comprised by predominantly teacher talk. The techniques here decrease the amount of teacher talk which is one of the main reasons to utilize these techniques asserted by the instructors. Moreover, it was proven by Somuncu & Sert (2019) that instruction giving is not a monologue driven by only teachers, but it includes interactional sequences with student's interference in case of non-understandings of instructions. The present study also proves that instruction giving does not have to be a

monologue given by the instructors from another perspective. Even though there were such incidents that the students interfered to ask further explanations when they had understanding troubles, these incidences are not presented here because they are not the main focus of the present study. However, instruction giving was initiated by the students by letting one student read the instruction aloud. On the other hand, instruction giving was moved out of an interactional sequence by individual reading of them. These two-instruction giving techniques break the traditional way of giving instruction. Lien (2018) categorizing instruction giving processes into two groups instructions including students' contributions and monologue type instructions found that the former type fosters the students' engagement to the activity and ensures that they comprehend what to do whilst the latter type caused the opposite. In the current study, the instructors left the stage to the students rather than getting the students' contributions to their instruction giving process. Hence, it is still amenable to argue whether these techniques foster students' engagement into activities, which was also advocated by the instructors using them.

Another argument pointed out by the instructors was that individual reading of instructions promotes learner autonomy; nonetheless, there are no direct data upon this connection found in literature. Lastly, one reason shown for using making one student read aloud technique was that it enables the instructor to observe their students' pronunciation and fluency; hence, this can bring a new perspective to instruction giving being an informal formative assessment tool.

L1 translation is one technique generally avoided or considered as the last way to give an instruction, which is convergent with the classroom data (1,64%). The instructors emphasized that they try to use everything before giving the instructions in L1 and added that using L1 frequently is likely to result in reinforcement of not using L2 or not trying to understand the instructions in the target language. The students would not bother themselves trying to understand any instructions in L2. As Anderson (2004) suggests, using English while giving instructions is a good chance to provide students natural English. In contrary, L1 use for giving instruction is a common finding in literature (Sali, 2011; Taşçı & Aksu-Ataç, 2020). The reason behind this inconsistency is likely to be the students' levels. Sali's (2011) study was administered with pre-intermediate level students. Taşçı and Aksu-Ataç (2020) also conducted their study in a public primary school; therefore, in the current study, the students' levels were also low. In current study, the instructors also put forward that they opt to use L1 with lower-level students. Glaser (2020) also found out that L1 use in

instruction delivery is one of the inefficient ways in her study. Sowell (2017) caveats that students are likely to have problems with understanding even simple instructions due to overuse of L1. However, using L1 display questions is easier to understand; consequently timesaving, which is why it is preferred from time to time. Moreover, explaining instructions in L1 might remove instruction checking phase out of the procedure since the instructors provide a more understandable input. This corporates with many researchers also advocating that L1 use may or must exist in L2 classrooms (Atkinson, 1987; Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2016; Ur, 1996).

Demonstration suggested by many scholars (Gower et al., 1983; Scrivener, 2005) is one of the most used technique that is claimed by the instructors. It is applied as a subsidiary and expositive technique to make the meaning clearer for students. The instructors iterated that they also use modelling, gestures, mimics, pointing, and exemplifying under demonstration technique based on activity type. On the other hand, it was observed that the technique was once used by only one instructor to model a role-play activity. This low rate of demonstration was compatible with the results of Liruso and Debat (2002-2003). Furthermore, the instructors emphasized that using demonstration technique is almost impossible because of the limitations of online lessons.

Presenting or repeating the instructions more than once by using multiple techniques like explaining with examples, L1 translation or paraphrasing was common in the observed lessons out of many reasons (51,42%). In words of the instructors in the study, basically their aim to provide clearer instruction in each time leads them to repetition of instructions, which is in line with the suggestions given for instruction delivery (Ur, 1996). The instructors stated that they generally behave instinctive; if they feel like there is a problem with their voice, instruction, technology, or activity through their observation, they repeat instructions in various ways. However, repetition of problematic instructions has been seen as unsuccessful management of non-understandings of students (Somuncu & Sert, 2019). Additionally, 18,32% of repetitive instructions were given using exactly the same instruction, which some of the instructors unwillingly experienced due to their physical or mental tiredness. The instructors accepted that in most of the cases, the students have already understood the instruction and started the activity while they are discontentedly trying to convey the meaning. Especially, during online lessons, they are not able to make sure that their instruction reaches out to the students or not, so this causes some hesitations. Accordingly, the rate of repetitions of instruction giving in online lessons was a little bit higher (45,35%).

Consequently, since the preferences of the instructors varied, the factors affecting their instruction giving practice process were also asked to the instructors. Based on their replies to this question and overall interview, the factors were categorized and coded as; activity-based, medium of teaching, instruction-based, student-based, time management, and instructor-based.

5.3. RQ4, RQ5, and RQ6: Instructors' Views on Their Instruction Checking Practices and Instruction Checking Practices in Class in Hybrid Education

The instructors were asked if they check their instructions, how often they check, which techniques they utilize to check and on what grounds their preferences diversify. To begin with, most of the instructors stated that they intend to and try to check students' understandings after giving instructions most of the time but not for every instruction based on various reasons. In contrary, the classroom data have shown that 73,15% of the activity instructions delivered are not checked, which is also in line with many studies examining troubles in instruction giving in literature (Lien, 2018; Liruso & Debat, 2002-2003; Margaretha, 2015). Unlike other studies, this study also compares instruction checking rate regarding different mediums of teaching (face-to-face and online). Even though the instructors stated that they attempt to check instructions more frequently in online lessons, the classroom data indicated that there is almost no difference between instructions which are not checked in face-to-face (73,81%) and online lessons (72,67%). These close rates were explained by the instructors' giving different reasons. For example, they can monitor and see if the students get the instruction or not in face-to-face lessons; therefore, they do not have to ask questions verbally. On the other hand, they stated that they lose lots of time for every detail in online lessons, so they do not have time for checking instructions. The present study indicates that even though the instructors are aware of the importance of instruction checking, they may have some handicaps in practice due to some reasons.

Prior to presenting the techniques observed to be used in the classes, the instructors were asked if they have a special technique to check students' understandings of instructions. Some mentioned instruction checking questions (ICQs) and in face-to-face lessons, monitoring or observing their students' facial expressions and readiness to start the activity as a tacit tool to induce their understandings (Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2020; Halliwell, 1991). The techniques were presented to the instructors and asked which ones they prefer to apply and why they opt for some specific techniques not the others.

Even though the instructors have awareness of display questions and their cumbersome, they tend to utilize them due to their practicality like easy to ask and easy to answer by students. This corporates with the classroom findings; the most used technique was display questions (18,12%). The use of display questions in many contexts has been criticized due to their closedness to real interaction because the replies are already known by teachers (Cullen, 1998; Musumeci, 1996; Thornbury, 1996). Moreover, they were also found inefficacious to get a real informational clue from students for checking instructions (Scrivener, 2005; Thornbury, 2000; Ur 1996).

The instructors' views upon *asking referential questions* were quite positive. The technique was found very beneficial, to the point and elicit more information regarding the instruction given. However, the percentage of asking referential questions was quite low (1,34%). In literature, the efficiency of referential questions to get more hints about students' knowledge and suffice a real interaction has been proven in every aspect of lessons (Brock, 1986; Seedhouse, 1996; Thornbury, 1996; Walsh, 2006). As a consequence, they were also found prone to draw more clues about students' understandings in instruction giving procedure (Scrivener, 2005; Thornbury, 2000; Ur, 1996).

L1 display question use was rare (0,34%) as stated during the interviews conducted with the instructors. L1 use in instruction checking was found ineffective (Glaser, 2020).

Another one was *getting summary from students*, which was also one of the most favored because of its getting more information about students' understandings but the least used technique (3,69%) by the instructors based on audio-recordings of the lessons because of its being impractical, time-consuming and hard to reply for students. This technique was suggested in literature (Scrivener, 2005). However, repetition of instructions in L1 by students is found as an inefficient way (Glaser, 2020).

Regardless of the mediums of teaching, neither the frequency nor style of checking altered. They also agreed that they do not change the way of checking except for monitoring technique in face-to-face classes. However, the instructors stated that they check the instructions more frequently in online lessons.

Determining factors in instruction checking overlapped with most of the factors highlighted in instruction-giving: activity-based, medium of teaching, instruction-based, student-based, time management and instructor-based factors. There is no data found in literature categorizing the reasons behind teachers' instruction giving and checking behaviors.

5.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, the findings of the study are discussed under the light of the relevant literature. Moreover, the research questions are replied considering the findings of the interviews and the classrooms practices regarding hybrid education impacts.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

6.1. Summary of the Study

This study aiming to explore instruction giving and checking practices for activities by comparing the data from different mediums of teaching (face-to-face and online) lays out thorough information about the issue by gathering instructors' views upon their practices. With this aim, a qualitative research method design was applied. With this purpose, seven instructors voluntarily participated in this study. 56 hours of lessons were recorded (four hours of face-to-face and four hours of online lessons for each instructor) and analyzed using content analysis. Based on the findings of the audio recordings, interview questions were devised. After conducting the interviews, the lessons were analyzed regarding the instructors' views one more time. Hence, the whole data collection and analysis process were conducted in a data-driven way. The findings related to instruction giving practices and instruction checking practices were separately displayed in a detailed way.

One finding was that most of the instructors do not have enough time to get prepared for their instructions beforehand due to their busy schedule. To secure students' attention before instruction giving, they stated that they only use transition words signaling upcoming activity most of the time. This is in line with the classroom data; in only 4,42% of the given instructions, the instructors attempted to grab their attention with a small speaking activity, telling an anecdote, showing pictures or a brainstorming activity. The techniques used to convey the instructions were also categorized and six techniques were identified: *paraphrasing, using the original book instruction, choosing a student to read aloud, reading individually, L1 translation,* and *demonstration*. There were a few discrepancies about the frequency of use of these techniques and the instructors' opinions related to frequency of the techniques. Furthermore, the reasons to utilize or not to utilize the techniques were sought throughout the interviews. Therefore, detailed replies indicated strengths and weaknesses of

the techniques. The factors affecting instruction giving process can be listed as*: activity-based, medium of teaching, instruction-based, student-based, time management,* and *instructor-based*. Based on their answers, the data also enabled to check if some of the observable factors had an impact on their preferences or not. Hence, activity types, medium of teaching and instruction-based factors were examined in relation to instruction giving ways of the instructors. They were found as effective in this process.

With the aim of checking instructions, the instructors applied several techniques: asking elicitation questions (display questions, referential questions, L1 questions) and getting a summary from students. Even though the current study is limited to verbal checking ways, the instructors emphasized that they were able to monitor their students in face-to-face classrooms. However, there was still a slight difference between the rates of verbal checking in different mediums of teaching. Another finding was the instructors' preferences about checking techniques. They opted for display questions mostly because of time limitations even though they found them unreliable. Not only display questions but also the other techniques were asked the instructors to opine about. Their weaknesses and strengths were gathered. Similarly, the factors affecting instruction checking process were the same*: activity-based, medium of teaching, instruction-based, student-based, time management,* and *instructor-based*. Some of them were available to be compared based on the data gathered from the classroom. It was found that activity types, medium of teaching and instruction-based factors were effective in instruction checking ways of the instructors.

To sum up, both instruction giving and checking ways of the instructors varied based on distinct factors they put forward.

6.2. Pedagogical Implications

As seen throughout the study, there is no standardized way of instruction giving and checking. Moreover, the instructors were asked if they had taken any lessons covering how to give instructions and most of them stated that they might have taken information about how to give instructions as a part of the course named Teaching Approaches and Methods. Most of the instructors, especially the ones who did not graduate from ELT departments, emphasized that in-service teacher trainings organized by the institution really helped them to improve their instructions. With these in mind, as Korkut (2015) stands out that instruction giving is not explicitly integrated into ELT program of YÖK. Augmentations of the program in reference to this issue may be suggested to be drawn attention to.

Pre-planning of instructions may prevent some problems like time-management or giving complex or long instructions. Writing them with a clear mind and choosing correct words is significant to try to provide more understandable instructions (Ur, 1996). Another solution can be visual aids to be utilized during instruction giving especially in online lessons (Somuncu & Sert, 2019).

Instructors can also observe their practices and take responsibility of their own progress in instruction giving. They can either record themselves and take some notes as a reflection upon the issue or apply more detailed sources to evaluate their instructions.

Securing students' attention beforehand is likely to lessen occurrences of repetitive instructions and to decrease time spent on instruction checking by sufficing the instructions reach out to all students.

Regardless of medium of teaching, verbal checking frequency of instructions should be included not to cause troubles found in most of the studies (Glaser, 2020; Lien, 2018; Margaretha, 2015). Scrivener (2005) proposes that "even the clearest instructions can be hard to grasp" by pinpointing the significance of checking instructions (p. 76). Hence, checking instructions can be suggested to prevent these problems. While checking, asking referential questions and getting summary from students are seen as the most efficient ways to accomplish it based on the related literature (Brock, 1986; Seedhouse, 1996; Thornbury, 1996) and the views of the subject instructors in the present study.

6.3. Suggestions for Further Research

Students' views on their instructors' instruction giving and checking practices can be gathered. Perspectives of teachers have been already collected; however, gathering students' opinions about instruction giving and checking process would bring more insight to the phenomenon.

A similar study can be conducted in different context to increase the generalizability of the study, which would also reveal more unknown techniques that have been used by teachers and enrich literature in reference to the issue.

Lessons from different levels can be observed and the differences can be identified under the scope of instruction giving.

As aforementioned in the Implications section, a study can be carried out on teachers' comments on their self-practices and their altered behaviors throughout the time can be examined.

A similar study can be conducted through using another analysis method to enlighten other aspects of instruction giving and checking processes like interactional sequences based on different techniques used in this study.

Throughout this study, the main purpose which is to examine instruction giving and checking practices has been emphasized thoroughly regarding different aspects of the issue.

REFERENCES

Akyol, T. (2014). *An analysis of teaching practices and classroom interaction of native and non-native teachers of English*. Master's Thesis, Akdeniz University Institute of Educational Sciences, Antalya.

Albrecht, B. (2006). Enriching student experience through blended learning. *Research Bulletin*, *12*, 1-12.

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2008). *Staying the course: Online education in the United States, 2008*. Sloan Consortium. PO Box 1238, Newburyport, MA 01950.

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

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

Anderson, L. W. (2004). *Increasing Teacher Effectiveness*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.

Atkins, A. (2001). *Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF Model in a One-to-One classroom*. An analysis. Retrieved from http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Atkins_4.pdf

Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource?. *ELT Journal*, *41*(4), 241-247.

Atwater, J. B., & Morris, E. K. (1988). 'Teachers' Instructions and Children's Compliance in Pre-school Classrooms: A descriptive analysis'. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 21*, 157–167.

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*(1), 9-32.

Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Badawi, M. F. (2009). *Using Blended Learning for Enhancing EFL Prospective Teachers' Pedagogical Knowledge and Performance.* Paper presented at Learning & Language - The Spirit of the Age. Ain Shams University, Cairo. Retrieved from: http://eric.ed.gov .

Badem, F. (2018). *Interactional resources for restoring understanding of teachers' instructions in an EFL classroom.* Master's Thesis, Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Badem-Korkmaz, F., & Balaman, U. (2020). Third position repair for resolving troubles in understanding teacher instructions. *Linguistics and Education, 60*, 100859.

Bärenfänger, O. (2005). Learning management: A new approach to structuring hybrid learning arrangements. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *2*(2), 14-35.

Berelson, B. (1971). *Content analysis in communications research*. New York: Hafner.

Berge, Z. L. (1995). Facilitating computer conferencing: Recommendations from the field. *Educational Technology, 35*(1), 22-30.

Berglund, T. Ö. (2009). Multimodal student interaction online: An ecological perspective. *ReCALL*, *21*(2), 186-205.

Bowers, R. (1980). *Verbal behaviour in the language teaching classroom*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Reading, UK & Ireland.

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

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction* (pp. 56-310). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

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*, 18-33.

Celcia-Murcia, M. (1989). *Interaction and Communication in the ESL Classroom*. A Forum Methodology.

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

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

Cook, V. (2016). *Second language learning and language teaching*. London: Routledge.

Cooper, J. (1990). Cooperative learning and college teaching: Tips from the trenches. *Teaching Professor, 4*(5), 1-2.

Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (2013). *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

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

Dillenbourg, P., Schneider, D., & Synteta, P. (2002). Virtual learning environments. In A. Dimitracopoulou (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 3rd Hellenic Conference on Information, and Communication Technologies in Education* (pp. 3-18). Rhodes: Kastaniotis.

Dillon, C. L., & Gunawardena, C. N. (1995). *A framework for the evaluation of telecommunications-based distance education.* Paper presented in 17th Congress of the International Council for Distance Education, Open University, Milton Keynes.

Dinçer, A. (2008). *A discourse analytical study on teachers' oral instructions in ELT classrooms.* Master's Thesis, University of Çukurova the Institute of Social Sciences, Adana.

Doehler, S. P. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In *Conceptualising 'learning'in applied linguistics* (pp. 105-126). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007) *Research methods in applied linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University.

Downes, S. (2005). E-learning 2.0. *ELearn, 2005*(10), 1.

Downs-Lombardi, J. (1996). Ten teaching tips for newcomers. *College Teaching, 44*(2), 62-64.

Edwards, A. D., & Westgate, D. P. G (1994). *Investigating classroom talk.* London: The Falmer.

Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, *4*(3), 193-220.

Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behavior.* London: Addison-Wesley.

Gardner, B., & Gardner, F. (2000). *Classroom English*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Glaser, K. (2020). Instruction-giving in the primary English classroom: Creating or obstructing learning opportunities?. *Classroom Observation: Researching Interaction in English Language Teaching. Bern: Peter Lang*, 57-83.

Goodwin, M. H. (2006). Participation, affect, and trajectory in family directive/response sequences. *Text & Talk, An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, *26*(4–5), 515–543. https://dxdoi:10.1515/TEXT.2006.021.

Gower, R., Walters, S., & Phillips, D. (1983). *Teaching practice handbook*. London: Heinemann.

Gündüz, T. (2020). *Giving Instructions in L1 And L2 in EFL Listening Classes: The Effects on A2 Level Learners.* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr

Ha, C. B., & Wanphet, P. (2016). Exploring EFL teachers' use of written instructions and their subsequent verbal instructions for the same tasks. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *15*(4), 135-159.

Hall, J. K. (1997). 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., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*, 186-203.

Halliwell, S. (1992). *Teaching English in the Primary Classroom*, London: Longman.

Harmer, J. (1995). Taming the big 'I': teacher performance and student satisfaction. *ELT Journal*, *49*(4), 337-345.

Harmer, J. (2008). How to teach English. *ELT Journal*, *62*(3), 313-316.

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.

Horton, W. (2011). *E-learning by design*. US: John Wiley & Sons.

İnceçay, G. (2010). The role of teacher talk in young learners' language process. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 277-281.

Insch, G. S., Moore, J. E., & Murphy, L. D. (1997). Content analysis in leadership research: Examples, procedures, and suggestions for future use. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8*(1), 1-25.

Jocuns, A. (2012). Classroom discourse. In C. A. Chapelle (Eds.). *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 620 – 625). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Kameen, P. T. (1978). A mechanical, meaningful, and communicative framework for ESL sentence combining exercises. *Tesol Quarterly*, 395-401.

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

Keegan, D. (2013). *Foundations of distance education*. London: Routledge.

Korkut, P. (2015). *Improving ELT Student Teacher's Classroom Talk via Self Evaluation Teacher Talk (SETT) Framework*. Doctoral Dissertation, Gazi University, Ankara.

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

Krashen, S. (1981). Second language acquisition. *Second Language Learning*, *3*(7), 19-39.

Lei, X. (2009). Communicative Teacher Talk in the English Classroom. *English Language Teaching*, *2*(1), 75-79.

Leidner, D. E., & Jarvenpaa, S. L. (1993). The information age confronts education: Case studies on electronic classrooms. *Information Systems Research*, *4*(1), 24-54.

Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning, and values*. Norwood: Ablex.

Lien, N. H. (2018). Instruction Giving in EFL Classes from a Conversation Analysis Approach: A Case Study. *THAITESOL Journal, 31*(2), 1-19.

Lin, M. H., & Chen, H. G. (2017). A study of the effects of digital learning on learning motivation and learning outcome. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 13*(7), 3553-3564.

Liruso, S. M., & Villanueva de Debat, E. (2003). Giving oral instructions to EFL young learners. *Encuentro Revista de Investigación en la Clase de Idiomas*, 13-14, 138–147.

Ljosa, E. (1992). Distance education in a modern society. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning, 7*(2), 23-30.

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.

Lynch, T. (1996) *Communication in the Language Classroom*, Oxford: Oxford University.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Malamah-Thomas, A. (1987). *Classroom Interaction.* Oxford: Oxford University.

Mangubhai, F. (2005). What can EFL teachers learn from immersion language teaching?. *Asian EFL Journal*, *7*(4), 203-212.

Margaretha, E. (2015). *Teacher's problems in giving instruction for elementary students of Bethany School.* Unpublished thesis, Satya Wacana Christian University Faculty of Language and Literature, Indonesia.

Markee, N. (2015). Giving and following pedagogical instructions in task-based instruction: An ethnomethodological perspective. In *International perspectives on ELT classroom interaction* (pp. 110-128). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mason, R. (1991). Moderating educational computer conferencing. *Deosnews*, *1*(19), 91-00011.

Matheson, A. S., & Shriver, M. D. (2005). Training teachers to give effective commands: Effects on student compliance and academic behaviors. *School Psychology Review*, *34*(2), 202-219.

McCarthy, M. (2006). Fluency and confluence: What fluent speakers do. *Explorations in Corpus Linguistics*, 1.

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

Mercer, N. (1992). Talk for teaching and learning. *Thinking voices: The work of the National Oracy Project*, 215-223.

Mercer, N. (2002). Developing dialogues. *Learning for life in the 21st century: Sociocultural perspectives on the future of education*, 141-153.

Meyer, H. (2008). The pedagogical implications of L1 use in the L2 classroom. *Maebashi Kyoai Gakuen College Ronsyu*, *8*, 147-159.

Moore, M. G. (1989). Three types of interactions. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, *3*(2), 1-6.

Moore, M. G. (2003). *From Chautauqua to the virtual university: A century of distance education in the United States* (No. 393). Center on Education and Training for Employment, College of Education, the Ohio State University.

Moorhouse, B. L. (2020). Adaptations to a face-to-face initial teacher education course 'forced'online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *46*(4), 609-611.

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

Nagamine, T. (2011). Facilitating reflective learning in an EFL teacher education course: A hybrid/blended-learning approach.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Understanding Language Classrooms: A Guide for Teacher-Initiated Action*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Nurpahmi, S. (2017a). Teacher talk in classroom interaction. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, *3*(1), 34-43.

O'Connor, M. C., & Michaels, S. (1996). Shifting participant frameworks: Orchestrating thinking practices in group discussion. *Discourse, Learning, and Schooling*, *63*, 103.

Oksaar, E. (1990). Language contact and culture contact: Towards an integrative approach in second language acquisition research. *Current Trends in European Second Language Acquisition Research. Multilingual Matters, Clevendon*, 10-20.

Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2007). *Building online learning communities: Effective strategies for the virtual classroom*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Pesesa, K. N. (2016). *Student Teachers' Ability In Giving Instruction During Teaching Learning Process Of Practice Teaching At UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya*, Doctoral dissertation, UIN Sunan Ampel, Surabaya.

Peters, O. (2000). Digital learning environments: New possibilities and opportunities. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *1*(1), 1-19.

Prusak, K. A., Vincent, S. D., & Pangrazi, R. P. (2005). Teacher talk. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, *76*(5), 21-25.

R.Nurieva, G., & M.Garaeva, L. (2020). Zoom-based distance learning of English as a foreign language. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, *11*(7202013142020), 439-448.

Ramirez, J. D. (1986). Comparing structured English immersion and bilingual education: First-year results of a national study. *American Journal of Education*, *95*(1), 122-148.

Rohmah, Z. (2003). Teacher's questions in reading classes. *TEFLIN Journal*, *13*(2), 163-174.

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

Santoso, A. (2010). *Scaffolding an EFL (English as a foreign language)'effective writing'class in a hybrid learning community*, Doctoral dissertation, Queensland University of Technology Faculty of Education, Queensland.

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning teaching* (Vol. 2). Oxford: Macmillan.

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

Searle, J. R. (1975). Speech acts and recent linguistics. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *263*(1), 27-38.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts1. *Language in Society*, *5*(1), 1-23.

Seedhouse, P. (1996). *Learning talk: A study of the interactional organisation of the L2 classroom from a CA institutional discourse perspective*. Doctoral dissertation, University of York, York.

Seedhouse, P. (1997). The case of the missing “no”: The relationship between pedagogy and interaction. *Language Learning, 47*(3), 547-583.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective. *Language Learning, 54*(1), x-300.

Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University.

Sharma, P., & Fiedler, S. (2004). Introducing technologies and practices for supporting self-organized learning in a hybrid environment. In *Proceedings of i-Know*, (Vol. 4).

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Slavin, R. E. (1995, June). A model of effective instruction. In *The Educational Forum, 59*(2), pp. 166-176. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis Group.

Slimani, A. (1989). The role of topicalization in classroom language learning. *System*, *17*(2), 223-234.

Smelser, L. M. (2002). Making Connections in Our Classrooms: Online and Off.

Somuncu, D., & Sert, O. (2019). 5. EFL Trainee Teachers’ Orientations to Students’ Non-understanding: A Focus on Task Instructions. In *Conversation Analytic Perspectives on English Language Learning, Teaching and Testing in Global Contexts*, 110-131. Multilingual Matters.

Sowell, J. (2017). Good Instruction-Giving in the Second-Language Classroom. In *English Teaching Forum*, *55*(3), 10-19.

Sun, A., & Chen, X. (2016). Online education and its effective practice: A research review. *Journal of Information Technology Education, 15*.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, *4*(3), 251-274.

Tang, E. (2011). Non-native teacher talk as lexical input in the foreign language classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(1), 45.

Tasçi, S., & Aksu-Ataç, B. (2020). L1 Use in L2 Teaching: The Amount, Functions, and Perception towards the Use of L1 in Turkish Primary School Context. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, *7*(2), 655-667.

Thornbury, S. (1996). Teachers research teacher talk. *ELT journal*, *50*(4), 279-289.

Thornbury, S. (2000). A dogma for EFL. *IATEFL Issues*, *2*(2).

Todd, R. W., Chaiyasuk, I., & Tantisawetrat, N. (2008). A functional analysis of teachers' instructions. *RELC Journal*, *39*(1), 25-50.

Trinder, R. (2016). Blending technology and face-to-face: Advanced students' choices. *ReCALL*, *28*(1), 83-102.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Van Lier, L. (2001). Constraints and resources in classroom talk: Issues of equality and symmetry. *English Language Teaching in its Social Context*, 90-107.

Volery, T., & Lord, D. (2000). Critical success factors in online education. *International journal of Educational Management*, *14*(5), 216-223.

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

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.

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

Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL*, *6*(1), 1-14.

Walsh, S. (2014). Developing classroom interactional competence. *Language Issues: The ESOL Journal*, *25*(1), 4-8.

Waring, H. Z., & Hruska, B. L. (2012). Problematic directives in pedagogical interaction. *Linguistics and Education*, *23*(3), 289-300.

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.

Willis, J. (1992). Inner and outer: spoken discourse in the language classroom. In *Advances in spoken discourse analysis* (pp. 162-182). London: Routledge.

Wilson, B. G., & Christopher, L. (2008). Hype versus reality on campus: Why elearning isn't likely to replace a professor any time soon. *The e-learning handbook: Past promises, present challenges*, 55-76.

Wintergerst, A. C. (1993). Why-Questions in Classroom Discourse. *College ESL*, *3*(1), 70-79.

Woodberry, R. D., & Aldrich, H. E. (2000). Planning and running effective classroom-based exercises. *Teaching Sociology*, *28*(3), 241-248.

Wu, B. (1998). Towards an understanding of the dynamic process of L2 classroom interaction. *System*, *26*(4), 525-540.

Xhaferi, B., & Ramadani, A. (2020). Teachers' experiences with online teaching using the zoom platform with efl teachers in high schools in kumanova. *Seeu Review*, *15*(1).

Yamagata-Lynch, L. C. (2014). Blending online asynchronous and synchronous learning. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *15*(2), 189-212.

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

Young, R. F. Interactional Competence in Language Learning, Teaching, and Testing. *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, 426-443.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: The Sample of Transcribed Instructions

Int1-Face-to-face lesson-Instruction 2

All right, so. Let's do this, so I think it is difficult for you to concentrate on yourself I want you to work in pairs you two/three work together. Tell me what are these? and would you like to buy any of these products as a gifts to any of your friends? Would you like to receive any of these as presents for you? Okay? Let me give you five minutes so you can discuss these questions…

Int2-Face-to-face lesson-Instruction 4

Now we will read "sharks saved my life" we will read it then you will tell me which sentence is true about Caroline experience in Egypt we will read this part and you will tell me which sentence is true about Caroline experience in Egypt but first we will read okay? before reading this part, I want you to look at these sentences and read it then you should read the reading paragraph. Okay? Burak what will we do now? (st explains to some extent) how many minutes do you need for this? 4 is enough.

Int5-Online lesson-Instruction 8

I want you to look at pictures we have also some questions here. Look at the questions and then describe the photo for us. The questions here are to help to give you idea. You do not have to answer all of them. These questions can give you an idea while describing the photo.

Int6- Face-to-face lesson-Instruction 10

So there are some sentences here. Let's look at here "talk to a partner" it says which words describe your feelings in these situations (Int6 reads the instruction) which word describe your feelings in these situations. (REPEATS) There are 8 situations here. First of all, focus on the words. OKAY? (gives one example) let's decide on these for you okay. 2 min.

Int7-Online lesson-Instruction 18

So, we will talk about weddings and today we will talk about clothes I want you to discuss about this picture in breakout rooms but before we do it, I want somebody to read the questions. So, now, I want you to discuss these questions. All right? (Making a student read).

APPENDIX 2: The Sample of Interview Questions

IGT (Instruction giving techniques)

(The techniques used for giving instructions are presented here.)

1. Which ones do you use? Which one do you prefer most? Which one do you prefer least? On what grounds?
2. Which ones do you think are useful/useless?
3. Are there any other techniques except for these?
4. How do your instructions vary based on the medium of teaching (online & face-to-face)?

ICT (Instruction checking techniques)

1. Do you control students' understandings after giving the instruction all the time? If so, why? If not, why, depends on what? What factors are important?
2. What kind of techniques do you use to check your instructions?

(The techniques used for checking instructions are presented here.)

3. Which ones do you use? Which one do you prefer most? Which one do you prefer least? On what grounds? Which ones do you think are useful/useless? Are there any other techniques except for these?
4. How do your checking techniques vary based on the medium of teaching (online & face-to-face)?



GAZİLİ OLMAK AYRICALIKTIR…