

**T.C.  
ERCIYES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES  
EDUCATION**

**WHEN WAITING IS NOT ENOUGH FOR STUDENT  
PARTICIPATION: A MICRO-ANALYTIC  
INVESTIGATION OF RESPONSE ELICITATION  
STRATEGIES IN EFL CLASSROOMS**

**Prepared by  
DUYGU GÜNEŞ**

**Master's Thesis**

**January 2025  
KAYSERİ**



**T.C.  
ERCIYES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES  
EDUCATION  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION**

**WHEN WAITING IS NOT ENOUGH FOR STUDENT  
PARTICIPATION: A MICRO-ANALYTIC  
INVESTIGATION OF RESPONSE ELICITATION  
STRATEGIES IN EFL CLASSROOMS**

**Prepared by  
DUYGU GÜNEŞ**

**Supervisor  
Assist. Prof. Dr. Ufuk GİRGIN**

**Master's Thesis**

**January 2025  
KAYSERİ**

## **BİLİMSEL ETİĞE UYGUNLUK**

Erciyes Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, tez yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırladığım bu tez çalışmada,

- tez içindeki bütün bilgi ve belgeleri akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi,
- görsel, işitsel ve yazılı bütün bilgi ve sonuçları bilimsel etik kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu,
- başkalarının eserlerinden yararlanılması durumunda ilgili eserlere bilimsel normlara uygun olarak atıfta bulunduğumu,
- atıfta bulunduğum eserlerin bütününe kaynak olarak gösterdiğimi,
- kullanılan verilerde herhangi bir tahrifat yapmadığımı,
- bu tezin herhangi bir bölümünü bu üniversitede veya başka bir üniversitede başka bir bilimsel çalışması olarak sunmadığımı

beyan ederim.

**DUYGU GÜNEŞ**

## YÖNERGEYE UYGUNLUK

**“When Waiting is not Enough for Student Participation: A Micro-Analytic Investigation of Response Elicitation Strategies in EFL Classrooms”** adlı Yüksek Lisans tezi, Erciyes Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Tez Önerisi ve Tez Yazma Yönergesi’ne uygun olarak hazırlanmıştır.

### **Hazırlayan**

Duygu GÜNEŞ

### **Danışman**

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ufuk GİRĞİN



## KABUL VE ONAY

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğüne,

Duygu GÜNEŞ'in hazırladığı **When Waiting is not Enough for Student Participation: A Micro-Analytic Investigation of Response Elicitation Strategies in EFL Classrooms** başlıklı bu çalışma jürimiz tarafından **Yabancı Diller Ana Bilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalında Yüksek Lisans Tezi** olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Jüri Başkanı	Doç. Dr. Erdem AKBAŞ	.....
Jüri Üyesi (Danışman)	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ufuk GİRGIN	.....
Jüri Üyesi	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Tuğba ASLAN	.....

Bu tez Erciyes Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim, Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliği'nin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca yukarıdaki jüri üyeleri tarafından ... / ... / ..... tarihinde uygun görülmüş ve Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunca ... / ... / ..... tarihi ve ..... sayılı karar ile kabul edilmiştir.

Prof. Dr. Onur Alp İLHAN  
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürü

## TEŞEKKÜR

İlk olarak, Yüksek Lisans eğitimim boyunca bu sürecin hem akademik hem de psikolojik bir süreç olduğunu verdiği koşulsuz destek ile her zaman hissettirip kolaylaştıran; özverisi, gayreti, anlayışı ve insancılığı ile örnek aldığım ve hem ders dönemimde hem de tez dönemimde bana bir rehber olan, büyük bir titizlikle ve sabırla verdiği her geri dönüşü sonrası yaptığım şeye inancımı kuvvetlendiren, öğrencisi olduğum için kendimi şanslı saydığım Sayın Danışman Hocam Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ufuk Girgin'e sonsuz şükranlarımı sunar ve teşekkür ederim.

ERUMARG oturumlarında ve sonrasında desteklerini hiçbir zaman esirgemeyen Doç. Dr. Zeynep Ölçü Dinçer ve Arş. Gör. Dr. Yasemin Acar ve değerli yorumları için Doç. Dr. Erdem Akbaş ve Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Tuğba Aslan Hocalarıma teşekkürü borç bilirim. Yüksek Lisans mülakatımızda tanışıp bu yolu beraber yürüdüğüm, geçirdiğim zorlu zamanlarda bana inanmayı bırakmayan, derdimle dertlenen sevgili meslektaşım Aslıhan Burcay Koç'a müteşekkirim. Ayrıca çalışmanın etik kuralları gereği anonim kalması gerektiğinden adını veremeyeceğim Erciyes Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu ekibine veri toplama sürecimde sağladıkları destekten ötürü teşekkür ederim. Aldığım her kararda arkamda duran anne ve babama, tüm motivasyon konuşmaları için Güler Anneme, canım ablam Derya'ya, ders ve tez sürecimde birlikte geçiremediğimiz vakitler için gösterdiği anlayıştan ötürü canım yeğenim Emir Efe Kaplan'a ayrıca teşekkür ediyorum.

Son olarak, en derin teşekkürüm yol arkadaşım Alper'e. Hikayemiz başlarken birbirimize verdiğimiz sözleri tuttuğu için. Mezuniyetimden on yıl sonra yüksek lisansa başlamam konusunda verdiği destek ve cesaret için. Bana benden daha çok inandığı için. Düşüğümde elimi tutup daha büyük bir güçle devam etmemi sağladığı için. Sonu gelmeyen sorularıma sabırla cevap verdiği için. Bütün tezi sayamayacağım kez dinlediği için. Yeri geldiğinde konuyu ilk kez duyan bir öğrenci gibi anlamaya çalıştığı için, yeri geldiğinde bir öğretmen gibi yol gösterdiği için. Bütün bunları yaparken hep sabırla, şefkatiyle, sevgisiyle yanımda olduğu için. Olmasaydın, olmazdı, sevgili.

Duygu GÜNEŞ

Ocak 2025, KAYSERİ

**ÖZ**

**BEKLEMEK ÖĞRENCİ KATILIMI İÇİN YETERLİ  
OLMADIĞINDA: YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE  
ÖĞRETİMİ YAPILAN SINIFLARDA CEVAP ALMA  
STRATEJİLERİ ÜZERİNE MİKRO-ANALİTİK BİR İNCELEME**

**Duygu GÜNEŞ**

**Erciyes Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü**

**Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ocak 2025**

**Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ufuk GİRGİN**

Öğrenme ve öğretme sürecinin öğrenci katılımını destekleyecek şekilde etkili yönetilebilmesi için öğretmenlere sınıf içi etkileşimsel yetinin (SİEY) kazandırılması yabancı dil eğitimi araştırmalarının odaklarından biridir. Dil sınıflarında hedef dili konuşmanın öğrenmeye etkisi hakkındaki çalışmalar, öğrenciye cevap üretebilmesi için uygun süre tanınmanın önemini vurgulamaktadır. Çalışmalar, tanınan bu sürenin çoğunlukla öğrenci katılımı ve öğrenci cevabıyla sonuçlandığını belirtmektedir. Ancak bu süre öğrenci cevabı ile sonuçlanmadığında öğretmenin cevap almak için neler yaptığı da SİEY için araştırılmalıdır. Bu sebeple, bu araştırma dil sınıflarında (uzatılmış) bekleme süresi ((U)BS) öğrenci cevaplarını almada başarısız olduğunda bir dil öğretmenin tüm-sınıf konuşma etkinliklerini yönetirken öğrenci cevaplarını başlatma ve sürdürmede kullandığı yöntemleri incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Veri odaklı bakış açısıyla Konuşma Çözümlemesi yöntemini kullanan bu çalışma sonuçları, öğretmenin öğrencilere tanıdığı (U)BS başarısız olduğunda daraltılmış tekrar, salt tekrar, ipucu ve reformülasyonla öğrenme desteği, açıklama, eylem talebi, yorum, muziplik stratejileri ile aynı konuşmacının cevabını sürdürmek için onaylama sesi ve baş hareketi, olumlu geribildirim, doğrulama, kasıtlı eksik söz, düzeltme, başla onaylama, direkt isimle seslenerek aday gösterme ve söz sırası tamamlama stratejilerini kullandığını göstermiştir. Farklı konuşmacılarla cevabı sürdürmek için kullanılan stratejilerin aynı konuşmacı için kullanılan olumlu geribildirim, onaylama sesi ve baş hareketi, söz sırası tamamlama, teşvik stratejilerine ek olarak mevcut konuşmacının bir sonraki konuşmacıyı seçmesi ve bir grubu hedef gösterme şeklinde olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu sonuçlar, hizmet-öncesi ve hizmet-içi öğretmenlere SİEY konusunda farkındalık kazanarak mesleki olarak gelişmeleri için çıkarımlar sunmuş ve ileriki çalışmalarda yararlanılmak üzere tavsiyeler vermiştir.



**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Konuşma Çözümlemesi, Sınıf İçi Etkileşim Yetisi, Tüm-Sınıf Konuşma Etkinliği, Uzatılmış Bekleme Süresi



## **ABSTRACT**

# **WHEN WAITING IS NOT ENOUGH FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION: A MICRO-ANALYTIC INVESTIGATION OF RESPONSE ELICITATION STRATEGIES IN EFL CLASSROOMS**

**Duygu GÜNEŞ**

**Erciyes University, Institute of Educational Sciences**

**Master's Thesis, January 2025**

**Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ufuk GİRGIN**

In order to effectively manage learning and teaching processes and encourage student participation, equipping teachers with classroom interactional competence (CIC) is crucial in foreign-language teaching. Research on target language use in foreign-language classrooms emphasizes the significance of providing students with sufficient time to produce answers and suggests that this provision mostly results in students' responses. However, what teachers do when (extended) wait-time ((E)WT) does not result in student responses remains underexplored. This study investigated a second-language (L2) teacher's response initiation and pursue strategies in managing whole-class speaking activities when (E)WTs failed to initiate responses from students. Adopting conversation analysis (CA), the findings of this study show that when (E)WTs failed to initiate student responses, the teacher deployed several strategies, such as pure repetitions, narrowed-down repetitions, hinting and reformulation, clarification, producing requests for action, commentary and teasing to facilitate participation. To pursue interaction with the same interactant, she utilized continuers, nodding, positive feedback, confirmation check, repair and designedly incomplete utterances (DIU), nominating students by using explicit address terms, and turn completion. Her strategies to pursue more talk from different interactants were in the form of current-speaker-selects-next, targeting a group in addition to positive feedback, turn completion and continuer and nodding strategies. This study has important pedagogical implications for both pre- and in-service teachers and underscores the importance of CIC awareness in L2 English-teacher training.

**Keywords:** Classroom Interactional Competence, Conversation Analysis, Extended Wait-Time, Whole-Class Speaking Activity



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

BİLİMSEL ETİĞE UYGUNLUK .....	i
YÖNERGEYE UYGUNLUK.....	ii
KABUL VE ONAY .....	iii
TEŞEKKÜR.....	iv
ÖZ .....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ix
LIST OF EXTRACTS AND REALIZATIONS.....	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii
CHAPTER I .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. The Background and Significance of the Study.....	1
1.2. The Purpose of the Study .....	5
1.3. Assumptions .....	6
1.4. Limitations .....	7
1.5. Definitions.....	7
CHAPTER II.....	8
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	8
2.1. Teacher Talk, Participation, and Classroom Interactional Competence.....	8
2.1.1. Teacher talk .....	8
2.1.2. Participation, learning, and classroom interactional competence .....	11
2.1.3. (Extended) wait-time.....	13
2.1.3.1. (Extended) Wait-time in science and math lessons .....	14
2.1.3.2. (Extended) Wait-time in language lessons .....	16
2.1.3.3. (Extended) Wait-time in language lessons from a CA perspective ...	18
2.1.3.4. (Extended) Wait-time in some other contexts .....	21
2.2. Embodiment, Nodding, and the Continuer “Mm hm” .....	25
CHAPTER III .....	27
METHODOLOGY .....	27
3.1. The Purpose and Research Questions of the Study.....	27
3.2. The Research Context, Participants, and Data Collection Procedures.....	28

3.2.1. The research context .....	28
3.2.2. The participants .....	29
3.2.3. The data collection procedures.....	30
3.3. Ethical Considerations .....	31
3.4. Research Methodology.....	32
3.4.1. The principles and aims of CA.....	32
3.4.2. The key instructional structures of CA .....	34
3.4.3. The rationale for the research methodology.....	35
3.5. Data Analysis .....	36
3.5.1. Transcription .....	36
3.5.2. Data analysis procedures.....	38
3.6. Validity and Reliability .....	39
CHAPTER IV .....	40
ANALYSIS .....	40
4.1. The Management of Initiation Strategies When (E)WTs Fail to Lead to Student Involvement .....	41
4.2. The Management of Pursue Strategies with Different Interactants .....	65
4.3. Summary of the Findings.....	74
CHAPTER V.....	76
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND IMPLICATIONS .....	76
5.1. Discussion and Conclusion .....	76
5.1.1. Initiation strategies in managing whole-class speaking activities when (E)WTs fail to initiate responses from students .....	78
5.1.2. Pursue strategies in managing whole-class speaking activities after initiating the response sequence.....	80
5.1.2.1. Pursue strategies with the same interactant.....	80
5.1.2.2. Pursue strategies with different interactants .....	82
5.1.3. Creating learning opportunities and CIC .....	83
5.1.4. Creating space for learning through embodiment: the case of nodding and the continuer, “Mm hm”.....	85
5.2. Implications.....	85
5.3. Suggestions for Future Research.....	87
REFERENCES.....	89
APPENDICES .....	100
Appendix A. Ethical Approval .....	100
Appendix B. Jefferson Transcription Conventions .....	101

Appendix C. Mondada Conventions for Multimodal Transcriptions .....	102
Appendix D. Time Management (Extract 1), What Advice (Extracts 3 and 6) ...	103
Appendix E. A Million Dollars (Extracts 2 and 5).....	103
Appendix F. Modern Women (Extracts 4 and 7).....	104
Appendix G. L2 Classroom Modes.....	105
Appendix H. SETT Interactures.....	106
ÖZGEÇMİŞ .....	107



## LIST OF EXTRACTS AND REALIZATIONS

Extract 1: Time Management (19.40-21.00)	42
Realization 1 Management of Initiation	45
Realization 2 Management of Pursue with the Same Interactant	45
Extract 2: A Million Dollars (20.15-21.25)	46
Realization 3 Management of Initiation	50
Realization 4 Management of Pursue with the Same Interactant	50
Extract 3: What Advice (21.00-23.26)	51
Realization 5 Management of Initiation	55
Realization 6 Management of Pursue with the Same Interactant	56
Extract 4: Modern Women (11.30-15.25)	57
Realization 7 Management of Initiation	64
Realization 8 Management of Pursue with the Same Interactant	65
Extract 5: A Million Dollars (21.25-22.40)	66
Realization 9 Management of Pursue with Different Interactants	68
Extract 6: What Advice (23.26-24.25)	69
Realization 10 Management of Pursue with Different Interactants	71
Extract 7: Modern Women (15.25-16.15)	72
Realization 11 Management of Pursue with Different Interactants	74

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

CA: Conversation Analysis

CA-for-SLA: Conversation Analysis for Second Language Acquisition

CIC: Classroom Interactional Competence

CEFR: Common European Framework of Reference

DA: Discourse Analysis

DIU: Designedly Incomplete Utterance

EAP: English for Academic Purposes

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELL: English Language and Literature

ELT: English Language Teaching

ERUMARG: Erciyes University Micro Analysis Research Group

ESL: English as a Second Language

(E)WT: (Extended) Wait-Time

FPP: First-Pair-Part (of an adjacency pair)

IMDAT: Introducing CIC, Micro-teaching, Dialogic reflection, Actual teaching, Teacher collaboration and critical reflection)

IRF: Initiation-Response-Feedback

L1: First language

L2: Second language

SETT: Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk

SPP: Second-Pair-Part (of an adjacency pair)



TCUs: Turn Construction Units

TRPs: Transition Relevance Places

ZPD: Zone of Proximal Development



# **CHAPTER I**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This study explored teachers' management of initiation and pursue strategies in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom. The purpose was to adopt Conversation Analysis (CA) to explore a second-language teacher's strategies to initiate and pursue interaction when (extended) wait-times ((E)WTs) fail to lead to student involvement during whole-class speaking activities. This chapter first introduces the significance and purpose of this study and then the assumptions and limitations of the study will be discussed. This chapter will also briefly define the key terms and definitions related to the study to enable readers to follow the course of the study.

### **1.1. The Background and Significance of the Study**

Classrooms create a crucial opportunity to provide one of the most natural and social places where unique interactions occur. These social interactional contexts pave the way for learning and understanding for interactants who try to find their own ways of organizing and shaping the given information in order to make sense of it (Roehler & Cantlon, 1996). It can therefore be claimed that learning is an interactive process in which interactants restructure the provided knowledge which leads to understanding. In relation to language learning, Walsh (2006) stated that such interactions are the focal points of second-language classrooms, which are considered to be dynamic contexts. Van Lier (1996) considered interaction as "the most important element of the curriculum" (p.5), whereas Ellis (2000) commented on socio-cultural theory by arguing that "learning arises not through interaction, but in interaction" (p.209) and suggested that social interaction is the medium of learning. Walsh (2011) also considered learning as a process in which the interactants participate not to "have or own" (p.49) and suggested focusing on the "doing" (p.49) aspect which is more observable and amenable to analysis.

By means of learner-centered language teaching methods, the focus was directed onto learners' communicative needs and led the way to a learning environment in which meaningful interaction was established through the target language between interactants (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). This approach considers teachers as not only knowledge transmitters but also as creative problem-solvers through meaningful interactions (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). Walsh (2011) commented that out of the many significant factors affecting classroom interaction, teachers play a crucial role during a lesson. Creating learning opportunities by making informed interactive decisions requires time and effort to be invested in professional development (Walsh, 2011). With regard to teachers' orchestrating roles, it would be to the benefit of everyone involved to take various factors into consideration to manage classroom interaction effectively to create learning opportunities, such as activities, turn-taking, feedback, giving enough time and setting examples (Walsh & Sert, 2019).

Originally designed in the 1960s by Moskowitz (1976), the 'Flint' system (Foreign Language Interaction) (p.139) focused on analyzing classroom interaction data by examining both verbal and non-verbal aspects of the target language in use, and she sought to enable teachers to reflect on their talk during the course of teaching. Fanselow (1977) developed a framework called 'FOCUS' (Foci for Observing Communications Used in Settings) to investigate "five characteristics of communications" which he identified as "the source, the medium, the use, the content, and the pedagogical purpose" (p.19). Introduced as communicative competence by Hymes (1972) and named by Kramsch (1986) as interactional competence, Walsh (2006) created a framework called 'Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk' (SETT) (p.144) to reinforce teachers' professional development through classroom interaction, enabling them to view classroom interaction as a mediator for fostering improvement in teaching and learning. Walsh (2011) defined classroom interactional competence (CIC) as "teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning" (p.158). Walsh (2013) stated that CIC focuses on enhancing learning opportunities, the teacher's role in managing the pedagogical aim and use of language, and learners' role in participating and contributing to interaction. Sert (2015) introduced 'IMDAT' (Introducing CIC, Micro-teaching, Dialogic reflection, Actual teaching, Teacher collaboration and critical reflection) (p.223) in order to have a better understanding of CIC and the "ongoing evolution of language awareness" (p.229). Regarding the role of classroom interaction in understanding the teaching and learning

processes (Dilber, 2022; Walsh & Mann, 2015), CIC has increased awareness and drawn more attention in language education (Can Daşkın, 2015; Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Seedhouse, 2008; Sert, 2015, 2019; Walsh, 2006, 2011, 2013). In order to raise teachers' awareness of CIC, Huth et al. (2019) introduced 'Conversation Analysis-based Interactional Competence' (p.99) to train teachers on;

- (1) sustained critical reflection of teachers' conceptions of what language is,
- (2) basic training of pre- and in-service teachers in micro-analytic procedures that enable the analysis of actual talk-in-interaction, and (3) models for translating and transferring research on spoken communication and interaction into pedagogical practice. (p.99)

Bearing these concerns in mind, maximizing interactional space and making effective strategic decisions to foster student participation through CIC put a responsibility on teachers. In addition, CIC enhances both teachers' and learners' awareness over the course of the teaching and learning process in line with pedagogical goals (Walsh, 2006, 2011). It thereby enables both interactants to be "transformative intellectuals" by restructuring the information within and beyond the classroom (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, p.8).

Heritage (2005) stated that CA views the context as a project and a product affected by the actions of interactants. According to Schegloff and Sacks (1973), CA describes "the details of social actions" (p.289) in natural settings. Owing to its data-driven nature, CA provides an examination of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction through detailed transcriptions, including the non-verbal aspects of the interaction (Kasper & Wagner, 2011). In terms of the ethno-methodological and epistemological perspectives (Heritage, 1984), CA enables a better understanding of the social contexts of everyday activities (Sert & Walsh, 2013). From an analytic and emic perspective, CA offers a descriptive perspective to show the complexity of language development in relation to the contextual and interactional aspects of language acquisition (Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Liddicoat, 2007; Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell, 2010; ten Have, 2007). Following such viewpoints on CA, another field called 'Conversation Analysis for Second Language Acquisition' (CA-for-SLA) has emerged and has provided evidence for comprehending teachers' teaching practices in L2 classrooms (Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Markee & Kasper, 2004). Kasper and Wagner (2011) stated that interactional competence serves two purposes in CA-for-SLA. First, it enables the interactants to participate in the conversation, and second, it creates conditions for

being involved more effectively in language-learning practices. It can therefore be claimed that by adopting the CA methodology in this current study, it is possible to examine and understand teachers' interactional competencies in second-language classrooms within social contexts. By analyzing interactional processes such as turn-taking management, sequence organization, initiations, pursues, repairs and feedback sequences, it is possible to gain insights into these interactional competencies (Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Schegloff, 2007; Seedhouse, 2004).

Goodwin (1986) stated that "the primary source of the data has typically come from the activities of speakers" (p.205), so it can be claimed that teachers carry the responsibility of initiating and maintaining classroom interaction as the managers of classrooms (Walsh, 2011). Thus, teachers' professional knowledge, proficiency level, motivation, attitudes and beliefs might be teacher-related, affecting the interaction. Moreover, teachers' decisions and choices of strategies and when and where to employ them play a crucial role in effectively managing the interaction. Hence, observing, analyzing and suggesting the implications of such decisions and strategies might reinforce teachers' professional development, as Sert (2019) suggested:

We need to make 1) practitioners aware of the importance of classroom interaction in relation to learning, 2) provide them with tools to integrate classroom interaction in teacher education, and 3) bring developmental evidence to illustrate change in teaching practices over time (p.217).

Farrell (2009) warned about the effects of teachers' adopted classroom interaction routines and suggested that teachers should improve their understanding of the relation between classroom methodologies and classroom interaction to provide a more effective learning environment. Building on the importance of teachers' management skills, it is essential to recognize their role as orchestrators of the complex dynamics within language-learning classrooms and to raise awareness of the importance of their professional development. To reinforce CIC in L2 classrooms, teachers should be aware of their own interactional practices to create learning opportunities. CIC involves various strategies to create engaging L2 classrooms, including maximizing interactional space and shaping learner contributions (Atar, 2020b). Creating a safe and comfortable environment is crucial for encouraging students to take risks while using the target language. To promote student participation, it is essential to allow students time to process information and formulate responses, which Walsh (2006) introduced as extended wait-time (EWT), an interactional feature

of the SETT Framework. Numerous studies have identified wait-time as a critical aspect of educational research and a key feature of CIC (for example, Alsaadi & Atar, 2019; Atar, 2016; Atar & Seedhouse, 2018; Barnette et al., 1995; Fowler, 1975; Heinze & Erhard, 2006; Holley & King, 1971; Maroni, 2011; Rowe, 1972; Shrum & Tech, 1985; Süt, 2020; Tobin, 1986; White & Lightbown, 1984; Yaqubi & Rokni, 2012; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2016). Although research on wait-time (WT) revealed that extending it can lead to increased student participation, its implementation and effectiveness may vary depending on several parameters, such as the context and participants, as well as certain strategies that teachers employ in case of its failure.

This study is significant since it seeks to examine and extend the results of previous studies in the literature regarding teachers' strategies when (E)WT fails to lead to student responses and what teachers do in order to promote student involvement by enabling them to produce more talk in a specific context and determine if there are any similarities and differences in the employment of strategies regarding the same and different interactants (for example, Alsaadi & Atar, 2019; Atar, 2016; Atar & Seedhouse, 2018; Barnette et al., 1995; Fowler, 1975; Heinze & Erhard, 2006; Holley & King, 1971; Maroni, 2011; Rowe, 1972; Shrum & Tech, 1985; Süt, 2020; Tobin, 1986; White & Lightbown, 1984; Yaqubi & Rokni, 2012; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2016). Given the crucial role of teachers in initiating and managing classroom interactions, this study explored a second-language teacher's management of initiation and pursue strategies during whole-class speaking activities when (E)WTs failed to lead to student responses in an EFL classrooms from a micro-analytic perspective.

## **1.2. The Purpose of the Study**

Although many studies have focused on (E)WT in classroom settings, their findings suggest that when WT is increased to three to five seconds, it serves the purpose of leading to student participation. However, research focusing on the strategies used by L2 teachers to initiate and pursue student responses in the case of the failure of (E)WTs is limited in terms of different contexts and classroom settings. This study therefore questions what happens when (E)WT fails to initiate student responses, and after initiating the response sequence, what strategies the teacher utilizes to pursue the conversation, and whether there are any differences between the pursue strategies in terms of interactants. what To achieve this, seventeen classroom

hours of video-recordings were taken from three EFL classrooms and analyzed through the micro-analytic lens of CA. In this scope, this study will address the following research questions:

1. What are a second-language teacher's initiation strategies in managing whole-class speaking activities when (E)WTs fail to initiate responses from students?
2. What are a second-language teacher's pursue strategies in managing whole-class speaking activities after initiating the response sequence?
  - 2.1. What are these pursue strategies with the same interactant?
  - 2.2. How do these pursue strategies change with different interactants?

### **1.3. Assumptions**

The importance of CIC and its effects on learning and teaching have paved the way for numerous studies that focus on teachers' interactive features in teaching. Through CIC, it is assumed that participation is crucial in language learning since students are actively involved in transferring their passive knowledge into active knowledge or to action, which is "the doing" part (Walsh, 2011, p.49). Although its role in learning cannot be ignored, student participation should not be forced. Therefore, it can be claimed that teachers should be equipped with effective interactional and management skills to facilitate student involvement. Effective deployment of wait-time can be considered one such skill. Since EWT is initiated and managed by the teacher only, the responsibility of conducting it successfully falls heavily on teachers' shoulders. As Atar (2020b) states, being aware of the importance of EWT and managing the interaction by effectively employing EWT is essential for teachers. Awareness of the value of increasing interaction might reinforce teachers' interactional skills, leading to more learning opportunities in language classrooms (Atar, 2020b). Thus, it is assumed that adopting CA as the research methodology will provide insights into interactional organizations of the classrooms so that it can help to develop better understanding of the details of the classroom talk and its connection to learning a language. It is also assumed that this methodology enables the researcher to observe and analyze the interaction in an "unmotivated looking" without any prior beliefs or intentions (ten Have, 2007) through "emic perspective" focusing on the "internal view, from inside the system" (Pike, 1967, p.37). Making data available to other analysts is assumed to

ensure reliability by unmotivated looking by others. The findings based on the empirical data are assumed to contribute to language teacher education, both pre- and in-service, to raise L2 teachers' awareness of managing and evaluating their self-talk, maximizing learning potential in the classroom, and hence, CIC.

#### **1.4. Limitations**

As a case study, the current study presents observations from three different L2 classrooms, each consisting of 18–25 students and conducted by only one teacher. It therefore cannot be denied that the reliability of the study could have been increased by including more teachers. If there were more data from different contexts with different teachers, the findings could have been different. Also, the student participants in this study had the same proficiency levels, but with different proficiency levels, the findings may have been different. Another limitation is related to the technical issues resulting from the recordings. As will be seen in the following chapters, even though two professional cameras were used in the study, what the participants said could not be fully captured due to the lack of individual microphones or audio-recorders, which would have been helpful in representing every detail of the interactions.

#### **1.5. Definitions**

‘Conversation analysis’ (CA) is the micro-analysis of naturally occurring interactions from an emic perspective without any prior beliefs, assumptions or intentions (ten Have, 2007).

‘Classroom interactional competence’ (CIC) is “teachers’ and learners’ ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning” (Walsh, 2011, p.158).

‘Extended Wait-Time’ (EWT) one of the interactional features within the SETT Framework; it involves “allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for students to respond or formulate a response” (Walsh, 2006, p.67).



## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter offers a review of teacher talk, participation and CIC by drawing attention to the findings of previous research. The first part of the chapter will focus on teacher talk, particularly the self-evaluation of teacher talk, CIC and (E)WT. The second part will discuss the role of embodied interaction in L2 English classrooms with a particular focus on nodding and the continuer “Mm hm”.

#### **2.1. Teacher Talk, Participation, and Classroom Interactional Competence**

##### **2.1.1. Teacher talk**

By nature, conversations consist of adjacency in pairs; for example, greeting is followed by greeting, a question requires an answer, a request is followed by a response such as an agreement or disagreement (Ingram & Elliott, 2014; White & Lightbown, 1984). As a form of institutional interaction, classrooms display many examples of such pairs, with a teacher initiating a sequence with a question and a student answers, or a student asks for clarification and the teacher clarifies. The process of teaching and learning therefore involves two-way traffic in which all interactants actively participate. Since it is a dynamic and social process, language learning is a “transactional” (Walsh & Li, 2013, p.249) process in which interactants collaboratively internalize, transmit and construct new knowledge by reflecting on what has been discussed. Teachers seek to involve students more by asking them to transform their passive knowledge into active knowledge by using the target language.

Using the target language is a productive skill which includes a teacher’s management of competences in order to encourage students to participate and produce the language like an “expert adult” (Roehler & Cantlon, 1996, p.2). During the course of classroom interaction, as the main initiator, the teacher “opens doors” (Saxton et al., 2018, p.63) for students to process, criticize, discuss and question so that together they can produce communication leading to learning. Vygotsky’s (1978) zone of proximal

development (ZPD), which represents the idea of “communication between the child and the people in his environment” (p.89), has influenced the importance of communication in language learning. Through the change in focus in language classrooms from “grammar and formal aspects to communication and interactional skills” (Atar, 2016, p.1), communication has become a key point in learning. As facilitators in classroom interaction, teachers therefore play a significant role in creating and affecting learning opportunities (Walsh, 2006, 2011). For teachers, as the more knowledgeable other, it is critical to be equipped with essential knowledge and strategies to guide and manage the learning process. Leading this process through the effective use of teacher talk requires competence because different variables have to be taken into consideration in a very dynamic context, as Nunan (1991) stated:

Teacher talk is of crucial importance, not only for the organization of the classroom but also for the process of the acquisition. It is important for the organization and management of the classroom because it is through language that teachers either succeed or fail in implementing their teaching plans. In terms of acquisition, teacher talk is important because it is probably the major source of comprehensible target language input the learner is likely to receive. (p.189)

In the light of this, Walsh (2006) introduced the self-evaluation of teacher talk (SETT) as a tool for teachers to self-observe and reflect on their teaching without the need for time and meticulous effort requiring transcription. The method involves analyzing 10-15-minute snapshot recordings from different classes, along with stimulated recall procedures involving an outsider. The importance of classroom interaction in shaping teaching practices has led to increased interest in CIC in language education (Aşık & Kuru Gönen, 2016; Can Daşkın, 2015; Girgin & Brandt 2020; Moorhouse, Li, & Walsh, 2021; Seedhouse, 2008; Sert, 2015; Walsh, 2006, 2011, 2013), which is also the principal focus of the current study. However, the challenge of transcribing often discourages teachers from engaging in professional development activities (Walsh, 2014). To address this, Walsh (2006) proposed particular strategies, including self-observation and the analysis of specific, short (15-minute) lesson extracts using frameworks such as SETT, without transcription. Second, Walsh (2006, 2014) suggested using 10-15-minute snapshot recordings from different parts of lessons, classes and times to compare and detect a pattern. Walsh (2006, 2014) suggested benefiting from stimulated recall procedures in which teachers

analyze recordings with a colleague, enabling immediate feedback and awareness-raising. These methods leverage teachers' insider perspective, enabling them to analyze interaction details which an outside researcher might miss. Walsh's approach (2006, 2014) emphasizes the critical role of context in classroom interaction and offers alternatives to traditional transcription-based analysis. These strategies and the SETT framework provide a perspective based on teachers' reflections and experiences in classroom settings. Through the four modes determined by Walsh (2006), SETT enables teachers to self-reflect on their classroom practices and processes. These modes are "Managerial mode, Materials mode, Skills and system mode, Classroom context mode" (Walsh, 2006, p.66) (see Appendix G). Walsh (2006) described each step of a lesson as a mode with a set of "interactional features" (p.67) (see Appendix H). For instance, in managerial mode, the aim is to convey information, manage the physical learning setting and present an activity. The interactional features in the managerial mode come in the form of extended teacher turns in which instructions and explanations are delivered and transitional markers and confirmation checks are expected. In the materials mode, the pedagogical goal is to present and assess language practices and elicit responses regarding the material, which can be in the form of text, audio or video, through IRF patterns, display questions, form-focused feedback, repairs and scaffolding when necessary (Walsh, 2006). In the skills and systems mode, the objective is to enable learners to produce specific items in the target language and the teacher mostly resorts to direct repair and form-focused feedback to provide correct answers, scaffolding students to produce the correct form, teacher echo and display questions (Walsh, 2006). In the classroom context mode, the goal is to establish a context in which learners present their opinions fluently. In this mode, there are minimal repairs and short teacher turns, questions are referential and feedback is about the content (Walsh, 2006). The literature on L2 teacher training shows that frameworks such as SETT and IMDAT enhance teachers' awareness and enable them to detect patterns in their own classroom interactional practices and experiences, reflecting and making informed choices to construct a learning environment and learner participation (Aşık & Kuru Gönen, 2016; Atar, 2017, 2020b; Sert, 2015; Walsh, 2006, 2013, 2014). For this study, Walsh's SETT framework was therefore adopted as a guide for detecting and understanding L2 teachers' classroom interactional practices and pedagogical purposes in micro-contexts. Through a micro-analysis of teacher talk in a

classroom setting, this study observed, discusses and offers suggestions to raise teachers' awareness of such interactional features as management strategies.

### **2.1.2. Participation, learning, and classroom interactional competence**

Pekarek Doehler (2010) stated that “learning a language involves a continuous process of adaptation of patterns of language-use-for-action in response to locally emergent communicative needs” (p.107). This suggests that addressing such needs should consider the perspectives of both parties involved in interactions. To effectively meet this requirement, it can be suggested that all participants possess the skills necessary to navigate talk-in-interaction. This ability, named by Kramsch (1986) as interactional competence (IC), provides learners with opportunities to process and navigate their skills and knowledge in order to interact. Young (2008) described this ability as the “relationship between the participants’ employment of linguistic and interactional resources and the contexts in which they are employed” (p.101).

The literature shows that numerous researchers have examined L2 interactional competence across various settings, including second-language classrooms (for example Balaman, 2016; Cekaite, 2007; Girgin, 2017; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011). A key discovery of these studies has been the crucial role of student involvement in language learning, and from a CA approach, language learning in classroom environments is not viewed as an individual process but as a phenomenon that arises from “participation” in turn-by-turn interactions (Seedhouse & Walsh, 2010). The literature has highlighted how researchers have used CA to examine various aspects of L2 teacher talk. This includes studying teacher repetitions and assessments (for example Park, 2013; Waring, 2008) as well as analyzing micro-details such as pauses, prosody and the non-verbal aspects employed by teachers (for example Balaman, 2016; Dilber, 2022; Girgin, 2017; Hellermann, 2003; Kääntä, 2010; Mortensen, 2012; Sert, 2011; Şimşek, 2022). Through these investigations, scholars have uncovered evidence of language-learning-related phenomena within L2 classroom interactions. Consequently, this research has enhanced our comprehension of the resources which either facilitate or obstruct learning opportunities in L2 educational settings. Walsh (2002) reported that some teaching practices, such as direct error correction, content feedback, confirmation checks, EWT and scaffolding, can enhance learning opportunities but that practices such as turn completion, teacher

echo and teacher interruptions can obstruct these opportunities. Walsh and Li (2013) found that deploying techniques such as extended learner turns, scaffolding, paraphrasing and increased planning time might create learning spaces. Waring (2008) showed that employing explicit positive assessment in the third turn of the IRF sequence in specific contexts can limit opportunities for students to express comprehension difficulties or to explore alternative correct responses. Sert's (2011) multimodal CA study showed that the teacher resorts to several techniques, such as gestures, embodied explanations and code-switching, to involve a student who has claimed insufficient knowledge. It can therefore be suggested that previous research has provided important findings to give a better understanding of what facilitates student participation and what kinds of skill and strategy teachers need to pave the way for Walsh's (2006) concept of CIC.

CIC was introduced and defined by Walsh (2006) as the ability to facilitate language learning through interaction and Walsh's (2011) concept of CIC was subsequently specifically defined as "teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning" (p.158). Placing interaction at the heart of the teaching and learning process, CIC is related to how much teachers support active student participation in teaching a foreign language, and to what extent they encourage students to use that foreign language (Walsh, 2011). Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) stated that students' active participation in the teaching and learning process plays an essential role in learning a foreign language, so it can be argued that students should develop and enrich their knowledge about CIC since as a locus for institutional interaction, classrooms have "extreme flexibility and variability" in terms of characteristics (Seedhouse, 2004, p.181). Saxton et al. (2018) described the characteristics of effective classroom discussions as "a positive climate for thinking and talk, an appreciation of everyone's ideas, affective responding, the value of thinking time, and the courage to wait" (pp.65-67).

CIC introduces various ways leading "more engaging L2 classrooms such as maximizing interactional space, shaping learner contributions, using wait-time effectively, and effective elicitation" (Atar, 2020b, p.832), so creating sufficient space in which students feel safe and comfortable enough to take risks while using the target language is necessary to increase student participation. Deploying EWT effectively, one of the practices in the SETT framework of Walsh (2006), therefore plays a crucial role in allowing students enough time to process knowledge and form a response, and

hence participate. Moreover, the literature suggests that wait-time is one of the focal points of educational research, indicating that EWT is a key feature of CIC and has effective benefits on students' responses (for example Alsaadi & Atar, 2019; Atar, 2016; Atar & Seedhouse, 2018; Barnette et al., 1995; Fowler, 1975; Heinze & Erhard, 2006; Holley & King, 1971; Maroni, 2011; Rowe, 1972; Shrum & Tech, 1985; Süt, 2020; White & Lightbown, 1984; Yaqubi & Rokni, 2012; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2016). That is, if deployed by teachers, it results in student participation. This current study extended the results of previous research by presenting insights into L2 teachers' response initiation and pursue strategies when (E)WTs fail to lead to student involvement during whole-class speaking activities from a micro-analytic perspective.

The following section will present a review of the literature on (extended) wait-time research. Definitions and categorizations regarding (extended) wait-time will be explained. Then, the studies which focused on wait-time in classroom interactions will be presented.

### **2.1.3. (Extended) wait-time**

Ingram and Elliott (2014) stated that it is possible to witness various types of turn-taking in different contexts, which gave birth to unique changes in interactional patterns and behaviors. Silences can occur naturally during turn-taking sequences and these silences might have different roles in relation to their length, location and controller (Fowler, 1975), and might linguistically bear different meanings (Ingram & Elliott, 2014). Sacks et al. (1974) categorized silences into three types in order to understand the concept in a conversation: "gap, lapse, and pause" (p.715). A gap occurs through a change in the speakers. When no speaker change occurs, a pause arises in a speaker's turn in which the turn is continued by the initial speaker, and a lapse exists through extended gaps, enabling interactants to take the turn (see also Ingram & Elliott, 2014). In mundane talk, minimized gaps and one second of silence are commonly tolerated (Jefferson, 1989; Sacks et al., 1974). Ingram and Elliott (2014) suggested that even though lapses are not usually common in classroom interactions, if they do occur, the next turn belongs to the teacher, which draws attention to the importance of teachers' strategies to manage these silences and turns. When the literature was reviewed to determine how these silences and turns were managed, wait-time was found to be an important aspect of the classroom interaction. Wait-time has been a

focus of attention in science, math, social studies and medical education, and not least in language education from primary schools to university level in different contexts.

#### ***2.1.3.1. (Extended) Wait-time in science and math lessons***

Coining the term “wait-time” to specify silences, Rowe (1972, p.1) conducted pioneering research on the impact of wait-time in classroom interactions, particularly in science education, and how increasing the pause between teacher questions and student responses, as well as after student responses, affected various aspects of classroom dynamics. Based on observations and 84 tape-recordings of 36 classrooms, Rowe (1972) reported that when wait-times are extended from the typical one second to three to five seconds, several positive outcomes might occur. These outcomes included longer student responses, increased unsolicited appropriate responses, higher student confidence, more analytic thinking, more student questions and increased participation from students who were typically considered “relatively slow” (Rowe, 1972, p.1). Rowe (1972) also noted changes in teacher behavior, such as increased response flexibility and alternative questioning patterns and suggested that managing the wait-time along with other factors such as reward patterns and frequencies and process facilitation can potentially influence students’ language development, logical thinking and sense of control over their learning environment.

Following that study, Fowler (1975) examined the effects of increased wait-time on student interactions and cognitive processes in science lessons with 51 pre-service teachers. Based on tape-recorded and transcribed data, the findings showed that increased wait-time led to additional student utterances, more student-to-student interactions and more effective science inquiry. Another study of the effect of extended teacher wait-time on science achievement was conducted by Tobin (1980) with 23 classes from eleven middle schools. Based on the analysis of tape-recordings, the findings showed that an extended teacher wait-time (beyond three seconds) led to higher science achievement scores. These findings were subsequently found to be relevant to Stahl’s (1994) concept of wait-time as “think-time” (pp.3-4), serving a specific purpose in enhancing teaching and learning in the classroom by facilitating information processing, reflection and improved classroom dynamics.

Another science study was conducted by Cho et al. (2012) who investigated wait-time in medical education, focusing on the discrepancy between faculty

members' perceptions and actual practice. A questionnaire was distributed to 40 faculty members, 33 of whom reported an expected wait-time of ten seconds after asking a question. However, analysis of the recorded video-tapes to observe the members' actual questioning skills showed that the actual wait-time was only 2.5 seconds, highlighting a gap between intention and implementation. Cho et al. (2012) reiterated that previous research suggested that longer wait-times of three to five seconds could improve student responses and academic achievement, with 10-15 seconds being considered ideal for high-level thinking questions common in medical education. Their findings therefore underscored the importance of training teachers in implementing effective questioning techniques, including skillful and adequate wait-times, to enhance student participation and understanding in medical classes.

After his study on science education, Tobin (1986) investigated extended teacher wait-time in mathematics and language lessons. The study involved 20 classes in sixth and seventh grades. Based on the measurements of EWTs in the audio tapes, the results showed that EWT led to improved quality of teacher and student discourse, as well as higher mathematics achievement. Specifically, classes in which EWTs were deployed exhibited fewer teacher interruptions, longer student responses, more questions and a higher proportion of application-level questions in mathematics. Similar results were observed in the language classes with an increase in comprehension-level questions. The study replicated Rowe's (1972) finding that maintaining an average teacher wait-time of three to five seconds in the whole class setting can enhance the learning environment and improve student outcomes in subjects such as mathematics and language.

In addition to Tobin's (1986) study, Heinze and Erhard (2006) investigated the wait-time between teacher questions and student responses in German mathematics classrooms by analyzing 22 videotaped geometry lessons with eighth grade students, focusing on classwork. Heinz and Erhard (2006) found that the average wait-time between a teacher's question and a student's response was 2.5 seconds, with 75% of the responses occurring within three seconds. Their findings on this short wait-time showed consistency across different types of question and lesson phases, suggesting that teachers may not be aware of or were intentionally using wait-time as an instructional tool. Their findings showed a pattern which could be part of the routine teaching style in German mathematics classrooms. Heinz and Erhard (2006) suggested that this limited wait-time could potentially affect students' ability to process complex



mathematical concepts, particularly in reasoning and proof tasks. Ingram and Elliott (2014) also examined wait-time in 17 mathematics lessons at four secondary schools by employing CA to investigate the structure of turn-taking and its relationship to wait-time. Their findings showed that EWTs were structurally built into the turn-taking sequences of formal classrooms, enabling longer pauses than in ordinary conversation. Ingram and Elliott (2014) suggested that this structure explained many of the outcomes associated with EWTs, such as students providing longer answers, more explanations and increased confidence in responses, thereby suggesting the use of extended silences to influence student behavior and participation.

#### ***2.1.3.2. (Extended) Wait-time in language lessons***

Following these studies, the literature review showed that research on EWT has not been limited to science and math education. As already mentioned, alongside Tobin's (1986) study of EWT in both mathematics and language classes, several studies have focused on language education. White and Lightbown (1984) focused on the analysis of question-and-answer exchanges in ESL classrooms. They examined transcripts from recordings of four ESL classes in a secondary school near Montreal. They counted and timed the questions and answers by teachers and students, measuring wait-time which they defined as the duration between questions and answers. The findings showed that the teachers asked an average of 200 questions per class period (approximately four per minute), with 41% of these questions receiving no response. The average wait-time provided by the teachers was only 2.1 seconds. The findings also showed that the teachers frequently repeated or rephrased questions when answers were not immediately forthcoming, but that this did not lead to an increased student response rate. These findings highlighted the dominance of teacher-centered interactions in these classrooms, so White and Lightbown (1984) reiterated the results of previous research and suggested that longer wait-times might be beneficial for student participation and language learning.

After White and Lightbown's study (1984), Shrum and Tech (1985) examined wait-time in L2 classrooms in first-year high school Spanish and French classes, focusing on the duration of pauses after questions (post-solicitation wait-time) and responses (post-response wait-time). The average post-solicitation wait-time was found to be 1.91 seconds, whilst post-response wait-time averaged 0.73 seconds in

7,500 classroom events. Notably, wait-time was significantly longer after questions were asked in their native language compared with the target language. Based on audio-recorded data, their descriptive study also found that teachers made most of the solicitations (95%), whereas students provided most of the responses (89%).

There have also been studies which have investigated the effect of extended teacher wait-time on student participation in English language classes in Türkiye. Aras (2007) conducted one of these studies in a primary school with two fifth-grade classes in Ankara. Aras (2007) adopted a quasi-experimental design in which one class received EWT treatment and the other served as a control group. Data were collected through classroom observations, pre- and post-tests of student participation, and questionnaires administered to both students and teachers. The findings showed that extending the teacher wait-time from an average of 1.79 seconds to 7 seconds led to a statistically significant increase in student participation, especially among less talkative students. Analysis of the student questionnaire responses showed that most students were aware of the positive effects of EWT although many did not consciously notice the change. The teacher questionnaire responses showed that although most teachers were familiar with the concept of wait-time, it was not widely implemented in practice, so Aras (2007) suggested that EWT could be an effective strategy for increasing student participation in primary ELT classes.

In addition to these studies on EWT in language classes, Mak (2011) focused on the importance of wait-time in reducing speaking-in-class anxiety among Chinese ESL learners. Based on a quantitative analysis of the questionnaire data, Mak (2011) found that the Chinese students usually required longer wait-time to speak up and respond compared with their European counterparts, as “group unity” and “face” (p.211) are important elements in their culture. Mak (2011) suggested that such cultural aspects are threatened when students feel pressured to speak without adequate preparation time, and emphasized that not giving enough time for learners to process a question and formulate an answer was a reason for the lack of response from students. Mak (2011) also noted, however, that the excessive lengthening of wait-time can exacerbate anxiety among students and therefore suggested that teachers should be mindful of providing appropriate wait-time to reduce anxiety and encourage participation in ESL classrooms particularly for Chinese learners.

With a specific focus on the importance of wait-time in developing young students’ language and vocabulary skills, Wasik and Hindman (2018) emphasized the

findings of previous studies that implementing wait-time can lead to increased student participation, longer and more accurate responses and improved language development. Even so, they reported that wait-time was rarely used in pre-school classrooms, with teachers often quickly following up with closed questions or answering their own questions because of concerns about disrupting lesson pacing and pupils' attention span. Despite these challenges, they argued that the benefits of wait-time, particularly in promoting language development and providing opportunities for students to talk and receive feedback, outweigh such obstacles, emphasizing that wait-time can be especially beneficial for English-language learners who need additional time to process and formulate responses in their L2.

Another study conducted in an EFL context investigated the impact of EWT on promoting Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate (Kamdideh & Barjesteh, 2019). The study repeated the findings of previous research that extending the wait-time to three to five seconds had a significant positive effect on learners' willingness to communicate compared with a control group that was given limited wait-time (less than three seconds). The experimental group showed a higher willingness to communicate after the intervention. According to the findings from a questionnaire, Kamdideh and Barjesteh (2019) suggested that giving students more time to think before responding can increase their willingness to communicate in the second language, and that extending the wait-time could be an effective strategy for EFL teachers to foster student participation and communication in the classroom.

#### ***2.1.3.3. (Extended) Wait-time in language lessons from a CA perspective***

The literature review showed that the number of studies focusing on EWT in language education has increased since 2000 (for example Alsaadi & Atar, 2019; Aras, 2007; Atar, 2020a; 2020b; Kamdideh & Barjesteh, 2019; Mak, 2011; Süt, 2020; Wasik & Hindman, 2018). It was found that post-2000, research started to increasingly adopt CA as a methodology to investigate EWT in language education from a micro-analytic perspective.

Yaqubi and Rokni (2012) also examined the impact of teachers' limited wait-time practice on learners' participation opportunities in EFL classroom settings. They examined ten EFL teachers' classroom interactions using CA to investigate how limited wait-time structured classroom discourse. Their findings suggested that a

limited wait-time reduced learners' interactional space and triggered interactive practices which diverted teacher talk from the goal of increasing learner participation, such as self-elaboration, self-answering, extended teacher turns, interruptions, turn completion, teacher echo, closed questions and explicit positive assessment. Yaqubi and Rokni (2012) suggested that EWT implementation could enhance learners' participation opportunities, improve the quality of teacher questions and develop teachers' CIC.

Following these studies, Yatağanbaba and Yıldırım (2016) focused on the effect of limited wait-time on student participation. They conducted research in three young EFL learner classrooms with three EFL teachers. Based on the analysis of video-recorded data by CA, their findings showed that limited wait-time, along with teacher interruptions, often obstructed learner participation and reduced learning opportunities in both form-and-accuracy and meaning-and-fluency contexts. Yatağanbaba and Yıldırım (2016) therefore suggested that increased wait-time, along with other strategies such as acknowledgment of contributions and minimization of interruptions, could enhance CIC and facilitate greater learner engagement. Yatağanbaba and Yıldırım (2016) repeated the importance of teachers' awareness of their wait-time practices and their potential impact on student participation and learning outcomes.

Another study investigating wait-time in EFL classrooms was conducted by Alsaadi and Atar (2019). They particularly focused on student reaction wait-time in high school EFL classrooms in Saudi Arabia in two specific classroom micro-contexts: the classroom context mode and the material mode. After analyzing the audio-recordings of natural classroom interactions using CA, Alsaadi and Atar (2019) suggested that an EWT of three to five seconds could enhance learning opportunities, especially when aligned with pedagogical goals and language use. They found wait-time to be particularly effective following referential or analytical questions, as these questions require students to produce original responses. They also noted that EWT might not always be beneficial, particularly for display questions or when there was a mismatch between institutional aims and language use. Alsaadi and Atar (2019) highlighted the importance of the context-specific nature of wait-time effectiveness and its potential impact on classroom interaction, teacher talk and student involvement.

Atar (2020a) carried out another study of EWT in EFL classrooms, particularly on how pre-service teachers interrupt it. Atar (2020a) reiterated previous studies' findings that EWT can have beneficial impacts on teaching, such as decreasing the

lack of responses from students and increasing student self-selection; it was also found, however, that teachers often utilized “wait-time of only around 1 second” (p.277). Atar (2020a) investigated how pre-service teachers interrupt EWT through practices such as rephrasing, repetition, providing candidate responses, giving verbal and non-verbal cues and changing activities. Based on the analysis of five video-recordings using CA, Atar (2020a) argued that these interruptions could limit students’ opportunities to elaborate on their responses and self-selected turns, suggesting that awareness of such practices could be incorporated into pre-service teacher training programs to improve classroom interaction management and promote more effective use of waiting time. In his next study, Atar (2020b) focused on the effect of awareness raising on pre-service English teachers’ utilization of EWTs in an EFL context. Based on a qualitative research design, the data of seven classroom video-recordings were analyzed using CA and two feedback interviews with the pre-service teachers were analyzed using descriptive analysis, which concentrated on participants’ views and perceptions about the implementation. The results showed that the implementation of awareness raising improved participants’ efficient use of EWT as part of CIC. The findings showed that EWT use increased students’ participation and self-selection, leading to more elaborate responses. The development of EWT use was observed to occur gradually. The pre-service teachers reported that implementation was beneficial for their teaching skills and increased student participation. However, the results also showed that students’ low proficiency levels and anxiety sometimes affected the effectiveness of EWT use.

Following these studies, in a specific context, Süt (2020) examined the use of wait-time by native ESL teachers in the UK and its impact on student contributions in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classes. After using CA to analyze six classroom hours of recordings from three different teachers, the findings showed that the teachers frequently implemented wait-time, with a total of 47 instances observed across the sessions, generally leading to increased student contributions and interactions. In some cases, however, the findings showed that EWT did not elicit student responses, thereby prompting teachers to employ additional strategies, such as rephrasing, making clarifications and asking more questions. Süt (2020) suggested that wait-time can be a beneficial tool for enhancing classroom interaction and facilitating student participation in language classes, although its effectiveness can vary depending on factors such as student proficiency and anxiety levels.

Investigating the wait-time in English-language classrooms, Daslin and Zainil (2020) conducted research with twelve English teachers in SMAN Padang, Indonesia. Using CA on transcribed video-recordings and stimulated recall interviews (SRI), they reported that most teachers provided only one to two seconds of wait-time, falling short of the recommended three to five seconds. Daslin and Zainil (2020) identified several factors limiting wait-time, including teacher echoing, interruptions, elaborations and self-answering, while implementing sufficient wait-time, potentially limiting students' opportunities to think and respond elaborately. Following that study, Zainil et al. (2023) conducted another study focusing on wait-times in EFL classrooms, particularly in junior high schools, with 18 teachers in Kota Padang, Indonesia. Using CA to analyse video-recorded classroom interactions and SRI, they found that most teachers provided shorter wait-times (1-2 seconds) than the recommended 3-5 seconds; on average, the teachers waited 3.49 seconds, with only 33.1% giving the ideal wait-time. The findings showed an interesting result that the teachers tended to provide longer wait-times for questions asked in English (4.18 seconds) than for those in Indonesian (3.19 seconds). The findings also showed that many teachers were unaware of their wait-time practices and the importance of this strategy in encouraging students' thinking and participation. Zainil et al. (2023) therefore emphasized the need for teachers to be more conscious of wait-time as it can significantly impact student learning and classroom interaction.

#### ***2.1.3.4. (Extended) Wait-time in some other contexts***

As well as these studies, the literature reviewed also showed that there were several studies investigating EWT and underlining the complex nature of implementing it. For example, Duell (1994) examined the effects of EWT on university student achievement by conducting two experiments comparing different wait-times (1, 3 and 6 seconds) between teacher questions and student responses by considering variables such as the number and type of questions asked, which differed from previous research. Contrary to previous studies with younger students, Duell (1994) found no evidence from tape-recorded data that EWT enhanced either low-level or higher-level achievement for university students. Duell (1994) interestingly reported that extending the wait-time from three to six seconds led to a significant decrease in higher-level achievement. Duell (1994) suggested that university students

might not benefit from EWT in the same way as younger students, possibly because of their ability to use strategies which provide additional processing time even after being nominated. Duell (1994) highlighted the complexity of studying isolated variables such as wait-time in classroom settings and suggested caution in generalizing these results to typical university classrooms.

Baysen et al. (2003) focused on wait-time in science, social studies, mathematics and Turkish lessons at primary school level in Türkiye. They studied twelve teachers, each teaching two lessons: one as the control group and the other as the experimental group. The audio-recorded lessons were examined in terms of various aspects such as wait-times for each question, question frequency, student response duration, student participation and dialogue patterns. The findings showed that increasing the wait-time from an average of 2.3 seconds to 20.6 seconds led to significant improvements in student engagement and learning outcomes, such as longer student responses, increased student-initiated questions, more frequent expression of ideas, and enhanced teacher/student and student/student dialogues. Baysen et al. (2003) concluded that EWTs transform the classroom environment into a more student-centered, interactive space which promotes critical and creative thinking, aligning with discovery-based learning approaches.

Maroni (2011) focused on the concept of wait-time in classroom interactions in twelve Italian primary schools. Her findings, drawn from 15 hours of video-recording analysis using CA, suggested that longer wait-times could foster students' involvement and improve the quality of their answers. The findings also showed that simply waiting for a long time did not always result in coherent and relevant student answers. Maroni (2011) therefore suggested that the effective use of wait-time required teachers to combine long pauses with relevant verbal turns and calibrate these pauses appropriately. Maroni (2011) emphasized the delicate nature of pauses as resources in classroom discourse and suggested that when used correctly, they could enhance the teaching-learning process.

The literature also contained a study specifically focusing on the effectiveness of wait-time in classroom questioning and its trainability through a staff development program called QUILT (Questioning and Understanding to Improve Learning and Thinking) (Barnette et al., p.1). The study examined variables related to higher levels of wait-time I, which is defined as “the time a teacher pauses after asking a question before acknowledging a student’s response” (Barnette et al., 1995, p.1), usage by

elementary and secondary school teachers, and whether knowledge and skill in using wait-time could be improved through professional development. After analyzing 9,595 teacher-initiated questioning episodes from 254 coded videotapes, Barnette et al. (1995) found several variables significantly related to wait-time I, including the cognitive level of questions, student designation and teacher behaviors, such as probing and redirecting questions. The findings showed that teachers who participated in the full QUILT program showed significant gains in knowledge and in the use of wait-time I, indicating that concentrated and focused staff development can effectively improve this skill. Barnette et al. (1995) highlighted the importance of wait-time in stimulating reflective thinking and student involvement and suggested that increasing teachers' use of wait-time might have positive effects on various aspects of classroom questioning and student learning.

Although previous studies have primarily focused on the implementation and duration of EWT, key differences such as contexts, definitions, types of wait-times and methodologies were detected in their research design. In summary, pioneering studies conducted by Rowe (1972) focused on wait-time in science education and found that extending the wait-time from one second to three to five seconds led to positive outcomes such as longer student responses and increased participation. Tobin (1980; 1986) examined the effects of extended wait-time in math and science classes and found that three to five seconds of wait-times improved discourse quality and achievement. Fowler (1975) categorized wait-time into four types based on who controls the silence and found that increased wait-time led to more student interactions but fewer inferences, again in science lessons. White and Lightbown (1984) analyzed ESL classrooms, finding very short average wait-times of 2.1 seconds; they therefore suggested that longer wait-times could be beneficial. Maroni (2011) drew attention to combining relevant verbal turns with longer wait-times to foster student involvement. Ingram and Elliott (2014) employed CA to examine wait-time and its effect on student and teacher behavior in math classes, and interestingly found that EWT was structurally built into classroom turn-taking, which differs from ordinary conversation. Alsaadi and Atar (2019) focused on student reaction wait-time in Saudi EFL classes and underlined the effectiveness of a three to five seconds of wait-time, especially for referential questions. Süt (2020) examined native ESL teachers' use of wait-time in UK and found that frequent implementation of wait-time generally led to increased student contributions. Collectively, these studies highlighted the significant impact of



EWTs on student engagement and participation in various educational settings. Studies have consistently shown that an EWT of three to five seconds can lead to numerous positive outcomes, including longer student responses, increased participation, and improved discourse quality (for example, Atar, 2020a, 2020b; Barnette et al., 1995; Cotton, 1988; Duell; 1994; Rowe, 1972; Tobin, 1980, 1986). These consistent findings across different contexts underscore the importance of incorporating longer wait-times as a strategic pedagogical tool to enhance classroom interaction and learning outcomes. The current study, however, focused on and empirically and sequentially examined the specific strategies employed by teachers when (E)WTs fail to lead to student involvement during whole-class speaking activities within an EFL classroom setting from a micro-analytic perspective. The study specifically adopted Walsh's (2006) definition of extended wait-time which is "allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for students to respond or formulate a response" (Walsh, 2006, p.67) and the multimodal CA approach to include embodied resources while investigating the specific strategies which the teacher employed when (E)WT failed to generate student responses and involvement. Although Walsh (2006) did not explicitly establish a duration boundary between WT and EWT, based on the literature summarized above, this study considers three seconds or above as an EWT. Since the study presents the data sequentially, the teacher's WT practices were not isolated from the analysis. As such, the acronym, (E)WT, was used to mark the duration boundary and to refer to both.

As highlighted by the research discussed in this literature review, many teachers are unaware of their wait-time practices or struggle to implement them effectively. Teacher training for CIC is therefore essential for raising awareness of the effective implementation of wait-time in order to avoid the anxiety caused by prolonged silences and disruption of the flow of the lesson. Training programs focused on CIC, such as those proposed by Walsh (2006, 2011) and Sert (2015), can help teachers to develop the skills needed to manage classroom interaction more effectively. By raising teachers' awareness of the importance of wait-time and providing them with strategies to integrate it into their practice when (E)WTs fail to lead to student involvement, such training can enhance learning opportunities and foster greater student engagement in second-language classrooms. The current study used empirical data to address this gap by examining teachers' strategies and their impact on

classroom interaction, and potentially contributes to informing future teacher training programs and enhancing classroom interaction practices.

## **2.2. Embodiment, Nodding, and the Continuer “Mm hm”**

The concept of embodiment has attracted significant attention in L2 classroom interaction research. Embodiment refers to the use of non-verbal resources such as gaze, gestures, head nods and body posture in meaning-making processes. Teachers use several embodied resources to support their messages, maintain learner participation, and monitor and maintain fluid interaction, which helps to reinforce the comprehension of L2 input to explain vocabulary, clarify grammar structures and manage classroom dynamics (Girgin, 2017; Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Hazel et al., 2014; Kääntä, 2010, 2012; Mortensen, 2012, 2016; Rasmussen, 2013; Sert, 2011, 2013, 2015; Şimşek, 2022). Additionally, embodiment plays a crucial role in L2 classroom interactional organization, contributing to turn allocation, repair initiation and the projection of preferred or dispreferred actions (Girgin, 2017; Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Hazel et al., 2014; Kääntä, 2010, 2012; Mortensen, 2012, 2016; Rasmussen, 2013; Sert, 2011, 2013, 2015; Şimşek, 2022). For instance, Kääntä (2010, 2012) showed how teachers use gaze, head nods and pointing gestures to allocate turns to students. Even a teacher's silence after a student's second turn, or gaze orientation towards a student, can convey the message of dispreference, thereby suggesting a repair from the students (Kääntä, 2010). Sert (2011, 2013, 2015) showed how teachers use embodied resources (such as leaning towards the student) to conduct epistemic status checks and provide feedback (see also Girgin, 2017).

Research has shown that head nods serve important functions in turn-taking and structuring participation. In L2 classrooms, teachers' head nods have been observed to be utilized for various communicative purposes, as a way of agreeing, showing reciprocity (Goodwin, 1986; Heath, 1992), nominating the next speaker (Kääntä, 2010, 2012), display acknowledgment of student responses, confirmation (Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Wang & Loewen, 2016) and encouragement of further student talk-turn allocation, often in conjunction with verbal tokens or as part of “embodied allocation” (Kääntä, 2010, 2012; Margutti 2004; Mehan 1979; Sert, 2015; Şimşek, 2022). The shape and timing of head nods can convey different meanings in projecting and shaping upcoming actions; for instance, more expansive nods can register

information as news, whilst less expansive nods simply acknowledge receipt (Kääntä, 2010, 2012). Heath (1992) demonstrated how speakers' head nods during an utterance could solicit co-participation from recipients, prompting them to exhibit affiliation through reciprocal nodding. The timing of these nods can indicate how the speaker's turn should be responded to. An absence of reciprocal nodding from recipients may indicate a disaffiliating stance.

Wang and Loewen (2016) found that nodding was one of the most commonly employed embodied actions by teachers when providing oral corrective feedback in ESL classrooms. Nodding was frequently used to confirm students' utterances and emphasize important words. This suggests that nodding can serve as a non-verbal form of positive reinforcement and positive evaluation and draws attention to key information. Even so, Girgin and Brandt (2020) observed a teacher to be employing rapid head nods in conjunction with deploying the continuer "Mm hm" to signal that the students can elaborate further on their turns. Such nodding with a rising intonation was found to encourage the students to expand on their answers. Their findings also showed that nodding can function as a form of acknowledgment of students' intention to continue. Similarly, Mortensen (2016) reported that cupping the hand behind the ear, often accompanied by leaning forward and nodding, can initiate repair in the absence of speech. This suggests that nodding can be integrated with other embodied actions to make meaning in L2 classroom interaction.

Overall, research has shown that head nods serve as a flexible and versatile embodied resource which teachers draw on to facilitate interaction, provide feedback, manage turn-taking, repair and shape student participation in classroom interaction. As an embodied resource, nodding enables teachers to convey their messages in ways that complement and enhance verbal instruction. As will be shown in the analysis chapter, the findings of the current study also are in line with the findings of the previous research in that non-verbal resources, specifically head nods performed by the teacher and accompanied by the continuer "Mm hm", contribute to meaning-making and hence the teaching process (Girgin, 2017; Kääntä, 2010, 2012; McHoul 1978; van Lier 1994).

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter presents the details of the study in terms of its purpose, research questions, research context, participants, data collection procedures, research methodology, data analysis, validity and reliability, and ethical issues. In Section 3.1, the purpose and research questions of this study will be explained. Section 3.2 will introduce details regarding the research context, participants, and data collection procedures. In Section 3.3, the ethical considerations will be discussed. Section 3.4 will present the research methodology, CA, and will explain why it was adopted as the research methodology for this study. Section 3.5 will focus on the details of the data-analysis process. In Section 3.6, issues regarding validity and reliability will be discussed.

#### **3.1. The Purpose and Research Questions of the Study**

This study investigated the initiation and pursue strategies that an EFL teacher resorted to when (E)WTs failed to lead to student responses during the whole-class speaking activities by utilizing multimodal CA. As discussed in the literature review, although (E)WT has been studied previously, extant research has mostly focused on whether the (E)WT has been deployed or its duration when employed. However, the gap in the literature regarding the specific strategies of an (E)WT's failure, the strategies utilized by teachers in such cases, and whether the strategies used by teachers vary in relation to interactants and contexts have informed the research questions of this study. The questions of this study were therefore devised to determine what happens when (E)WTs fail to lead to student involvement, regardless of their duration. The CA methodology was adopted for the study from a multimodal perspective to answer the following research questions:

1. What are a second-language teacher's initiation strategies in managing whole-class speaking activities when (E)WTs fail to initiate responses from students?

2. What are a second-language teacher's pursue strategies in managing whole-class speaking activities after initiating the response sequence?

2.1. What are these pursue strategies with the same interactant?

2.2. How do these pursue strategies change with different interactants?

The objective of the first question was to explore how the teacher initiates a response sequence when an (E)WT fails to serve its purpose of giving students sufficient time to formulate an answer. This question explores the ways in which the teacher manages the initiation sequence during the whole-class speaking activities. The second question explores how the teacher pursues the response sequence after the first initiation. Its objective is to discover what strategies the teacher employs to enable interactants to continue their talk after initiating the response sequence. The two sub-questions were designed to determine whether there are any differences between these pursue strategies in terms of interactants and whether these strategies vary from one interactant to another.

### **3.2. The Research Context, Participants, and Data Collection Procedures**

#### **3.2.1. The research context**

The data for this thesis were collected in the School of Foreign Languages of Erciyes University, a state university in Türkiye, in the fall semester of the 2022-2023 academic year. The English preparatory program contained different students from various majors. Its aim is to enable students to use English in their vocational training and complete their undergraduate studies with sufficient language skills after one year of an intensive language program. The school's vision is to teach foreign languages according to the levels determined by the Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001) by following recent technological, scientific and academic developments. After a proficiency exam administered by the School of Foreign Languages, the students are placed according to their majors and levels. A score of 60 or above out of 100 is considered to be adequate for them to pursue their studies in their own departments. For students who do not score 60 or above, the School of Foreign Languages has different follow-up classes depending on the results of the proficiency exam. These classes include coursebook and skill-based lessons.

The data for this study came from lessons taught using the *New Language Leader Pre-Intermediate English Coursebook* published by Pearson with three different groups of students from the English Language Teaching (ELT) and English Language and Literature (ELL) Departments in the fall semester of 2022-2023. This course is a 14-hour lesson delivered on a weekly basis during the fall term conducted jointly by three to four EFL teachers at the time of the recordings, one of whom voluntarily participated in this study. During the lessons, the teacher followed the coursebook and resorted to several teaching materials such as worksheets, online web tools and a smart board to benefit from the e-book. The data, in the form of 17 classroom hours (45 minutes from each class) of video-recordings, consisted of the coursebook activities varying from language reference sections to study skills sections and from reading to speaking sections. As the focus of this study was to examine a second-language teacher's initiation and pursue strategies when (E)WTs fail to initiate responses from the students during whole-class speaking activities, it was considered appropriate to analyze all 17 hours of video-recordings. Although some of these activities did not originally belong to speaking sections (see Appendices D and E), the teacher modified them into whole-class speaking activities and created a classroom context mode "to enable learners to express themselves clearly, to establish a context, and to promote oral fluency" (Walsh, 2006, p.66).

### **3.2.2. The participants**

As explained in the previous subsection, the participants of this study comprised of three different groups of students registered at ELT and ELL: two of these groups took lessons during the day time, one group in the evening<sup>1</sup>. Each group consisted of 18 to 21 students whose ages ranged from 18 to 45. In the evening group, all of the students were L1 Turkish speakers and therefore were L2 English speakers. In the other two groups, there were eight foreign students whose L1 was Russian or Indonesian. The coursebook was for the pre-intermediate level, so it can be claimed that the proficiency level of the students was A2 according to CEFR. The teacher who voluntarily participated in the research was and born and raised in Türkiye. She had been a second-language teacher at the School of Foreign Languages for six years and had a master's degree in ELT from a different university in Türkiye. Voluntary student

---

<sup>1</sup> Daytime and evening education programs have different admission scores in Türkiye.

participants and the schedule for video-recordings were determined in October 2022 and the video-recordings started in the first week of November 2022. Since the lessons in the fall semester began in the last week of September, the participants had known each other for almost a month.

It can be considered problematic to make generalizations about a specific phenomenon by depending on only one teacher, but this was nevertheless not a validity issue, as Sert and Walsh (2013) stated that CA “enables researchers to draw detailed and focused conclusions on a given interaction, and the main aim is to describe the actions achieved by any limited participants in a multi-party talk” (p.547). Similarly, Creswell (2013) pointed out that case studies enable a researcher to explore “a real-life, contemporary bounded system over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information, and reports a case description and case themes” (p.97). Moreover, this study did not intend to make a comparison between teachers regarding the investigated phenomenon. In addition, as previously discussed in the literature review section, there have been many studies which focused on only one teacher as a case study (see also Girgin, 2017; İnçeçay, 2010); it can therefore be claimed that by the nature of its qualitative research design examining one teacher as a case study, this study has “the potential for rich contextualization that can shed light on the complexities of the second language learning process” (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p.172).

### **3.2.3. The data collection procedures**

To examine the teacher’s management of initiation and pursue strategies when (E)WTs fail to lead to student involvement, a multimodal conversation analytic perspective was adopted to focus on the micro-details (pauses, overlaps, prosodic features, and non-verbal clues) of the interactions along with non-verbal resources (gaze, gestures, and head nods) to gain a better understanding of the teacher’s initiation and pursue strategies (Schegloff, 2007). Bearing in mind the objective of the study, to meet this purpose, it was decided that the most effective data collection tool was video recording of the classes. The data for the study were gathered with two digital cameras located at the front and back of the classrooms at the beginning of each session following the procedures presented by Girgin et al. (2020) in terms of angles, location, height, focus, and the quality of the resolution. One camera was placed to focus on the

teacher, and the other to focus on the students. The researcher was not in the classroom during the video-recordings. In total, 17 classroom hours of video-recordings were gathered and analyzed for this study. This can be seen as sufficient for a CA-based L2 classroom study, as Seedhouse (2004) recommended that five to ten hours are deemed adequate to provide “a reasonable database from which to generalize and draw conclusions” (p.87). Out of the 17 hours of video-recorded data, nine-hours of video-recording came from the evening class. Two separate four-hour video-recordings came from each of the daytime classes. The same teacher was present throughout the dataset, but the student cohorts varied.

Before collecting the data, all necessary ethical procedures were followed attentively (see the following Section 3.3). After receiving ethical approval for this study in September 2022, the schedule for the video-recordings was determined in October 2022. The data collection lasted from October to December 2022 during the fall semester of the 2022-2023 academic year.

### **3.3. Ethical Considerations**

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Erciyes University (Appendix A). The administration of the School of Foreign Languages at Erciyes University was informed of the proposed study and provided the necessary permission documents. After becoming aware of the details of the study, a teacher wanted to participate in the research voluntarily and her written consent was secured. According to her timetable, the participants and the video-recording schedule were determined. The participants were informed about the project and consent forms were distributed. These forms were designed to assure the participants that (1) participation was completely voluntary, (2) they could withdraw from the study at any time without explanation, (3) there would be no penalty or effect on their grades, (4) the recordings would be used only for scientific research purposes, but (5) they might be shared only with researchers complying with the same confidentiality regulations, (6) their identities would never be revealed, (7) their names would be anonymized and replaced with pseudonyms (for example, T for the teacher and S1, S2, and S? (unknown students) for the students). After all signed consent forms were secured, the data collection process began with the voluntary participants.



### **3.4. Research Methodology**

Labov (1972) stated that “the aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain these data by systematic observation”, and that this is problematic, but not “insoluble” (p.209). Mackey and Gass (2005) described qualitative research as a “rich”, “detailed” and “holistic” data analysis to investigate participants in their “natural settings” through “emic perspectives” (pp.169-170). This study was therefore planned to be a combination of a qualitative and descriptive study, including a corpus of video recordings, to address what Labov (1972) described as a paradox and to examine how the parameters affect within the interaction (Mackey & Gass, 2005). CA is a qualitative and inductive research technique and mostly studies naturally occurring “talk-in-interaction” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p.13; Liddicoat, 2007; ten Have, 2007) to observe and identify patterns in the use of language over a long period of time (Brown, 2004). Considering the characteristics of this study, CA was an appropriate research methodology and tool to reveal how the phenomenon under investigation was employed and managed in the course of interaction.

#### **3.4.1. The principles and aims of CA**

Developed by Harvey Sacks, Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson in the 1970s (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998), CA is basically “the study of talk” (p.13) and its structural organization. The principal aim of CA is to “describe, analyze, and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life” (Sidnell, 2010, p.1). CA had influences from two theoretical backgrounds in sociology: (1) Goffman’s “organization of human interaction”, which was later called “interaction order” (Sidnell, 2010, p.6) within its own social situations, and (2) Garfinkel’s ethnomethodology focusing on the methods to examine the social interaction that people practice in everyday routines (Sidnell, 2010). Although primary studies of CA have examined everyday talk, the focus in recent years has shifted to institutional contexts, bringing variety in relation to its goal orientation. Drew and Heritage (1992) outlined the organization of institutional talk in various elements, such as “lexical choice, turn design, sequence organization, overall structural organization, social epistemology and social relations, and interactional asymmetries in institutional settings” (pp.29-47). So, in terms of the role of pedagogy and its goal-oriented

interactional nature in L2 classrooms, CA was chosen as the most appropriate methodology to enable processing and interpreting the systematicity in the interaction through what Pike (1967) described as the “emic” (p.37) perspective focusing on behavior investigated within its own setting. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) summarized talk-in-interaction as “systematically organized and deeply ordered”, “methodic”, “based on naturally occurring data” and “not to be constrained by prior theoretical assumptions” (p.23). In adopting CA as the research methodology, four fundamental points were considered to be the basic principles of CA, as defined by Seedhouse (2004). The first principle is that there is “order at all points”, which was a term coined by Sacks (1984, p.22) to note that every detail should be taken into account within its own social and institutional setting, and it can be argued that it is possible to discover such details and order through empirical analysis. As opposed to the Chomskyan perspective that talk-in-interaction is random and disorganized, and both verbal and non-verbal actions might acquire particular meanings in particular settings (see Girgin, 2017; Şimşek, 2022). The second, as Heritage (1984) described it, is that communication is “doubly contextual” (p.242) in terms of “context-shaped and context-renewing” (p.242); so, it can only be contextualized in its own sequential organization in relevance to its previous turn, and it will build the next turn as a result of the “mutual co-operation of the speakers” (Goodwin, 2013, p.12). According to Seedhouse (2004), the third principle is Heritage’s (1984) notion that “no order of detail can be dismissed, a priori, as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant” (p.241). It can be claimed that this notion paves the way for CA’s intensive and detailed analysis and transcription features to analyze the recordings of naturally-occurring interactions. Any aspect of such interaction cannot be ignored on the grounds that it might be considered irrelevant, since any details can “shape and contribute to the analysis” (Balaman, 2016, p.63). The analysis and transcriptions should therefore include every aspect of the interaction, such as pauses, their length, lexical and non-lexical responses, overlaps, latches, prosodic changes and embodied actions such as nods, gazes and hand gestures. The fourth principle, Heritage (1984) stated, is that “analysis is strongly data-driven” (p.243) and “bottom-up” (Seedhouse, 2004). The analysis should be separated from prior research assumptions and it should be generated within the data from an emic perspective. Sacks (1984) stated that recordings can enable other analysts to observe and investigate the data, so the analysis should be based on evidence from the recordings in a way that other analysts could replicate the same analysis. So as

Seedhouse (2004) stated, the CA procedure is required to have an “unmotivated look” at the data and “an inductive search” throughout the analysis to find a collection of patterns of a phenomenon under investigation. After revealing the patterns, it is necessary to conduct a detailed analysis of such examples to produce “a more generalized account” explaining “how a phenomenon relates to the broader matrix of interaction.” (Seedhouse, 2004, pp.38-39).

### **3.4.2. The key instructional structures of CA**

In this study, Seedhouse’s (2004) perspective for “interaction as an action” and “why that, in what way, right now?” (p.16) was taken as the principle to reveal the organizational structure of the interaction. These analytic tools for interactional organizations are in adjacency pairs, preference and sequence organizations, turn-taking, and repair (Sacks et al., 1974). Sequence organization occurs naturally in adjacency pairs in interactions, conceptualized as “one thing leading to another” (Girgin, 2017; ten Have, 2007, p.130). For example, questions which lead to answers and invitations mostly result in acceptance or decline (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Şimşek, 2022). This organization, called an adjacency pair, comes in the form of a first pair part (FPP) containing a question by one speaker, and a second pair part (SPP) delivering an answer by another. This organization is generally followed by the preference issue of whether an offer is accepted/agreed or declined/disagreed (Pomerantz, 1984). Seedhouse (2004) noted that the preference concept does not mean “wanting or liking something”, but is an issue of “affiliation or disaffiliation” (p.23). If an FPP is followed by a direct SPP without delays, hesitations, or minimal gaps, it can be associated as preferred, but if they are delayed and/or weakly performed SPPs can be associated as dispreferred (Pomerantz, 1984; Schegloff, 2007).

Turn-taking, which is considered a core concept of CA, is the sequential order of speakership changing between participants during an interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Sacks et al., 1974; ten Have, 2007). It is observed that interactants change continually during a talk-in-interaction, and overlaps between interactants commonly occur (Sacks et al., 1974). Turn Constructional Units (TCUs) and Transition Relevance Places (TRPs) form the basis of turn-taking organization. TCUs can exist in the form of words, phrases, and sentences and can be recognizable as showing whether the unit is completed (Sacks et al., 1974; Seedhouse, 2004;

Schegloff, 2007). If a TCU is completed, then a TRP occurs and interactants can change to take the turn (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Schegloff, 2007). This shift between speakers at TRP can occur in three ways: (1) the current speaker holds the floor with more TCUs, (2) the current speaker selects the next speaker, and (3) the next speaker can self-select (Sacks et al., 1974; ten Have, 2007).

The other important concept in CA is repair, which involves overcoming the problems of hearing, speaking or understanding, and not just correcting errors in an interaction (Schegloff et al., 1977). According to Seedhouse (2004), repair is a vital analytic tool for coping with problems obstructing interaction and developing and managing mutual understanding between the interactants by themselves. Repairs can be executed in four ways and the primary distinction between these types of repair is in the initiations and the completions: (1) self-initiated self-repair, where the speaker initiates and completes the repair to the trouble source; (2) self-initiated other-repair, where the speaker initiates the repair to be completed by the recipient; (3) other-initiated self-repair, where the recipient initiates the repair to be completed by the speaker of the trouble source, and (4) other-initiated other-repair, where the recipient initiates and completes the repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). Drew and Heritage (1992) stated that CA serves to unfold the structural organizations in an interaction to investigate how people understand one another in their social lives and to observe the systematic differences between mundane conversations and institutional settings. Seedhouse (2004) also drew attention to the fact that what is “repairable” might differ in “particular institutional focus” (p.143). It can therefore be claimed that CA provides an opportunity to uncover the systematic differences between the organization of institutional talk and ordinary talk regarding what is repairable in L2 classrooms according to the pedagogical agenda. Repairs are observed to be mostly initiated by the teacher providing the correct answer or initiating the repair to be completed by the students; in everyday life, however, people mostly both initiate and complete the repair themselves.

### **3.4.3. The rationale for the research methodology**

As mentioned in previous sections, CA was determined to be the most appropriate research methodology for this study, since it provides a deeper understanding of classroom interaction (Markee & Kasper, 2004). When studying the

data from L2 classrooms by applying CA, it is possible to detect how a sequence takes place, and it is managed as talk-in-interaction with a focus on micro-details. Such details can reveal the relevance between sequences and why these details are employed at specific times and places in talk-in-interactions. This relevance can help to prove what Schegloff (1968) meant by “given the first, the second is expectable” (p.1083) with a closer look into L2 classrooms to understand “why” that action happens “in that way, right now” (Seedhouse, 2004, p.16). In the current study, CA was chosen to show the reflexivity between the interaction, interactants’ perspectives, and institutional goals regarding the investigated phenomenon through video-recordings to provide empirical data and transcriptions analyzed at micro-levels accompanied by embodied actions and multimodal resources to gain a better understanding of the interactional features employed by the interactants.

### **3.5. Data Analysis**

#### **3.5.1. Transcription**

Heritage (1984) considered transcription an essential tool for understanding and examining data. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) saw transcriptions as “the core of analysis” (p.73) and a “representation of the data” (p.74). ten Have (2007) stated that, “transcripts are not the ‘data’ of CA, but rather a convenient way to capture and present the phenomena of interest in written form” (p.95). CA researchers therefore generally benefit from a standard transcription system to provide more reliable data to other analysts. Since CA was adopted as the research methodology for this study, following orthographic transcriptions, the data were transcribed in detail using the transcription conventions developed by Jefferson (2004) (see Appendix B) to identify the verbal aspects of the interaction, such as pauses, overlaps, interruptions, word stresses, intonations and the pace of the talk (Girgin, 2017; Sert, 2015; Şimşek 2022). The coding system used by many CA researchers, including Girgin (2017), was adopted to identify the number of extracts, and titles were assigned to each extract. The numbers were used to show when the extracts began and ended. Courier New, black color, and a 10-point font were standardly used for the transcriptions, and bold font was added for the titles, as can be seen below:

**Extract 2: A Million Dollars (20:15–21.25)**

There are seven extracts in total in this study. Since this study focuses on the teacher's management of initiation and pursue strategies when (E)WTs fail to lead to student involvement, four of the extracts will be examined in the management of initiation strategies section. Three of the extracts will be examined in the management of pursue strategy section. These three extracts are continuations of three extracts examined in the initiation section, except for one extract in which there is no pursue strategy. These extracts were therefore given the same title to reflect their continuation, as shown below:

**Extract 5: A Million Dollars (21.25-22.40)**

It can also be argued that transcripts might fall short of presenting the micro-details and multimodality of interactions. Since Heritage (1984) noted that "no order of detail can be dismissed" (p.241), in addition to the Jeffersonian conventions (2004), the data transcription also benefitted from Mondada's (2018, 2019) conventions (see Appendix C) to describe embodied actions such as gaze, gestures, and posture. Furthermore, pauses in the data transcription were calculated with the help of the free audio software Audacity Team Version 3.1.2 (2021). In this study, different symbols for each gesture were used to describe the embodied actions, referring to emergence on the left and completion on the right; for such descriptions; Times New Roman, grey color, and 11-point were used as the font. Throughout the transcriptions for the analysis, each extract had its own symbols and descriptions. If an embodied action belonged to the same speaker, no extra explanation as to speaker names was given, as seen in Example 1 below, which means that the nodding embodied action belongs to S1. However, if an embodied action was performed by a different interactant, the name of the interactants was presented before the line, as shown in Example 2. Example 2 also presents the arrow line symbol for the embodied actions continuing for some lines and ending on different lines, indicating the embodied action starting in Line 15 and ending in Line 20. Example 3, however, shows that the same embodied action has different symbols for different interactants, and the numbers in parentheses indicate the duration of the pause. If the pause is micro (one-tenth of a second or less) (Jefferson, 2004), it is shown with a point symbol between parentheses, as seen in Example 1, in Line 22.

### Example 1

```
22 T    you have made had a new hair [style](.) i like it
23 S1                                     &°[yes  ] & thank you°
                                     & nods      &
```

### Example 2

```
15 S3 we have more than one subject * work like speaking erm
    listening=
    t                                     * nods---> l. 20
```

### Example 3

```
81      Σ ♣(1.6)      Σ ♣
s8      Σ raises her hand Σ
s9      ♣ raises her hand ♣
```

### 3.5.2. Data analysis procedures

The video-recorded data were examined and micro-analyzed from an emic perspective by applying CA, which takes participant relevant “internal view” (Pike, 1967, p.37) within the data. After data collection, the first step was to watch the recordings closely and repeatedly to gain familiarity with the context and the participants through an unmotivated look. Without a prior theoretical concept, the data were approached in an unbiased manner to identify the phenomenon of interest. Through repeated viewing, the wait-time given to the students to formulate a response by the teacher drew attention. After detecting the numerous deployments of (E)WTs in the database, it was observed that (E)WTs failed to initiate responses from the students. Following the detection of such (E)WT failures in the data, an orthographic transcription of the recordings was completed to locate possible cases of the teacher’s response initiation and pursue strategies to lead to student involvement. Orthographic transcriptions were enriched using the conventions developed by Mondada (2018, 2019), with additional details. Then the entire dataset was examined to build a collection of cases, and a detailed analysis was carried out.

Before analyzing the data in micro-detail, the context regarding the course type, the student's proficiency levels, the lesson's pedagogical aim, the materials, and the classroom modes were determined to gain a better understanding of the interaction. Then the detailed transcripts were examined focusing on (E)WTs, turn-taking, sequence organization, multimodality, and embodiment in the talk-in-interactions. In the analysis, it was found that (E)WTs failed to initiate responses from students regardless of their duration. The teacher then resorted to several strategies to initiate and pursue responses from the class. Upon identifying the phenomenon, the strategies employed by the teacher to facilitate student engagement and the manner and timing of her implementation of these strategies were analyzed.

### **3.6. Validity and Reliability**

In relation to the emic perspective of CA, Seedhouse (2004) stated that internal validity is required to verify the reliability and credibility of a study. It can be claimed that the "next turn proof procedure" (Sacks et al., 1974) is the only way to validate an analysis (Girgin, 2017; Seedhouse, 2004). Seedhouse (2004) stated that a researcher "cannot make any claims beyond what is demonstrated by the interactional detail" (p.255). In this study, therefore, some of the transcribed data were presented to Erciyes University Micro Analysis Research Group (ERUMARG) participants, a data session group in which researchers studying CA present their data to obtain feedback and confirm their claims. According to Peräkylä (2004), the "selection of what is recorded, the technical quality of recordings, and the adequacy of transcripts" (p.288) are the key elements for improving reliability. For the first element, Peräkylä (2004) suggested that a large enough number of cases to be analyzed and transcribed is required to observe "the variation of the phenomenon" (p.288). In this study, 17 classroom hours of data were recorded and viewed repeatedly to detect candidate cases in naturally occurring data, without prior ideas. Peräkylä (2004) stated that the sound, location, and inclusiveness of the recordings play a crucial role in ensuring that the data include every micro-detail of the interaction. To ensure inclusiveness, two professional cameras were placed at the back and front of the classrooms. The final issue referred to by Peräkylä (2004), the quality of the transcripts, was ensured in the present study by using the Jeffersonian (2004) conventions for speech and Mondada's (2018, 2019) convention system for embodied actions.



## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS

This chapter presents a detailed analysis of what strategies the teacher deployed to initiate and pursue student responses in case of an (E)WT's failure in the EFL classrooms using CA principles. Walsh (2006) stated that EWTs provide students with sufficient time to shape an answer and thus have one of the most important roles in fostering learning opportunities in L2 English classrooms. Previous studies have explored the interactional strategies that teachers use to keep the channel open when (E)WTs fail (for example, Alsaadi & Atar, 2019; Atar, 2016; Atar & Seedhouse, 2018; Barnette et al., 1995; Fowler, 1975; Heinze & Erhard, 2006; Holley & King, 1971; Maroni, 2011; Rowe, 1972; Shrum & Tech, 1985; Süt, 2020; White & Lightbown, 1984; Yaqubi & Rokni, 2012; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2016). Most of the previous studies (see Chapter 2) suggest that sufficient EWT leads to students' contributing and that limited wait time tends to obstruct learners' participation opportunities. The aim of this study was therefore to extend previous research by exploring the strategies which a teacher resorts to in order to lead to student involvement in initiating and pursuing a whole-class speaking activity in EFL settings from a micro-analytic perspective. For this purpose, the teacher's employment of (E)WTs was analyzed using CA and alternative management strategies which she employed when (E)WTs failed were examined to determine the features of the sequential organization.

The organization of this chapter is as follows. The first section will be an analysis of the selected extracts from the data, showing the teacher's management of initiation strategies when her (E)WTs failed. In the second section, an analysis of the selected extracts, including the teacher's management of pursue strategies, will be presented. As stated in the methodology section, all of the extracts in both sections came from a pre-intermediate level coursebook lesson, and the classroom interactional organization was first established by the material, the *New Language Leader Pre-Intermediate English Coursebook* published by Pearson.

#### **4.1. The Management of Initiation Strategies When (E)WTs Fail to Lead to Student Involvement**

The collection of extracts for this study shows that “allowing students sufficient time to respond and formulate a response” (Walsh, 2006, p.67) might not always result in students’ participation. Walsh (2006) stated that learners are in a “disadvantaged position” (p.122) to comprehend the question first and then shape an answer, so providing sufficient time for them to process and produce a reply is a great benefit for the students. However, the data analysis showed that even though the teacher employed many (E)WTs on various occasions, these did not always lead to students’ contribution. With respect to the findings of the micro-analysis of the extracts, some characteristic uses of the teacher’s initiation and pursue strategies when her (E)WTs fail were identified. This section will provide a detailed analysis of the teacher’s management of initiation strategies after an (E)WT failed to lead to student participation and how and when the teacher employed them in relation to the pedagogical aims of the lessons. Additionally, throughout the data analysis, it was found that the teacher’s use of pursue strategies varied based on the pedagogical aims, specific circumstances, and interactants after initiating a sequence. While the teacher was pursuing the conversation with the same interactant, she could also pursue the interaction with different participants. Although her use of pursue strategies will be elaborated in the following section, when the teacher employed pursue strategies with the same interactants, its management will be covered here so that the flow of continuing interaction will not be disrupted.

This section presents four L2 English classroom interaction extracts showing the teacher’s initiation strategies when an (E)WT failed to lead to student involvement. The findings show that the teacher found solutions to initiate students’ responses after an (E)WT did not serve its purpose by orienting to sequential organization in interaction (Olbertz-Siitonen, 2015). All extracts in this section exemplify cases in which the teacher pursued the interaction with the same interactant.

Extract 1 comes from an interaction in which the coursebook mentioned above is used. The teacher’s pedagogical aim is determined by the unit to be covered in the material, in this case, the coursebook. Thus, the interaction starts in the Materials Mode (Walsh, 2006). The focus was on time management. Before the extract, the class talked about whether they were good at time management and how they knew that they were

good at it. Then, among the expressions in the book (see Appendix D), the class decided which expressions suggest problems with time and which delivered positive feelings about time. The extract then begins with a referential question from the book to elicit why time management will be essential for the students, and the teacher modified it to a whole-class speaking activity, creating a mode switch to Classroom Context Mode and initiating the sequence with a quotation from the book.

Following several (E)WT failures in achieving the students' participation, Extract 1 presents how the teacher successfully managed to initiate a student's response through a narrowed-down repetition strategy. In addition, this extract shows that the teacher's successful interaction pursued strategies with the same interactant through a continuer accompanied by a nodding embodied action, positive feedback, and confirmation checks.

**Extract 1: Time Management (19.40-21.00)**

- 1 T okay why will time management be important for you if you continue  
 2 your english studies(.)beyond(.)pre intermediate b-v-level↑  
 3 (6)  
 4 S? (inaudible)  
 5 S1 "bu soruyu anlamadım"

**this question not understand**

*"I didn't understand this question"*

- 6 (1.8)  
 7 T why will(.)time management(.)be important(.)for you(.)if you  
 8 continue your english studies(.)lets finish the sentence here  
 9 (2.3)  
 10 S2 (°inaudible°)  
 11 T sorry↑  
 12 (1.6)  
 13 T ≠ cümleyi burda bitiridim yani ≠ (.) Ω to make it clear Ω

**sentence here finish**

*"It means I finished the sentence here."*

t ≠ makes a hand gesture

≠

s3

Ω raises his hand

Ω

14 T YES (.) S3

15 S3 we have more than one subject \* work like speaking erm listening=  
t \* nods---> l. 20

16 T =Mm hm=

17 S3 =grammar so=

18 T =perfect=

19 S3 =we have to /separate/ our hours (.) to study in a day=

20 T =PER FECT \* very nice S3(.).hhh Θyou mean we have different skills  
t ---> \*

s3 Θ starts nodding ---> l.24

21 T in english Θlike reading writing speaking (.) e:rm=  
©finger counts ---> l. 23

22 SS =listening=

23 T =listening and grammar↑© that's why we need to divide our time  
---> ©

24 T ¥ into five ¥ Θ to study ENGLISH↓ (.) right↑ very nice okay↓  
t ¥ shows five fingers ¥

s3 ---> Θ

25 (1.4)

26 T we:ll any different idea↑

27 (1.8)

28 S? Θ tsk Θ

s4 Θ shakes her head Θ

29 T okay↓

30 ÷ (4.7) ÷

t ÷ orients to the book and searches the related pages ÷

In Extract 1, in Line 01, the teacher (T hereafter in the analyses) initiates the sequence with a question from the book, accompanied by rising intonation, thereby creating a switch from Materials Mode to Classroom Context Mode (Walsh, 2006). It can be claimed that T benefited from a “why-question” in the book to “initiate longer responses” (Walsh, 2006, p.8) while creating an opportunity for a whole-class

discussion. However, this question fails to initiate a response from the students, as is evident by 6 seconds of silence (an EWT) in Line 03. The second turn of the IRF sequence continues with S1's reaction to the question ("*I didn't understand this question*") with a lower voice tone in Line 05, showing his non-understanding epistemic stance in Turkish (Heritage, 2012) explicitly. Even though it seems that the EWT in Line 03 works for the students (although S?'s production is inaudible in Line 04), as they produce answers in Lines 04 and 05, T prolongs the duration of the EWT in Line 06, thereby not orienting towards either of the answers. Upon this, T starts to repeat the same question in Line 07, possibly orienting to the reaction of S1; however, T resorts to a narrowed-down repetition as an initiation strategy to lead the students and elicit their responses in Lines 07 and 08. That is, T narrows down the question by omitting the last part (*beyond(.)pre intermediate b-v-level↑*). After this initiation strategy, 2.3 seconds of silence (a WT) follow; however, another yet inaudible response from S2 comes with a quiet tone of voice in Line 10. Upon this, T initiates a repair (*sorry↑*) in Line 11, orienting to S2's answer; however, this request also fails to produce a response, as evidenced by 1.6 seconds of silence (a WT) in Line 12. Therefore, in Turkish, T explains that she has finished the sentence by omitting the last part to make it clearer (that is, narrowing it down) in Line 13 accompanied by her palm showing down hand gesture (*≠ cümleyi burda bitirdim yani ≠ (.) Ω to make it clear Ω*). While T explains why she did what she did, a self-nomination from a different student comes in in the form of a raising hand embodied action in Line 13, and T gives the turn to S3 in Line 14. It can be claimed that the teacher's strategy of narrowing the question down works out for initiating a response from a student. After the response of S3 in Line 15, T pursues the interaction with the same interactant by deploying "Mm hm" as a bridging continuer (*=Mm hm=*) (Girgin & Brandt, 2020) in Line 16, because it is produced in a latch accompanied by a nod (Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Şimşek, 2022). Although it can be claimed that in Line 18, T produces a sequence closing the third turn (*=perfect=*) (Schegloff, 2007; Waring, 2008), S3 continues to produce more talk in Line 19 in a latch. Upon this, T continues by providing positive feedback in Line 20 and produces a confirmation check in Lines 20-24, accompanied by an embodied action (i.e., finger counting). It can therefore be claimed that T's providing positive feedback and producing a confirmation check works to pursue more talk from S3, as evident in Line 19, where

S3 extends his turn, and in Lines 20-24, where S3 confirms with a nod. Note also that in Line 22, the students co-construct the turn in chorus. After T's summary for the whole class, she closes the turn with a sequence closing third (*very nice okay↓*) in Line 24 (Schegloff, 2007; Waring, 2008).

Extract 1 shows that (E)WTs might fail to lead to students' involvement, regardless of their durations; so, it might not always result in student participation. Because of this, T resorts to a narrowed-down repetition in Lines 7 and 8 as a response initiation strategy to successfully achieve student participation, which results in self-selection by one of the students (see Realization 1). In addition, Extract 1 demonstrates that the teacher successfully pursues the interaction with the same interactant (S3) by using (*=Mm hm=*) accompanied by her nodding embodied action as a bridging continuer in Line 16, giving positive feedback (*perfect*) and (*=PER FECT \* very nice S3*) in Lines 18 and 20, and producing a confirmation check in Lines 20-24 to maximize learning, which is followed by S3's extension and nodding embodied action (see Realization 2). After the teacher asks if there are any other ideas related to the topic in Line 26, which is followed by a pause of 1.8 seconds, one of the students responds (*tsk*) in Line 28. This response is followed by S4's shaking head embodied action, indicating that there is no additional comment on the topic, and then the teacher closes the sequence with (*okay↓*) in Line 29. Upon this, the teacher continues the lesson with a different task from the same coursebook. Therefore, this extract does not continue with different interactants described in Section 4.2.

#### **Realization 1 Management of Initiation**

1	T	Initiation
2		EWT
3	T	Narrowed down repetition
4		WT
5	S	Response via self-selection

#### **Realization 2 Management of Pursue with The Same Interactant**

1	S	Response
2	T	Using a continuer

3	S	Response
4	T	Providing positive feedback
5	S	Response
6	T	Providing positive feedback + confirmation check
7	S	Confirmation via nodding

Extract 2 comes from another interaction in which the same coursebook is used. The teacher's pedagogic aim evolves around the unit to be covered, which refers to the Materials Mode (Walsh, 2006), as the teacher provides "input or practice around a piece of material" (p.66). The focus is on the second conditional (see Appendix E). Before the extract, the grammatical focus was reviewed and practiced through some exercises. After the second conditional's function to talk about possible future actions that are unlikely to happen has been covered, the teacher adapts the grammar point and transforms it into a speaking activity for the whole class, thereby creating a mode switch to Classroom Context Mode as "a rapid movement from one mode to another (Walsh, 2006, p.65) and initiating the sequence with a referential question from the book to elicit what the students would do if they won a million dollars. In this extract, it will be demonstrated that being different from the teacher's use of a narrowed-down repetition strategy to initiate a response from the students in Extract 1, the teacher's successful management of initiation strategies occurs in the form of pure repetition and hinting (Ro & Kim, 2024), which eventually leads to self-selection by a student. In addition to the teacher's strategy of providing positive feedback to pursue more talk in Extract 1, this extract shows that the teacher uses a DIU (Koshik, 2002) and repair as strategies to pursue more talk from the same interactant.

**Extract 2: A Million Dollars (20:15-21.25)**

1	T	>okay let me ask you a question what would you do if you
2		won< a million dollars↑
3		(1.9)
4	T	what would you do if you won a million dollars↑
5		(11.7)
6	T	we:ll yesterday
7		(2.3)

8 T i asked er:m the other class about their biggest dream and  
 9 one(.)said hocam(.)being rich is my(.)is my biggest dream  
 10 okay imagine that you are very rich  
 11 (1.2)  
 12 T you have a million dollars .hhh what would you do↑  
 13 (1.3)  
 14 T if you won a million dollars  
 15 \* (1.3) \*  
 s1 \* slightly raises his hand \*  
 16 T © yes s1 ©  
 © nods at s1 to begin speaking ©  
 17 S1 i would travel °till forever°  
 18 T ¥ you would travel↑¥  
 ¥ leans forward ¥  
 19 S1 forever  
 20 T forever (.) [nice ]  
 21 S1 °[until die] until die°  
 22 T louder please  
 23 S1 till die  
 24 T till ?  
 25 (0.8)  
 26 T death  
 27 S1 Θtill deathΘ  
 Θ nods Θ  
 28 T ◆Mm hm◆ very nice okay  
 ◆nods ◆  
 29 (1.1)  
 30 T >yes S2 what about you what would you do if you won< a  
 31 million dollars

With the help of the referential question from the coursebook in Line 01, T initiates the first turn of the IRF sequence with a rising intonation to elicit responses



on what the students would do if they won a million dollars. After 1.9 seconds of silence in Line 03, T repeats the same question purely without even a slight change in Line 04. However, this management of the first response initiation strategy (the pure repetition) does not result in any student contribution, as is evident in Line 05, where another but relatively longer EWT follows for 11.7 seconds. During this silence, the students are expected to give an answer, but, the EWT does not serve its purpose of facilitating a learner turn. T now resorts to hinting (Ro & Kim, 2024) as a management of the second response initiation strategy to activate the students' schemata and elicit their responses in Line 06. As such, T benefits from hinting (Ro & Kim, 2024) to construct an understanding among the students and elicit their responses for a whole-class speaking activity. To do this, T delivers her prompt (we:ll yesterday (2.3) i asked er:m the other class about their biggest dream and one (.) said hocam (.) being rich is my (.) is my biggest dream okay imagine that you are very rich) in the form of an extended teacher turn from Lines 06 to 10. Thus, T establishes a shared sense for the whole class related to the grammatical point and its function to talk about possible future events which are unlikely to happen, and provides a prompt with the word (dream) in Lines 08 and 09 and a superlative adjective (biggest). It can also be claimed that through another prompt (okay imagine that you are very rich) in Line 10, T seeks learners' contribution. However, 1.2 seconds of silence in Line 11 does not elicit any response. In Lines 12 and 14, T continues hinting as her management of the response initiation strategy and delivers the statement. Despite a slight change in the use of verbs (have) in Line 12, it can be claimed that this is not a reformulation; it is a repetition of self-repair since the teacher is an L2 English speaker.

Surprisingly, this time, in Line 15, it results in the self-selection of one of the students (S1) who raises his hand to contribute. Then, in Line 16, T gives the floor to S1 by deploying (yes s1) accompanied by her nodding embodied action (an embodied turn allocation) (Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Kääntä, 2010, 2012; Şimşek, 2022). S1 produces an answer in Line 17, thereby initiating the second turn of the IRF sequence and delivering his turn with a distinctly quieter tone of voice (i would travel °till forever°). In Line 18, T echoes S1's first part of the previous turn with a rising intonation (you would travel↑) accompanied by a leaning forward embodied action, thereby initiating a repair for him to speak louder through a prosodic clue accompanied by her leaning forward embodied action (Rasmussen,

2013). It can be claimed that this repair resolves non-hearing (Hazel et al., 2014; Mortensen, 2016; Rasmussen, 2013), it is not a pedagogical repair. Upon receiving this other initiated repair, S1 repeats the rest of his answer in a relatively higher tone of voice in Line 19, thus completing the repair. In the next turn, in Line 20, T repeats the same utterance to confirm the response and provides positive feedback (*nice*) (Walsh, 2006) at the same time as overlapping with S1's response in Line 20. Through this positive feedback, it can be claimed that T pursues the interaction with the same interactant again, as evidenced in the following line, where S1 continues to speak more by uttering a new response ([°until die] until die°) in a quieter tone of voice. Possibly because of this overlap, T asks S1 to speak louder in Line 22. Upon this, S1 delivers the utterance (*till die*) in a louder voice in Line 23. Then, in Line 24, T initiates a repair sequence by using a DIU (Koshik, 2002) through (*till ?*) as well as offering a wait time of 0.8 seconds in Line 25. Through this management strategy, T still pursues the interaction with the same interactant. With no contribution from the student, T provides the preferred answer (*death*) in Line 26 and repairs directly. Through this repair, T creates a brief mode-side sequence from the Classroom Context Mode to a Skills and System Mode. Being different from a non-hearing repair (Hazel et al., 2014; Mortensen, 2016; Rasmussen, 2013) in Line 18, it can be claimed that this repair is more of a pedagogical one. S1 uptakes and delivers the preferred response, as evidenced in Line 27 (*till death*) accompanied by his nodding embodied action. The feedback turn (*Mm hm very nice okay*) is shown in Line 28. T acknowledges the answer by deploying (*Mm hm*) with a falling intonation accompanied by a nod (Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Şimşek, 2022) and with a sequence closing third (Schegloff, 2007; Waring, 2008). Following S1's uptake in Line 27, T does not extend S1's turn in Line 28 but instead closes the channel and ends the sequence (*Mm hm very nice okay*) (Schegloff, 2007; Waring, 2008). In the following part of the Extract, T pursues the interaction with different interactants, so this will be addressed in Section 4.2.

In summary, Extract 2 shows that (E)WTs might fail to lead to students' involvement, regardless of their durations; therefore, T resorts to various management strategies (see Realization 3) to initiate the students' responses (different from the narrowed down repetition strategy deployed in Extract 1) such as pure repetition (Line 4) and hinting (Lines 6, 8-10, and 12-14). It is evident that these strategies successfully

result in one student's self-selection and his contribution in Line 17. Following these initiation strategies, T also successfully pursues interaction with the same interactant by providing positive feedback in Line 20 (*nice*). Apart from providing positive feedback, T also benefits from a DIU (*till?*) in Line 24, and a repair in Line 26 to enable S1 to produce more talk (see Realization 4).

**Realization 3 Management of Initiation**

1	T	Initiation
2		WT
3	T	Pure repetition
4		EW
5	T	Hinting
6		WT
7	S	Response via self-selection

**Realization 4 Management of Pursue with The Same Interactant**

1	S	Response
2	T	Positive feedback
3	S	Response
4	T	Using a Designedly Incomplete Utterance (DIU)
5	S	Response
6	T	Repair
7	S	Response

Extract 3 is the continuation of Extract 1. Before Extract 3, as seen in Extract 1 above, the teacher asked why time management will be critical in their continuing English studies to the whole class as a preparation phase to set up the next task. After successfully initiating the sequence through a narrowed-down repetition, the teacher pursued the conversation with the same interactant a continuer, providing positive feedback and producing a confirmation check. Although the teacher asked if there were

any different ideas in Line 26 in Extract 1, she closed the sequence without pursuing the interaction with different interactants after one of the students' responses (*tsk*) in Line 28. After choosing not to continue with different interactants on this topic, the teacher initiates the following activity, 2a, as seen in Appendix D. The next activity is supposed to be conducted as a work-in-small-group activity (see Appendix D); however, the teacher modifies it to a whole-class speaking activity, thus creating mode switch from Materials Mode to Classroom Context Mode (Walsh, 2006).

Extract 3 demonstrates that the teacher successfully manages the initiation of the sequence by employing several strategies which are different from those seen in the previous extracts. In the following extract, it is shown that T resorts to scaffolding by reformulation, clarification, and requesting for action as new strategies, as well as using hinting and pure repetitions again. Extract 3 shows that such strategies work and successfully result in three different self-selections. In addition to the initiation strategies, this extract shows that the teacher successfully pursues the interaction with the same interactant in a different way this time (by only performing a nod as an acknowledgment). Note also that lines between 60 and 76 are omitted because the teacher dealt with a classroom managerial issue in the form of small talk, which was not related to the pedagogical goal.

**Extract 3: What Advice (21.00-23.26)**

31 T well here are some sentences dear friends  
 32 (2.8)  
 33 T look at(.)wel-here are some problems you need to look at these  
 34 problems some students are having with(.)time management what  
 35 /advice/ would you give them .hhh i'm often late for  
 36 appointments o:r sometimes i miss(.)appointments completely  
 37 (1.2)  
 38 T do you have this problems† (.) do you have this problem  
 39 (3.4)  
 40 T >°for example°< rab hoca is very punctual person  
 41 (1.3)  
 42 S4 °punctual°?=  
 43 T =punctual [Mm hm]

44 S5 [dakik]  
**punctual**  
*"Punctual"*

45 (1.9)

46 T Δwhen you say(.)one thirty ∂ he will be there(1.3)at one thirty ∂  
∂ points down ∂

Δ looks at S7 --- > l. 54

47 (2.8)

48 S? €°vay be° €

**wow**  
*"Wow"*

s6 € shakes her head €

49 T not earlier (1.1) not later (.) but?  
(1.2)

51 S1 at exact time=  
52 T =on time

53 (1.0)

54 T Δ\$ yes (.) yes  
§ walks and gets one of the Ss' cellphone --- > l. 64  
--- > Δ

55 (3.1)

56 T yes dear friends

57 ™(1.3) ™

t ™ stops and looks at the question on one of the Ss' books ™

58 T what advice would you give them(.)what advice would you give them  
(1.6)

((lines between 60-76 are omitted))

77 T YES(.)dear friends(.)Ω what advice would you give them imagine  
s3 Ω raises his hand --- > l. 80

78 T that some students are having with a problems with time

79 managements .hhh for example he says i'm often late for  
 80 appointments or sometimes i miss a-appointments completely Ω  
 ---> Ω

81 Σ ♣(1.6) Σ ♣

s8 Σ raises her hand Σ

s9 ♣ raises her hand ♣

82 T yes (.) S8

83 S8 erm if they @are don't want to be late @  
 @ makes a hand gesture asking to raise her voice @

84 T louder

85 S8 \*if they are don't want to be late(.)they get up early and /ready/  
 t \* nods --->

86 erm ready for the appointment early= \*  
 ---> \*

87 T =very nice(.)if they are late for the appointment they should  
 88 get up ea:rly and(.)be ready for the appointment okay getting  
 89 up is the solution

In this extract, T refers to the sentences in the book in Line 31, thereby beginning the lesson in Materials Mode (Walsh, 2006). It can be claimed that the 2.8 seconds of silence in Line 32 provide sufficient time for both the teacher to adapt the activity and the students to orient themselves to the task. Benefitting from this WT in Line 32, T adapts the group work activity into a whole-class speaking activity, creating a mode-side sequence from Materials Mode to Classroom Context Mode (Walsh, 2006), and delivers the question to the whole class by omitting the original instruction to work in small groups for the activity in the book (see Appendix D).

After T's initiation of the FPP in Lines 33-36, 1.2 seconds of WT follow. Since there is no involvement, T resorts to scaffolding by reformulation (Walsh, 2006) as a management of the first initiation strategy to lead to student involvement in Line 38. That is, T reformulates the original question by relating it to the students' lives. Although reformulating, it can be claimed that T simplifies and personalizes the question to establish rapport and familiarity (see Kääntä, 2010). However, this also fails to initiate a response from the students, as seen in Line 39, where 3.4 seconds of

silence (an EWT) follow. Therefore, T employs hinting (Ro & Kim, 2024) as a second management of the initiation strategy in Line 40 by mentioning a teacher (*rab hoca*) whom they all know. While hinting, T provides a prompt and a key vocabulary (*punctual*) related to the topic to activate the students' schemata. Nonetheless, this also fails to initiate a response from the students, as 1.2 seconds of silence (a WT) follows in Line 41. From Lines 42 to 55, it can be claimed that T uses clarification as another strategy for response initiation, as it might be necessary to pave the way for obtaining the SPP. For example, even though one of the students (S5) provides the Turkish meaning (*[dakik]*), possibly for S4 in Line 44, there is no fuller answer regarding the advice to be given (that is, the SPP of the IRF) during 1.9 seconds of silence in Line 45. Therefore, in Line 46, T continues by producing clarification to pave the way for a fuller response. It can be argued that T's use of a combined strategy of scaffolding and clarification displays an example of what Walsh (2006) called an "unplanned scaffolding" (p.37) ability. Nevertheless, this initiation strategy also fails to lead to student involvement, as 3.1 seconds of silence (an EWT) follows in Line 55. After this silene, however, T resorts to using another response initiation strategy (requesting for action, giving the floor to the students) (Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2024) by uttering (*yes dear friends*) in Line 56 to initiate the SPP; however, it is also followed by another WT of 1.3 seconds of silence in Line 57, which also fails to initiate a response from the students. Upon this, T deploys a pure repetition in Line 58 and repeats the question twice (*what advice would you give them (.)what advice would you give them*).

Following another WT of 1.6 seconds of silence in Line 59, after the omitted part of the extract between Lines 60 and 76 during which, T deals with a classroom managerial issue in the form of a small talk among the students about the use of a cellphone during the lesson, T uses both a request for action (Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2024) and pure repetition as her initiation strategies in Lines 77-80 and manages to initiate the sequence successfully this time, as evidenced by three self-nominations (S3 in Line 77, S8, and S9 in Line 81). Upon this, T gives the turn to S8 in Line 82 as the first interactant. Even though S8 makes mistakes in Line 83 (*erm if they are don't want to be late*), T does not initiate a repair immediately, possibly because of the Classroom Context Mode, but keeps the channel open to pursue the interaction with a nod as her pursue strategy with the same interactant through Lines 85 and 86 (performing the nod as an acknowledgment) (Şimşek, 2022). This pursue

strategy successfully serves its purpose since it is the same interactant, S8, who continues to produce her response in Line 86. Upon this, T gives feedback in Line 87 and then reformulates S8's answer possibly for the whole class by also repairing the student's answer in Lines 87-89. Thus, T pursues the interaction with a different interactant, which will be addressed in Section 4.2.

In summary, Extract 3 reveals that (E)WTs might fail to lead to students' involvement, regardless of their durations. T therefore employs different strategies to successfully manage the initiation of the interaction sequence (see Realization 5). Varying from the strategies seen in the previous extracts, T resorts to scaffolding by reformulation in Line 38 (do you have this problem). Hinting (rab hoca) in Line 40 is another initiation strategy from which T benefits. The use of clarification (from Line 42 to 55) and the use of a request for action in Lines 56 and 77 (yes dear friends) are distinctively new strategies that T adopts. In addition, T employs pure repetition in Line 58 (what advice would you give them) and benefits from a request for action and pure repetition at the same time in Lines 77-80 to achieve students' participation as a response initiation strategy. Extract 3 also demonstrated that T's management of response initiation strategies successfully results in self-selection by three students (S3 in Line 77, S8 and S9 in Line 81). In addition to these initiation strategies, Extract 3 also shows that T successfully pursues the interaction with the same interactant (S8) only by nodding (see Realization 6) in Lines 85 and 86.

#### **Realization 5 Management of Initiation**

1	T	Initiation
2		WT
3	T	Scaffolding by reformulation
4		EWT
5	T	Hinting
6		WT
7	T	Clarification
8		EWT
9	T	Request for action



10		WT
11	T	Pure repetition
12		WT
13	T	Request for action + pure repetition
14		WT
15	S	Response via self-selection

**Realization 6 Management of Pursue with The Same Interactant**

1	S	Response
2	T	Nodding
3	S	Response

Extract 4 was obtained from a classroom interaction where the same book was used. The teacher's pedagogic aim evolves around the unit to be covered, which refers to the Materials Mode (Walsh, 2006), as the teacher provides "input or practice around a piece of material" (p.66). The pedagogic aim focuses on how to evaluate one's claims. The activity is supposed to be a discussion between students and their partners (see Appendix F) but the teacher modifies it to a whole-class speaking activity, thereby switching from Materials Mode to Classroom Context Mode and initiates the sequence with a quotation from the book. The following extract shows that the teacher benefits from using ironic teasing and commentary as new strategies to initiate a response from the students. Similar to the extracts examined before, the teacher also uses pure and narrowed-down repetitions, hinting, and a request for action as initiation strategies after several (E)WT failures. Extract 4 shows how the teacher's use of such strategies results in self-selection by one of the students.

In addition, this extract demonstrates the teacher's successful pursue strategies with the same interactant using a continuer, an explicit address term, a repair and a DIU. Unlike the previously discussed pursue strategies, in this extract the teacher deploys an explicit address term and benefits from a collaborative turn sequence to pursue more talk from the student.

**Extract 4: Modern Women (11.30-15.25)**

1 T lets start dear friends with speaking part and second quotation  
2 (.)modern women a:re as interested in the:se things as modern  
3 men(.)so perhaps(.)there were enough adverts aimed at women  
4 (3.2)  
5 T read the rest of the paragraph please  
6 (4.1)  
7 T do you agree with dans claim about modern women  
8 (3.3)  
9 T what differences do you see between ma:le(.)and female  
10 consumer habits↑  
11 (1.6)  
12 T how do adverts show that(.)they are aimed at(.)men o:r women  
13 (1.4)  
14 T thats a nice question  
15 (1.3)  
16 T do you agree with dans claim about modern women  
17 (1.2)  
18 T modern women are as interested in the:se things as modern men  
19 (1.7)  
20 T so perhaps(.)there were enough adverts aimed at women  
21 (5.2)  
22 T you have made had a new hair [style](.) i like it  
23 S1 &°[yes ] & thank you°  
& nods &  
24 (5.1)  
25 T yes .hhh do you agree with dans claim about modern women  
26 (4.2)  
27 T what differences do you see between ma:le and female consumer  
28 habits↑  
29 S2 °these things dediği ne°

**these things said what**

*"What do "these things" refer to?"*

30 (1.3)

31 T @lets focus on this question what differences do you see@ between

@ turns to the board and shows the question by tapping twice @

32 male and female consumer habits↑(.)think about it dear friends

33 (30)

34 S3 € Σ °ne yapıyoruz° €

**what are we doing**

*"What are we doing?"*

€ pokes S4 sitting next to her €

t Σ starts wandering around the chairs ---> l. 43

35 ∇ (6) ∇

s4 ∇ points at the question on the book ∇

36 T \* or i will choose

s5 \* scratches his head ---> l. 38

37 (2.1)

38 T £ randomly £ \*

£ talks with a smile £

---> \*

39 (1.6)

40 T yes hhh

41 (2.1)

42 T what how(.)what is what differences do you see between ma:le↑

43 and female consumer habits Σ

---> Σ

44 (6.7)

45 T think about (.) your(.)brother for example

46 (7.5)

47 T what differences do you see between male and female consumer

48 habits  
 49 (11.3)  
 50 COME ON  
 51 ♣ (2) ♣  
 s6 ♣ raises his hand ♣  
 52 T yes s6  
 53 S6 erm women habits is (1.1) erm © /fashion/ (1.2) erm generally /fashion/  
 t ©makes facial expressions---> l. 56  
 54 (1.1)  
 55 T Mm hm=  
 56 S6 =ma-ma-make up (1.1) [e:rm ] ©  
 t ---> ©  
 57 S2 [°ooh°]  
 58 S6 and (1.1) ≠ [for their ≠ ]  
 ≠ looks at S2 smiling ≠  
 59 S2 [dedikodu de de °tam olsun°]  
**gossip say complete be**  
*"Just call it gossip while you are at it"*  
 60 T sorry↑  
 61 (1.3)  
 62 S2 dedikodu de de tam olsun diyorum  
**gossip say complete be saying**  
*"I am saying just call it gossip while you are at it"*  
 63 T Hmm  
 64 S? (inaudible)  
 65 (2.1)  
 66 S6 ∂™ erm i i forget  
 s7 ∂ imitates strangling someone ---> l. 68  
 s6™ points at the girl in the back ---> l. 68  
 67 SS [ha ha ha ]

68 S2 [£ > im sorry im sorry ha ha < £ ]ð™  
£ talks with a smile £  
---> ð  
--->™

69 (2.3)

70 T yes s6

71 S6 /ment/ e:rm buying

72 (1.1)

73 T men buy=

74 S6 =men buy e:rm (.) /somethink↑/

75 (1.4)

76 T necessary=

77 S6 =necessary

78 T but women?

79 S6 yes woman always buy everythink

80 T oo Mm hm oo  
oo \_nods oo

81 (1.2)

82 T they want °to° buy everything YES girls defend yourself

The statement starting from Line 01 comes from the coursebook and aims “to elicit responses in relation to the material” (Walsh, 2006, p.66). The EWT in Line 06 allows the students sufficient time to read the rest of the questions, as T asks in the previous line (Line 05), using the statement (read the rest of the paragraph, please). Even though T asks the students to read the rest of the paragraph in Line 05, she starts to read aloud the questions in Lines 07, 09, and 12, which results in extended teacher turns. As the students see the same questions in their books and on the smartboard, these deliverances which come with (E)WTs, as seen in Lines 8, 11, and 13, can be claimed to be given to the students to read and understand the questions. Therefore, the students’ answers are not expected at these points, except in Line 12, where the students and teacher are aware that this point is the end of a series of questions written in the book. The WT in Line 13 is therefore the first point used to indicate that an answer from the students is needed. However, this fails to get an

answer from the students, possibly because the WT is not extended, as T resorts to commentary as management of the first initiation strategy to initiate a response from the students by commenting on the question in Line 14 (*thats a nice question*). As this strategy does not work, as evidenced in Line 15 with another WT, T employs pure repetition as a management of the second initiation strategy by reading the questions from the book in Lines 16, 18, and 20. As this repetition also fails to initiate an answer from the students, possibly because the WTs are not extended again (as evidenced by the WTs in Lines 17 and 19), after a 5.2 seconds silence (which is this time an EWT) in Line 21, T employs another strategy to initiate an answer from the students by teasing a student (S1) in Line 22 (*you have made had a new hair [style](.) i like it*), thereby using ironic teasing (Waring et. al., 2016) as an initiation strategy. This might be used to create a channel to initiate an answer about a related topic by establishing rapport, but this also does not work. Following 5.1 seconds of silence, which also functions as an EWT, in Line 24, T repeats a part of the question in Line 25 to get a response, but this also fails to initiate an answer from the students, as evidenced by 4.2 seconds of silence (an EWT) in Line 26. It is interesting that although the wait-times are extended, they fail to initiate answers from the class. T then repeats the second part of the question in Lines 27 and 28, but these pure repetitions also fail to initiate an answer from the students, possibly because the wait-time is not extended in Line 30. Note also that in Line 29, one of the students (S2) did not understand the questions. S2's reaction in a lower voice tone in her mother tongue (*"What do "these things" refer to?"*) indicates that she had some difficulty understanding the task. However, this was not oriented by the teacher, as presumably it was uttered in a softer voice. This might also be a reason for not getting an answer from the class.

After 1.3 seconds of silence (a WT) in Line 30, T resorts to another strategy, using a narrowed-down repetition, as initiation strategy. This narrowed-down repetition differs from that which Kääntä (2010, p.163, pp.175-176, p.239) referred to. Kääntä (2010) argued that these types of narrowing are realized by reformulating the initial question through a different one to narrow down the answer possibilities. In this extract, however, T explicitly focuses only on the second question to narrow it down and make it clearer (*lets focus on this question*). While narrowing the three-part question into a simpler and shorter one, T also benefits from an embodied action

(turning to the board and showing the question by tapping twice) to show specifically that part of the question. After this embodied narrowed-down repetition strategy, 30 seconds of silence (an EWT) come in Line 33. However, this initiation strategy also fails to obtain answers from the students, although the wait-time is extremely extended. In Line 34, S3 does not follow what they are doing and asks her desk mate, accompanied by a poking embodied action (*"what are we doing"*), followed by S4's embodied action showing where they are and what they are doing in the book.

From Lines 34 to 43, T wanders around the students' chairs, indicating that she is waiting for an answer. However, after no student participation, T explicitly says that, as the current speaker, she will select the next speaker (*or i will choose*) in Line 36. However, T does not do so, and another WT of 2.1 seconds of silence follows. Then in Line 38, T adds an adverb (*randomly*) in her smiling tone of voice, which shows that she is softening her warning to select the next speaker, even though she does not do so.

In Line 40, T deploys a token (*yes hhh*) and expects answers from the students; however, another WT of 2.1 seconds of silence in Line 41 shows that there is no contribution by the students, and this failure of initiation leads to Line 42, in which T resorts to her narrowed-down repetition strategy again by asking the specific part of the question. In Line 44, T provides another relatively longer EWT of 6.7 seconds of silence for them to formulate a response. Nevertheless, this results in another failure of initiation, as T takes the turn again in Line 45, and not one of the students. This time, however, T employs another strategy to initiate answers from the students: hinting (Ro & Kim, 2024) in Line 45. That is, T produces a prompt in reference to the content regarding the habits of different genders with (*think about (.) your(.)brother, for example*). After presenting a prompt in Line 45, T benefits from an interactional space for 7.5 seconds of silence (an EWT) in Line 46 to allow the students to absorb the new information and plan their turns. With the hint (*brother*), T aims to facilitate the students to respond and express their ideas in order to initiate the second part of the IRF sequence. By hinting through a prompt, T also simplifies the original question by providing a relatively more familiar example to allow the whole class to comprehend. However, the EWT in Line 46 are not followed by any student's contribution, as is evident in Line 47, where it is T again who takes the turn to repeat the question as part of her classroom idiolect. In Line 49, T resists

“filling the silence” (Walsh, 2006, p.131) by allowing another extremely longer EWT of 11.3 seconds of silence, but this also fails to initiate an answer from the students. Thus, T attempts to initiate an answer again by deploying a request for action (Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2024) Line 50 (COME ON) in a louder voice, indicating that she expects an answer immediately. It can be claimed that the use of a request for action successfully initiates an answer from the students, as one of them (S6) nominates himself by raising his hand to provide an answer in Line 51. Upon this, T gives a turn to S6 in Line 52.

After this initiation strategy serves its purpose, the second part of the IRF sequence starts in Line 53, where S6 produces his response with a grammatical mistake and mispronunciation. However, T chooses not to repair it in order to “enable learners to express themselves” (Walsh, 2006, p.66) as a part of the classroom context mode. This is also evidenced by the WT of 1.1 seconds of silence in Line 54, where T provides more space for S6 to express himself. T’s first management of a pursue strategy comes in Line 55, where she deploys a continuer (Mm hm) as an expansion elicitor (Girgin & Brandt, 2020) to keep the channel open. It can also be claimed that the embodied actions of T raising her eyebrows with a wry smile while curling her lips, starting from Line 53, also enables S6 to continue. Note that even though one of the students (S2) switches into her mother tongue in Lines 59 and 62, T does not orient to this and waits for S6 to continue to speak in Lines 65 and 69 (see the WTs of 2.1 seconds of silence in Line 65 and 2.3 seconds of silence in Line 69). However, these WTs fail to serve their purposes, possibly because they are not extended, and T pursues the rest of the answers from the student by explicitly nominating S6 in Line 70. The use of this explicit address term could be claimed to be used as a management of the second pursue strategy, as S6 takes the turn and continues to speak Line 71. Through another strategy in the form of direct repair (Walsh, 2006) of S6’s mistake in Line 73, T still pursues the interaction with the same interactant, S6. Then T uses different pursue strategies to keep the interaction going in Lines 76 and 78. T completes the turn (a collaborative turn sequence) (Lerner, 2004; Walsh, 2006) by providing a word in Line 76 (necessary=) as a pursue strategy, and S6 repeats the response in Line 77, thereby speaking further. T resorts to a DIU (Koshik, 2002) in Line 78 (but women?) as one of her pursue strategies, and in Line 79, S6 takes a fuller turn by comparing the differences between male and female consumer habits. Although T uses (Mm hm) as an expansion elicitor accompanied by a nodding action (Girgin & Brandt, 2020;



Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Şimşek, 2022) in Line 80 to keep the channel open, S6 does not produce more talk. In Line 82, T reformulates S6's answer to take the attention of the class at the same time as targeting a specific group in the class (they want °to° buy everything YES girls defend yourself), thereby using this as a pursue strategy with different interactants (see Section 4.2).

Overall, Extract 4 demonstrates that (E)WTs might fail to lead to students' involvement, regardless of their durations. In such cases, the teacher uses particular initiation strategies to conduct a whole-class speaking activity, such as a commentary (Line 14), pure repetitions (Lines 16-20, and 25-27) and narrowed-down repetitions (Lines 31-32), teasing a student (Line 22), hinting (Line 45) and using a request for action (Line 50), thereby successfully achieving participation (Realization 7). In addition, Extract 4 shows that the teacher successfully pursues the interaction with the same interactant (S6) by using the continuer (Mm hm) as an expansion elicitor in Line 55, nominating the student by using an explicit address term in Line 70, performing a direct repair in Line 73, producing a collaborative turn sequence in Line 76, and using a DIU in Line 78 (see Realization 8).

#### **Realization 7 Management of Initiation**

1	T	Initiation
2		WT
3	T	Commentary
4		WT
5	T	Pure repetitions
6		(E) WT
7	T	Teasing
8		EWT
9	T	Pure repetitions
10		(E) WT
11	T	Narrowed down repetition
12		EWT

13	T	Hinting
14		EWT
15	T	Request for action
16		WT
17	S	Response via self-selection

#### **Realization 8 Management of Pursue with The Same Interactant**

1	S	Response
2	T	Using a continuer
3	S	Response
4	T	Nominating the student by using an explicit address term
5	S	Response
6	T	Repair
7	S	Response
8	T	Collaborative turn sequence/ Turn completion
9	S	Response
10	T	Using a Designedly Incomplete Utterance (DIU)
11	S	Response

## **4.2. The Management of Pursue Strategies with Different Interactants**

Section 4.1 has presented the teacher's management of response initiation strategies after (E)WTs fail to lead to any student involvement. Section 4.1 also demonstrated several sets of examples in which the teacher pursued an interaction with the same participant. Section 4.1 focused on the teacher's pursue strategies with the same interactant and demonstrated that the teacher had successfully pursued the interaction with the same participant by providing positive feedback in Extracts 1 (perfect) and 2 (nice), a confirmation check in Extract 1 (you mean we have different skills), repairs in Extracts 2 (death) and 4 (men buy=), a collaborative

turn sequence in Extract 4 (necessary=), DIUs ( till? ) in Extract 2, and ( but women? ) in Extract 4, using continuers in Extracts 1 and 4, nodding embodied action in Extract 3 and nominating the student by using an explicit address term in Extract ( yes s6 ). Section 4.2 will now present a detailed analysis of the teacher's management of pursue strategies with different interactants during the whole-class speaking activities. This section presents the analysis of three extracts which are continuations of the extracts (i.e., Extracts 2, 3, and 4) analyzed in Section 4.1.

Extract 5 is the continuation of Extract 2 in Section 4.1. It shows that after the teacher successfully initiates the response sequence and pursues more talk from the same interactant (see S1 in Extract 2), she pursues further talk from different students. As mentioned in the discussion of Extract 2 (see Section 4.1), the teacher's pedagogical goal was determined by the material, the coursebook, so the mode is Materials Mode (Walsh, 2006). The teacher refers to the grammar points, focusing on the second conditional in the language reference section in the book (see Appendix E). With the help of the example question and answer, the teacher directs the question to the whole class and switches from the Materials Mode to the Classroom Context Mode (Walsh, 2006). After the successful initiation of the sequence with S1 in Extract 2 through the question asking what the students would do if they won a million dollars, Extract 5 shows the teacher's pursue strategies, such as current-speaker-selects-next and pure repetition, to involve different interactants.

**Extract 5: A Million Dollars (21.25–22.40)**

28 T ♦Mm hm♦ very nice okay  
 ♦ nods ♦  
 29 (1.1)  
 30 T >yes S2 what about you what would you do if you won< a  
 31 million dollars  
 ((lines between 32–36 are omitted))  
 37 (1.1)  
 38 T > yes S3 what about you what would do if you < (1.1) er:m  
 39 won a million dollars  
 40 S3 i would do investments  
 41 T #iNvestments†#(.)okay(.)nice(.)great idea

≠ her eyes glaze up ≠  
 42 (1.1)  
 43 T >what about you s4 what would you do if you won a million  
 44 dollars<  
 ((t coughs for 3.8))  
 45 S4 ♪ er:m i would ™ er:m travel er:m ♪ disneyland  
 ♪ rolls her eyes up ♪  
 ™ tidies her hair ---> l. 48  
 46 T ♣ REALLY↑ ♣  
 ♣ raises her eyebrows ♣  
 47 (1.3)  
 48 T you would travel to(.)disneyland okay(.)s5 ™> what about you  
 s4 ---> ™

After closing the sequence (♦Mm hm♦ very nice okay) in Line 28, a WT of 1.1 seconds follows in Line 29 (see also Extract 2). Because there is no self-selection from the class, T, as the current speaker, selects S2 to respond as the next speaker in Line 30 and immediately repeats the original question from Extract 2 (see Appendix E). However, Lines 32–36 are omitted because S2 refuses to respond and continues speaking in her mother tongue, thereby choosing not to participate in the activity. During 1.1 seconds of silence in Line 37, there is no self-selection by the students to take the turn, so in Line 38, T, as the current speaker, selects the next speaker again by directly nominating S3 to pursue more talk from different students. It is evident that this turn allocation practice of the current speaker selecting the next serves its purpose successfully, since S3, as a different interactant, takes the turn to produce his response in Line 40. It can therefore be claimed that, as Pomerantz (1984) stated, S3 produces a preferred response because S3's answer comes immediately without any hesitation or delay (see Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Schegloff, 2007). It is also evident that T takes S3's response as a preferred one because she repeats S3's contribution with a rising intonation accompanied by an embodied action (*her eyes glaze up*), and provides feedback before closing the sequence (*okay (.) nice (.) great idea*) in Line 41 (Schegloff, 2007; Waring 2008).

After another WT of 1.1 seconds in Line 42, with no self-selection to volunteer to take the floor, T, as the current speaker, again selects the next speaker through the

explicit nomination of S4 in Line 43. T again directs the same question to S4 using an explicit address term (the student's name) through a quicker delivery, as evidenced by the right and left carat signs in Lines 43-44. Even though the response is given in hesitation (*er:m*) accompanied by S4's eye-rolling embodied action (Pomerantz, 1984), this pursue strategy with different interactants is successful, as S4 formulates a response related to the topic. Upon receiving S4's response in Line 45, T delays the repair sequence with a question (*♣ REALLY↑ ♣*) to extend S4's answer with a rising intonation accompanied by a raising eyebrow gesture in Line 46. T's deployment of (*♣ REALLY↑ ♣*) might be claimed to serve as a topicalizer (i.e., see third-turn sequences in topic management) (Button & Casey, 1984, 1985). However, this does not work, as after a WT of 1.3 seconds of silence in Line 47, S4 neither extends her answer nor repairs it. Then, T initiates a direct repair with the help of a teacher echo (Walsh, 2006), and by repeating S4's answer, T provides the correct version (*you would travel to(.)disneyland*). With this repair in Line 48, a brief mode-side sequence to the Skills and System mode occurs. After closing the sequence with S4 (*okay*), T again resorts to current-speaker-selects-next as her pursue strategy to involve different interactants and delivers her question using an explicit address term (*s5 TM > what about you*) in the following part of Line 48.

After the teacher successfully initiated the student's (S1) response and pursued interaction with the same student (S1) (see Extract 2, Section 4.1), she employed current-speaker-selects-next and pure repetition strategies in Lines 30, 38, 43, and 48 to pursue more talk from different students (see Realization 9), which successfully served its purpose, since the students nominated by the teacher formulated their responses in the following lines, as can be seen in Extract 5.

**Realization 9 Management of Pursue with different interactants**

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | T | Current-speaker-selects-next + Repetition |
| 2 | S | Response                                  |

Extract 6 is the continuation of Extract 3 analyzed in the previous section (see Section 4.1). This activity again comes from the coursebook and is supposed to be conducted as a work-in-small-groups activity (see Appendix D), but the teacher modifies it into a whole-class-speaking activity, creating a mode switch from Materials to Classroom Context Mode (Walsh, 2006). As shown in Extract 3 in Section 4.1, after

the successful initiation of a response from a student (S8) on the target topic in Line 82, the teacher pursued the interaction with the same interactant (S8) until Line 89. After closing the turn through positive feedback and reformulating S8's answer for the whole class in Lines 87-89, the teacher pursued the interaction with a different student who self-selected (S3). Being different from the strategies of current-speaker-select-next and pure repetition, as demonstrated in Extract 5, Extract 6 presents a set of examples of management strategies through which the teacher pursues interactions with different interactants, such as using a continuer accompanied by a nod and repair.

**Extract 6: What Advice (23.26-24.25)**

87 T =very nice(.)if they are late for the appointment they should  
 88 get up ea:rly and(.)be ready for the appointment okay getting  
 89 up is the solution  
 90 T Ω you Ω yes (.) S3  
 s3 Ω raises his hand Ω  
 91 S3 lets say(.)this person is going to meet(.)someone at ten pm=  
 92 T \*=Mm hm\*  
 \* nods \*  
 93 S3 and (.) erm that person have to (.) take bus [and bus]  
 94 T [Mm hm ]  
 95 S3 bus (.) take that person in thirty minutes=  
 96 T \*=Mm hm=\*  
 \* nods \*  
 97 S3 =so he should set up he might set up nine thirty=  
 98 T \*=Mm hm=\*  
 \* nods \*  
 99 S3 =im going to exit(.)home(.)and going to bus at Σ this time=  
 s9 Σ raises her hand --  
 ->l.l01  
 100 T \*=Mm hm\*  
 \* nods \*  
 101 S3 if he(.)or she sets an alarm(.)that way Σ e:rm(.)he might(.)  
 S9 ---> Σ

102        dont be late

103    T    \* [Mm hm ] \*

             \*        nods        \*

104    S3   [in the moment]

105    T    he wont be late=

106    S3   =yes

107    T    very nice in this case okay nice S9 yes please

108    S9   erm he should take appointments e:rm (.) late=

109    T    \*=Mm hm=\*

             \*        nods        \*

110    S9   =late hours gibi=

**like**

             "Like late hours"

111    T    \*=Mm hm\* late hours okay

             \*        nods        \*

112        (1.7)

113    T    nice

114        (1.3)

115    T    nice

In Line 90, T gives the turn to a student who self-selects (S3) by using an explicit address term ( $\Omega$  you         $\Omega$  yes (.) S3) and pursues more talk by using a bridging continuer accompanied by a nodding embodied action (=Mm hm) to keep the channel open in Line 92 (Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Şimşek, 2022). This management of a pursue strategy evidently serves its purpose, since S3 continues to produce more talk in Line 93. T's other uses of the continuer accompanied by her nodding embodied action (Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Şimşek, 2022) in Lines 94, 96, 98, 100, and 103 are also successful, as evidenced in the following lines (95, 97, 99, 101, and 104), where it is S3 who continues to speak further. Another example of T's deployment of the pursue strategy comes in Line 105 through a repair (Walsh, 2006) (he won't be late=). This successfully results in S3's confirmation in Line 106 (=yes). After S3's confirmation, T closes the sequence by providing positive feedback (very nice in this case, okay nice) in Line

107. Upon this feedback, in the following part of Line 107, T gives the turn to S9, who raises her hand (self-selection) between Lines 99-101 through an explicit address term (S9 yes please). S9 delivers her response in Line 108 in a latch with a continuer (=Mm hm=) accompanied by T's nodding embodied action (Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Şimşek, 2022) in Line 109. It can be claimed that T's embodied response pursue strategy successfully serves its purpose since S9 continues to speak further in Line 110. After this, T closes the sequence with S9 through positive feedback (nice) (Walsh, 2006) in Lines 113 and 115.

Taken together, the above analysis shows that after successfully initiating and pursuing a response with S8 (see Extract 3 in Section 4.1.) the teacher also successfully pursues more talk from different students (S3 and S9 in this case) through a continuer accompanied by her nodding embodied action in Lines 92, 94, 96, 98, 100, 103, and 109 and repair in Line 105.

**Realization 10 Management of Pursue with different interactants**

1	T	Continuing with different students who self-select
2	S	Response
3	T	Using a continuer + Nodding
4	S	Response
5	T	Using a continuer + Nodding
6	S	Response
7	T	Using a continuer + Nodding
8	S	Response
9	T	Using a continuer
10	S	Response
11	T	Using a continuer
12	S	Response
13	T	Repair
14	S	Response



Extract 7 is the continuation of Extract 4 in Section 4.1. This demonstrates that after successfully initiating a fuller response and pursuing further talk with the same speaker (see S6 in Extract 4), the teacher pursues more talk with different students by employing several strategies which are different from those deployed in Extracts 5 and 6 analyzed above, such as using a request for action, targeting a specific group, positive feedback, and a collaborative turn sequence. As explained in the discussion of Extract 4 of Section 4.1, the pedagogic aim, which is evaluating claims, is determined by the material, the coursebook, so the mode begins in Materials Mode (Walsh, 2006). The activities in the section (see Appendix F) are supposed to be conducted through a discussion between partners, but the teacher adapts the discussion-between-partners activity to a whole-class speaking activity, creating a switch from Materials Mode to Classroom Context Mode (Walsh, 2006).

**Extract 7: Modern Women (15.25-16.15)**

82 T they want °to° buy everything YES girls defend yourself  
83 (3.2)  
84 T please↓ defend yourself  
85 S6 °they follow [(inaudible)°]  
86 T Ω [THEY FOLLOW ]  
t ☞ leans forward to s6  
S8 Ω raises her hand ---> l. 90  
87 S6 fashion=  
88 T =FAShion  
89 S6 more (.) than (.) us  
90 T [more than] okay men Mm hm(.) yes↑ S8 Ω  
---> Ω  
91 S6 [inaudible]  
92 S8 erm we we buy erm (1.3) everything we dont erm erm we dont  
93 buy everything  
94 T nice  
95 S8 erm we buy only e:rm=  
96 T =what we need=  
97 S8 =what we need

After repeating S6's answer at the beginning of Line 82, as can also be seen in Extract 4 of Section 4.1, T pursues more talk from different students by using a request for action (Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2024) and targeting a specific group (*YES girls defend yourself*). However, this pursue strategy fails to lead to any student involvement, as evidenced by 3.2 seconds of silence (an EWT) in Line 83. Upon this, T continues to pursue more talk using another request for action in Line 84 (*please↓ defend yourself*) (Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2024). Interestingly, S6, as the same interactant (see Extract 4 above), takes the turn again to expand on his idea and delivers his answer in a quieter tone of voice in Line 85. T repeats his answer, possibly for the sake of the whole class in Line 86. However, it should be noted that T's use of the second request for action as a pursue strategy results in self-selection by S8 in Line 86. It can therefore be claimed that T's use of a request for action as well as targeting a specific group succeed in generating more talk from the class. In Line 90, using an explicit address term (*yes↑ S8*), T gives the turn to S8 as a different speaker. After S8 produces her answer in Lines 92 and 93, T gives positive feedback in Line 94 (*nice*), possibly to encourage the student to say more. It can be claimed that giving positive feedback as a strategy to pursue more talk is successful because, in Line 95, S8 continues to produce more talk. In addition, note also that T completes the turn in Line 96 (a collaborative turn sequence) (Lerner, 2004; Walsh, 2006), possibly to help the student say more, thereby pursuing more talk. However, after repeating T's answer, S8 does not produce more talk, and T closes the channel by providing another positive feedback (*perfect*) in Line 98.

Extract 7 shows that after the successful initiation and pursue of a response with the same student (S6), the teacher uses a different set of response pursue strategies from those resorted to in Extracts 5 and 6 above to involve different students, such as using a request for action and targeting a specific group in Lines 82 and 84 (*YES girls defend yourself*) and (*please↓ defend yourself*), which eventually results in the self-selection of S8. In addition, the teacher provides positive feedback in Line 94 (*nice*) and produces a collaborative turn sequence in Line 96 (*=what we need=*) to successfully pursue different students' involvement during whole-class speaking activity.

#### **Realization 11 Management of Pursue with different interactants**

1	T	Request for action + Targeting a specific group
2		EWT
3	T	Request for action + Targeting a specific group
4	S	Response via self-selection
5	T	Positive feedback
6	S	Response
8	T	Collaborative turn sequence/ Turn completion
9	S	Response

### **4.3. Summary of the Findings**

The findings of this study show that if WTs are not extended, they do not lead to any student involvement. In addition, even if they are extended, they might not always serve the purpose of enabling students to form a response by allowing them enough time, thereby not leading to any student participation. The teacher deployed a range of strategies both to manage the initiation and to pursue the interaction after (E)WTs failed. The extracts analyzed specifically show that while the teacher is pursuing a conversation with the same interactant, she can also pursue the interaction with different participants. In this chapter, the analyses are presented in two sections: (1) the teacher's management of initiation strategies when (E)WTs fail to lead to any student involvement along with her response pursue strategies with the same interactant, and (2) the teacher's management of response pursue strategies with different interactants.

The first section, Section 4.1, focused on the teacher's management of response initiation strategies in which she pursued the interaction with the same interactant. For example, it was demonstrated that the teacher resorted to particular strategies to initiate a response from the class when her (E)WTs failed, such as narrowed-down repetitions (Extracts 1 and 4) and pure repetitions (Extract 2, 3, and 4). Other response initiation strategies were in the form of hinting (Extracts 2, 3, and 4). Scaffolding by reformulation as an initiation strategy was also demonstrated in Extract 3. The

teacher's other management of the response initiation strategy was also seen in the form of using a request for action in Extracts 3 and 4. Using commentary and ironic teasing as the teacher's response initiation strategies were shown in Extract 4.

Following the teacher's successful management of response initiation strategies after the failures of (E)WTs, she created learning opportunities for the students to nominate themselves to take the turn. The teacher also pursued the interaction with the same speaker who self-selected by means of the strategies examined in detail above, such as using a continuer (Extracts 1 and 4) and providing feedback (Extracts 1 and 2). As evident in the extracts, the teacher resorted to a confirmation check in Extract 1 as one of her pursue strategies. She also deployed DIUs and repairs to pursue interaction with the same interactant, as seen in Extracts 2 and 4. Nods were found to be another of the teacher's pursue strategies in Extract 3. Collaborative turn sequences/turn completions as a pursue strategy with the same interactant were seen in Extract 4. The teacher also pursued the interaction with the same interactant by nominating the speaker using an explicit address term in Extract 4.

As seen in Section 4.2, management strategies to pursue interactions with different speakers might differ from those deployed to pursue interactions with the same interactant discussed in Section 4.1. These strategies enabled the teacher to successfully pursue conversations with different speakers. The second section, Section 4.2, therefore examined the characteristics of the teacher's management of response pursue strategies with different interactants. The findings presented in Section 4.2 showed that the teacher used several strategies to pursue the interaction with different speakers. Extract 5 showed that she employed current-speaker-selects-next as a strategy to pursue more talk from different interactants and Extract 6 showed her use of a continuer, a nod and repair as pursue strategies with other speakers. The teacher's other pursue strategies were found to be requesting for action targeting a specific group, feedback and turn completions in Extract 7.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND IMPLICATIONS**

In this chapter, the findings will be discussed with reference to the literature discussed in the previous chapters. This chapter will also discuss creating learning opportunities and classroom interactional competence, and creating space for learning through nodding embodied resources. This chapter will conclude with a consideration of the pedagogical implications of the findings and suggestions for further research into the phenomenon investigated in this study.

#### **5.1. Discussion and Conclusion**

Previous studies of (E)WTs have mainly been based on their implementation, duration and effectiveness. They were based on various research fields. Pioneering research was mainly related to the field of science education and drew conclusions from tape-recordings (Fowler, 1975; Rowe, 1972; Tobin, 1980). Mathematics has also been a focus of attention in EWT research (Heinze & Erhard, 2006; Ingram & Elliott, 2014; Tobin, 1986). Tobin (1986) based his conclusion on tape-recorded data analyzed through statistical tests, and Heinze and Erhard (2006) video-taped lessons and calculated the wait-times. On the other hand, Ingram and Elliott (2014) focused on turn-taking and silences in mathematics lessons using CA. The literature review also presented many studies which had focused on EWTs in language education (for example, Alsaadi & Atar, 2019; Aras, 2007; Atar, 2020a, 2020b; Daslin & Zainil, 2020; Kamdideh & Barjesteh, 2019; Mak, 2011; Shrum & Tech, 1985; Süt, 2020; Wasik & Hindman, 2018; White & Lightbown, 1984; Yaqubi & Rokni, 2012; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2016; Zainil et al., 2023), but those studies differed in terms of their research methodologies. For example, White and Lightbown (1984) focused on question-answer exchanges and counted and measured wait-times through a quantitative analysis. Shrum and Tech (1985) drew conclusions from a descriptive study on Spanish and French lessons and recorded and coded the data to measure wait-times. Aras (2007) used a quasi-experimental design to study the use of EWTs in an EFL context.

Mak (2011) studied the effect of EWT on Chinese ESL learners' anxiety through the quantitative analysis of questionnaires. Kamdideh and Barjesteh (2019) investigated the effect of EWTs on Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate through a quasi-experimental research design and questionnaires. After the 2000s, the literature showed an increased use of CA as a methodology for examining the use of EWT in language education, specifically in EFL contexts (for example, Alsaadi & Atar, 2019; Atar, 2020a, 2020b; Daslin & Zainil, 2020; Süt, 2020; Yaqubi & Rokni, 2012; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2016; Zainil et al., 2023). Although these studies investigated EWT in language education through CA, their focus was either on its duration (Daslin & Zainil, 2020; Zainil et al., 2023) or on the effect of limited wait-time (Yaqubi & Rokni, 2012; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2016). Alsaadi and Atar (2019) examined student reaction wait-time in a Saudi EFL context. Atar (2020a, 2020b) conducted two studies on wait-time, focusing on how pre-service teachers interrupted it and awareness raising on pre-service teachers' use of wait-time. Süt (2020) also examined the use of wait-time, but her context differed in terms of the participants. She specifically focused on the use of wait-time by native ESL teachers in an EAP context. Even though their contexts, fields and methodologies varied, the research studies listed above highlighted the importance of the effective use of EWT to create more learning opportunities and suggested providing longer wait-times for enhanced student answers. However, the strategies used when (E)WTs fail to initiate responses from students have not been addressed in great detail. Therefore, research from a micro-analytic perspective examining the specific strategies employed by a teacher when (E)WTs fail to initiate responses from students in EFL classrooms, specifically during whole-class speaking activities, might be considered as underexplored. To contribute to and extend the literature, this study was designed to provide insights into the strategies used by an EFL teacher during whole-class speaking activities to keep the channel open when (E)WTs fail to facilitate student engagement.

Using multimodal CA, this study firstly investigated an EFL teacher's management of response initiation strategies when (E)WTs fail to lead to student involvement during whole-class speaking activities. The findings have demonstrated that if WTs are not extended, they do not lead to any student involvement. In addition, even if they are extended, they might not always serve the purpose of enabling students to form a response by allowing them enough time, thereby not leading to any student participation. Maroni (2011) cautioned that simply waiting longer does not always

result in coherent answers, emphasizing the need to combine pauses with relevant verbal prompts to encourage student involvement. Regarding this issue, the literature suggests that teachers tend to ask display questions, if wait-time is less than three seconds (Barnette et al., 1995; DeTure & Miller, 1985; Swift & Gooding, 1983). On the other hand, when EWTs fail to lead to student responses, teachers often employ techniques, such as repeating and redirecting the questions to other students or the whole class (Barnette et al., 1995) and modification in questioning (Atar, 2016; Atar & Seedhouse, 2018; Barnette et al., 1995; DeTure & Miller, 1985; Fagan et al., 1981; Rice, 1977; Swift & Gooding, 1983; Tobin, 1986). Barnette et al. (1995), for example, found that teachers who deploy EWTs are likely to provide opportunities for the entire class to contribute responses by repeating the questions and redirecting them to other students or the entire class. As for modification in questioning, it has been illustrated that teachers are more inclined to pose high-level cognitive questions after EWTs are employed (Fagan et al., 1981; Rice, 1977; Tobin, 1986). Swift and Gooding (1983), on the other hand, proposed that evaluative questions are more frequently used after EWTs. Clarification requests and elaboration questions (i.e., teacher probing) have also been claimed to be used after a wait-time of two to three seconds or more (Atar, 2016; Atar & Seedhouse, 2018; Barnette et al., 1995).

#### **5.1.1. Initiation strategies in managing whole-class speaking activities when (E)WTs fail to initiate responses from students**

Similar to the findings of the literature, this study shows that if the WT is not extended, this does not result in any student involvement. In addition, the findings of the current study indicate that even EWTs might not consistently result in student participation, irrespective of their duration (Extract 2 Line 5, 11.7 seconds of EWT; Extract 4 Line 33, 30 seconds of EWT; Extract 4 Line 49, 11.3 seconds of EWT). Consequently, the teacher might need to adapt and implement different strategies to increase student engagement, thereby being responsive to the moment (Waring et al., 2016). It should be argued at this point that attributing a limit to what constitutes an EWT (i.e., the duration of it) might be misleading when students' (un)willingness to participate is considered, especially during whole-class speaking activities in L2 classrooms in which students are required to use the target language by responding to teachers' referential questions. This might be the reason why Walsh (2006) did not

attribute a duration limit to wait-time, defining it solely as allowing sufficient time (i.e., several seconds) for students to formulate a response. It should be acknowledged, of course, that it is very hard to present evidence for this from the lines of the extracts analyzed for this thesis. However, in Extract 3, during the omitted part (Lines 60-76), the teacher deals with a classroom managerial issue in the form of a small talk among the students about the use of a cellphone during the lesson, which might show the unwillingness stance of the students to speak. Similarly, in Extract 5, where the teacher wants to pursue more talk from different students, during the omitted part (Lines 32-36), a student refuses to speak and continues speaking in Turkish, thereby choosing not to participate in the activity.

From a broader perspective, the findings have shown some similar strategies deployed by teachers when (E)WTs fail to lead to student involvement to those identified in the literature (for example, Alsaadi & Atar, 2019; Atar, 2016; Atar & Seedhouse, 2018; Barnette et al., 1995; Fowler, 1975; Heinze & Erhard, 2006; Holley & King, 1971; Maroni, 2011; Rowe, 1972; Shrum & Tech, 1985; Süt, 2020; Tobin, 1986; White & Lightbown, 1984; Yaqubi & Rokni, 2012; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2016). The teacher used narrowed-down repetitions (Extracts 1 and 4), pure repetitions (Extracts 2, 3 and 4), hinting (Extracts 2, 3 and 4), reformulation (Extract 3), clarification (Extract 3), requesting for action (Extracts 3 and 4), commentary and ironic teasing (Extract 4) as her response initiation strategies when (E)WTs failed to lead to student involvement during whole-class speaking activities. However, a detailed sequential analysis revealed that when the WT is less than three seconds, the teacher uses pure repetitions (Extracts 2, 3, and 4), scaffolding by reformulation (Extract 3), clarification (Extract 3), and commentary (Extract 4) to initiate responses from the class, thereby not resisting the temptation of filling the silence. On the other hand, when the WT is three seconds or more (i.e., EWT), it was found that the teacher uses hinting (Extracts 2, 3, and 4), narrowed-down repetition (Extracts 1 and 4), requesting for action (Extracts 3 and 4), and ironic teasing (Extract 4) to initiate responses from the class. Therefore, the findings of this study have extended and detailed the literature on the sets of strategies that teachers utilize to initiate responses from students through the lens of CA, which can prove beneficial in providing solutions to both pre- and in-service teachers to effectively manage classroom interaction during whole-class speaking activities.



It should be highlighted at this point that the findings of the study suggest that there is not one effective technique that fosters involvement, but a combination of them. That is why the acronym, (E)WT, was used throughout the analysis procedure (i.e., not to overlook the WT practices of the teacher), as the deployment of them in a sequence might have paved the way for participation. For example, it looks like hinting works out for initiating an answer from the class in Extract 2; however, it is not as effective as in doing so in Extract 3, where the teacher's use of pure repetition along with a request for action fosters participation from the class. Similarly, it looks like pure repetition does not work out for initiating a response from the class in Extract 2, where the teacher's use of hinting facilitates participation; however, it is effective in doing so in Extract 3, where one of the students self-selects and provides an answer right after it. This highlights the significance of teachers' adaptability and being responsive to the moment in the use of unplanned scaffolding techniques (Walsh, 2006; Waring, 2016; Waring et al., 2016) to facilitate student involvement and hence learning in the classroom. In addition, since the teacher's use of these techniques effectively results in the students' self-selection and participation after (E)WTs are implemented, it can be claimed that the teacher's management of (E)WT failures in this study is evidence of her CIC.

### **5.1.2. Pursue strategies in managing whole-class speaking activities after initiating the response sequence**

#### ***5.1.2.1. Pursue strategies with the same interactant***

The findings have also shown several key strategies used by the teacher to pursue student responses after a response sequence was initiated. They have also shown that the teacher's pursue strategies with the same interactant differ from those employed with different interactants to keep the channel open. Regarding her response pursue strategies with the same interactants, the teacher pursued more talk from the students by using a continuer (Extracts 1 and 4), providing feedback (Extracts 1 and 2), a confirmation check (Extract 1), DIUs and repairs (Extracts 2 and 4), nods (Extract 3), turn completions and using an explicit address term (Extract 4).

The teacher kept the channel open for the same interactant who self-selects and takes the turn by using continuers, providing positive feedback, confirmation checks, repairs (Walsh, 2006), DIUs (Koshik, 2002), nodding embodied actions (Girgin &

Brandt, 2020; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Kääntä, 2010, 2012; Şimşek, 2022), nominating a student by using an explicit address term, and collaborative turn sequences/turn completions (Lerner, 2004; Walsh, 2006). In order to pursue the interaction with the same interactant who self-selects, the teacher benefitted from continuers (Girgin & Brandt, 2020) in Extract 1 and 4, accompanied by her nodding embodied actions in Extract 1 (Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Kääntä, 2010, 2012; Şimşek, 2022), and nodding alone, as seen in Line 85 in Extract 3. The use of an explicit address term as one of the other strategies to pursue the interaction with the same speaker has been shown in Extract 4 since the teacher directly nominated S6 to give the turn back, while S2 interrupted S6 with her comments in Turkish. The other strategies that the teacher used successfully to pursue the interaction with the same speaker can be seen in prosodic clues and a DIU (Koshik, 2002) from Extract 2 and in Extract 4. As seen in Extract 1, S3 produced confirmations and the teacher answered in a latch followed by S3's confirmation through a nodding embodied action can serve as examples of the teacher's initiation strategies. Collaborative turn sequence (Lerner, 2004) (see also turn completions in Walsh [2006]) as a pursue strategy with the same interactant can be seen in Lines 74 and 76 in Extract 4. S6, as the current speaker has uttered his turn in Line 74, but the rest of the sentence has not been followed, as is evident by a WT of 1.4 seconds of silence. During that silence, there was no answer from S6, so the teacher delivered the searched word in Line 76, followed by S6's confirmation in Line 77, as Lerner (2004) explained. Repairs through echoes (Walsh, 2006) as a pursue strategy with the same interactant were exemplified in S6's utterance in Line 74 and the teacher's repair through echo in Line 73 in Extract 4; the other repair through echo example was in Extract 2, when S1 did not take up the teacher's prosodic clue and DIU (Koshik, 2002) and it was the teacher who repaired by providing the target word, followed by S1's uptake accompanied by his nod. Feedback as a strategy of pursue with the same interactant can be seen with S3, who had self-selected after the successful initiation in Extract 1. Another feedback example can be seen in Extract 2, it was given to the same interactant, S1, who had taken the turn after the initiation and uttered.

#### ***5.1.2.2. Pursue strategies with different interactants***

The findings have also revealed several differences regarding the management of pursue strategies with different interactants in whole-class speaking activities following successful sequence initiations. In order to pursue more talk with different interactants, the teacher deployed current-speaker-selects-next (Extract 5), using a continuer, nod and repair (Extract 6), using requests for action, targeting a specific group, feedback and turn completions (Extract 7). Extract 7 showed that the teacher guided the students into a group discussion using requests for action, since it was S6, a male student, with whom the teacher had pursued the interaction, as seen in Extract 4. The teacher benefitted from feedback to pursue an interaction with S8, who had self-selected after initiating with S6. Collaborative turn sequence (Lerner, 2004) can be seen as the teacher's pursue strategy in Extract 7 in which S8 uttered Line 96 and the teacher provided the rest in Line 97, and this strategy successfully resulted in S8's answer in Line 98. Throughout Extract 5, the teacher, as the current speaker, selected the next interactant insistently by using an explicit address term accompanied by pure repetitions of the original initiation question. Extract 6 started after the teacher's response initiation with S8 in Extract 3, and Extract 6 contained examples of continuer uses accompanied by her nodding embodied action (Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Kääntä, 2010, 2012; Şimşek, 2022) to pursue the interaction with different interactants; in this case, speaker S3. In the following lines, the teacher pursued more talk through repair (Walsh, 2006), after S3's answer including a grammatical mistake in Line 102, when she delivered the correct in Line 105, and S3 followed the teacher's answer in Line 106.

To sum up, this thesis has presented empirical data gathered in an EFL context through video-recordings. The data were examined and transcribed in detail from a micro-analytic perspective by adopting multimodal CA as the research methodology. The aim differed from that of previous research in terms of focus. Previous studies had primarily focused on the use and length of EWT whereas the current study focused on investigating what happened in the language classroom when (E)WT failed to lead students to respond. The findings showed that regardless of the duration, even EWTs might not always result in students' responses. The findings also showed that several key strategies are used by the teacher to pursue student responses after a response sequence was initiated. They also showed that the teacher's pursue strategies with the

same interactant differ from those employed with different interactants to keep the channel open. The next sections will discuss the findings of the thesis in relation to creating learning opportunities and CIC as well as creating space for learning through nodding embodied resources. This thesis will conclude with a consideration of the pedagogical implications of the findings and suggestions for further research into the phenomenon.

### **5.1.3. Creating learning opportunities and CIC**

This study has provided insights into how one EFL teacher managed classroom interaction when (E)WTs failed to lead to student responses during whole-class speaking activities. The findings show that even an EWT does not always lead to student participation, contrary to the literature (for example, Atar, 2020a; 2020b; Barnette et al., 1995; Cotton, 1988; Duell, 1994; Rowe, 1972; Tobin, 1980, 1986). This study's findings demonstrate that when extended wait-time was unsuccessful, the teacher employed a variety of initiation strategies to encourage student involvement, including hinting (Extracts 2, 3, and 4), narrowed-down repetition (Extracts 1 and 4), requests for action, (Extracts 3 and 4), and ironic teasing (Extract 4). These strategies enabled the teacher to create opportunities for students to participate in an interaction through self-selection and hence contribute to the learning and teaching processes. The study also highlights the teacher's ability to pursue an interaction with both the same student and different students through various interactional practices. With the same student, the teacher used continuers, positive feedback, confirmation checks, repairs and collaborative turn completions to extend the student's contributions. With different students, the teacher employed current-speaker-selects-next, continuers with embodied actions, repairs, requests for action, and posing questions which targeted a specific group (females, in this case) to involve more students in the discussion. These findings underscore the complex and dynamic nature of CIC, demonstrating that teachers must constantly adapt their strategies to maintain student engagement and create learning opportunities. For example, this study identified narrowed-down repetition as an initiation strategy when her EWT failed to lead to a student's response (Extract 1). The teacher resorted to this strategy to simplify and shorten the questions for the whole class's sake so that the students could contribute much more easily. The findings have proved that using requests for action and targeting a specific group had

encouraged the students to participate more freely as a group. In language classrooms, teachers are expected to lower the tension and anxiety in order to enable the students to produce and practice the target language. Specifically, in speaking activities, guiding the students into a group discussion can reduce the individual tension on the students and provide a more comfortable learning opportunity in which where they feel safe enough to take risks in using the target language. The results have also shown that the management strategies employed to pursue the interaction with different speakers diverge from those used to pursue interactions with the same interlocutor. However, the findings also proved that these strategies also effectively enabled the participants to engage and the teacher to successfully pursue the conversation. The findings of this study have therefore extended those of previous studies in terms of the management of initiation and pursue strategies with a focus on the interactant and underline the importance of the careful implementation of such strategies during whole-class speaking activities from a micro-analytic perspective. These findings have repeated the emphasis of previous research on raising teachers' awareness of the effective utilization of such strategies when EWTs fail to lead students to participate and respond.

These findings align with those reported in the literature, since they have highlighted the critical importance of CIC for effective language teaching and learning while managing the classroom interaction, and suggest that teachers need a range of interactional strategies to manage classroom discourse (Atar, 2020a; Balaman, 2016; Dilber, 2022; Girgin, 2017; Sert, 2015, 2019; Şimşek, 2022; Walsh, 2006, 2011, 2013). The findings also suggest that teachers require a diverse range of interactional strategies to successfully manage the classroom interaction. According to this study's results, the teacher showed flexibility in adapting strategies when initial attempts had failed to facilitate learning, particularly when EWTs failed to elicit student responses, showcasing her ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating learning in the classroom environment. This aligns closely with Walsh's (2011) concept of CIC. This flexibility in managing classroom interaction as a key aspect of CIC showed how the teacher adapted her interactional practices based on the pedagogical focus and student responses. In the light of this, it can be argued that the teacher's employment of multi-faceted strategies in situations when (E)WTs failed to lead to student responses emerges as one of the key aspects of CIC, highlighting the dynamic and context-sensitive nature of effective teaching. The teacher's ability to switch seamlessly

between different modes of interaction and the deployment of appropriate strategies in real time underscores the complex and fluid nature of classroom discourse. These findings emphasize the intricate and demanding interactional skill required by language teachers and underline the pressing need to develop teachers' awareness, skills and competencies in EFL classrooms to maximize learning potential.

#### **5.1.4. Creating space for learning through embodiment: the case of nodding and the continuer, “Mm hm”**

As discussed in the literature review, teachers' awareness and strategic use of multimodal resources can significantly impact their ability to manage classroom discourse and create a more engaging learning environment. At the same time, attending to students' non-verbal cues can provide valuable information regarding their understanding and engagement. The use of embodied resources, particularly head nods, has emerged as a significant aspect of the teacher's interactional repertoire (Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Kääntä, 2010, 2012; Şimşek, 2022). The literature highlighted that nods are used in conjunction with continuers (such as Mm hm) to acknowledge student contributions and to encourage further elaboration. The results of this study extend the findings of previous research on the multimodal nature of classroom discourse by showing how nodding plays an important role in pursuing student responses and in encouraging student participation in L2 English classrooms. For example, the findings show that the teacher's nodding often accompanied the continuer (Mm hm), serving as an embodied acknowledgment which prompted the students to extend their responses and encouraged them to speak further. It can therefore be claimed that the findings of this study align with those of previous research on the importance of embodiment as integral to the organization of L2 English classroom interaction (for example, Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Kääntä, 2010, 2012; Sert, 2015).

## **5.2. Implications**

The findings of this study have once more emphasized that EWT is a key element of classroom interactions, giving students rehearsal time (Walsh, 2006) to process and formulate responses. However, the results also show that even an EWT alone may not always be sufficient to lead to student participation, particularly in language learning contexts. It is therefore important to raise awareness of the fact that

when an EWT fails to generate student responses, teachers need to employ alternative strategies to maintain effective classroom discourse. The findings have shown that teachers can use strategies such as hinting, narrowed-down repetition, requests for action, and ironic teasing to initiate responses from the class when her EWTs failed to do so. They have also shown that embodied actions, specifically head nods play a crucial role in encouraging student participation.

Based on these findings, this research also recommends a paradigm shift in teacher training, emphasizing the centrality of interactional skills in effective language teaching, and the importance of developing CIC in language-teacher education (Atar, 2020a; Sert, 2011, 2015; Sert & Walsh, 2014). This study also emphasizes the need for teacher education programs to focus on developing a diverse repertoire of interactional strategies which can be useful for transitioning to alternative techniques when necessary. Therefore, this study also suggests incorporation of developing such skills into L2 teacher training programs conducted for four years in undergraduate levels in the Faculties of Education in Türkiye. By drawing attention to the multimodal nature of the interaction, verbal and non-verbal aspects of the interaction can be integrated into the pre-service teachers' theoretical education by the curriculum designers and in-service teachers' training programs by the department of in-service training. Following the theoretical education on multimodality of the interaction, it can also be suggested that raising practitioners' awareness of CIC by analyzing recordings of classroom interactions and engaging them in reflective practices is vital. Both pre- and in-service teachers can be engaged in reflective practices to integrate these skills into trainings of both pre- and in-service teachers periodically in order to enable them be aware of what they do in the classroom, reflect on their own performance, and learn from observed practices through a micro-detailed analysis of classroom interactions (Atar, 2020a, 2020b; Sert, 2015, 2019; Walsh, 2006, 2011). Through analyzing video recordings of classroom interactions, practitioners can identify effective practices and areas for improvement and follow the developments in their own fields and develop professionally by keeping up with the both existing and new trends.

Workshops for pre- and in-service teachers, both face to face and virtual, can also be recommended to identify, compare and share experiences regarding the similarities and differences cross-culturally so that practitioners can collaborate by extending the scope of their teaching practices in terms of their fields, levels of the students, and teaching contexts. Through these shared experiences, corpora,

guidelines, and materials such as handbooks can be developed to be benefitted from among practitioners to self-educate.

If teachers are equipped with multimodal awareness of verbal and non-verbal strategies, they can purposefully adapt their approach to the specific classroom context, pedagogical goals, and individual student needs, ultimately creating more dynamic and inclusive learning environments in which they can maximize student participation and hence their learning potential.

Overall, developing teachers' interactional competence should be seen as a fundamental and ongoing process in teacher education which requires sustained attention and practice. By prioritizing the development of CIC through teacher training, teachers can be empowered to create more engaging, responsive, and effective learning environments for their students.

### **5.3. Suggestions for Future Research**

This study used a micro-analytic CA approach to examine an EFL teacher's management of response initiation and pursue strategies when her (E)WTs failed to lead to student involvement during whole-class speaking activities. The findings showed that even EWTs do not always serve the intended purpose of providing students with sufficient time to formulate responses, and that teachers might need to employ additional interactional strategies to facilitate student involvement, such as hinting narrowed-down repetition, requests for action, and ironic teasing. After response initiation, teachers might need to use other strategies to pursue the interaction, such as continuers, positive feedback, confirmation checks, DIUs, repairs, nodding, explicit address terms and turn completions. However, these strategies might differ when the interaction is pursued with different speakers. Teachers could benefit from nominating other students with current-speaker-selects-next, using requests for action, and targeting a specific group.

To better understand whether the strategies which the teacher resorted to in cases of EWTs' failures would differ in other contexts, further studies could be conducted in different modes and different lessons. Investigation into the strategies to initiate and pursue an interaction when EWTs fail in other contexts is beyond the scope of the present study, and this finding is limited to whole-class speaking activities in EFL classrooms. It is also important to bear in mind that the findings of this study are



based on a particular setting in which one EFL teacher was observed. To better understand the practices of initiation and pursue strategies, there should be more studies on different contexts with different participants.

In addition to these diverse strategies, this study has also reiterated the importance of embodied actions, particularly head nods, to facilitate meaning-making and hence learning in the classroom. The results therefore underscore the importance of teachers developing heightened awareness of their own embodied practices to enhance their ability to create learning opportunities in the classroom. These insights open up promising avenues for further research, particularly in examining the complex interplay between the verbal and non-verbal aspects of classroom interaction. The results could yield additional valuable insights into teacher education and professional development programs.

Future research could also explore the long-term impact of CIC-focused training on teacher performance and student outcomes, as well as investigating practical and interactive methods for integrating CIC development into existing teacher education programs.

In conclusion, this study contributes to our understanding of the complex interactional processes involved in managing whole-class speaking activities in EFL contexts. This highlights the necessity for teachers to develop a nuanced comprehension of classroom interaction and the ability to deploy a range of verbal and non-verbal strategies to facilitate student participation. Future research could examine how these strategies vary across different proficiency levels, cultural contexts and specific language-learning tasks. Furthermore, longitudinal studies could explore how teachers develop these interactional competencies over time, and how targeted training interventions might accelerate this development.

## REFERENCES

- Alsaadi, N., & Atar, C. (2019). Wait-time in material and classroom context modes. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 6(1), 53-69. <https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.542495>
- Aras, S. S. (2007). *The effect of an extended teacher wait time on the participation of students in primary ELT classes* (Publication Number. 218002) [Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Türkiye]. National Thesis Center.
- Aşık, A., & Kuru Gönen, S. İ. (2016). Pre-service EFL teachers' reported perceptions of their development through SETT experience. *Classroom Discourse*, 7(2), 164-183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2016.1150865>
- Atar, C. (2016). *The sequential organization and management of teachers' other-initiation of clarification in second language classroom contexts* (Publication Number. 712943) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Newcastle upon Tyne, the UK]. National Thesis Center. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2ACnVlv>
- Atar, C. (2017). Konuşma çözümlemesi ve uygulamalı dilbilim. *Medeniyet Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 1 (1), 17-25.
- Atar, C., & Seedhouse, P. (2018). A conversation-analytic perspective on teacher-led clarification and its implications for L2 teacher training. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(2), 145-166.
- Atar, C. (2020a). Interrupting the extended wait-time: Pre-service English teachers' practices. *2nd ILTERG Conference Book of Proceedings*, 274-290.
- Atar, C. (2020b). The implementation of awareness raising for pre-service teachers' management of classroom interaction with a focus on extended wait-time. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Ö8, 831-848. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.827633>
- Audacity Team. (2021). Audacity(R): Free audio editor and recorder (Version 3.1.2) [Computer application]. Retrieved from [https://audacityteam.org/\[1\]](https://audacityteam.org/[1])
- Badem-Korkmaz, F. & Balaman, U. (2024) Eliciting student participation in video-mediated EFL classroom interactions: focus on teacher response pursuit practices. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(7), 1881-1903. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2127772>
- Balaman, U. (2016). *A conversation analytic study on the development of interactional competence in English in an online task-oriented environment* (Publication

Number. 435231) [Doctoral dissertation, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Türkiye]. National Thesis Center.

Barnette, J., Orletsky, S., Sattes, B., & Walsh, J. (1995). Wait-time: Effective and trainable. *ERIC*, ED 383 706.

Baysen, E., Soylu, H. & Baysen, F. (2003). Soru sorma ve dinleme süresi [Questioning and listening durations]. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 2(1),53-58.

Brown, J. D. (2004). Research methods for applied linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp.476-500). Blackwell.

Button, G., & Casey N. (1984). Generating topic: the use of topic initial elicitors. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp 167-190). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511665868.013>

Button, G., & Casey, N. (1985). Topic nomination and topic pursuit. *Human Studies*, 8, 3-55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00143022>

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

Cekaite, A. (2007). A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(1), 45-62.

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

Cho, Y.H., Lee, S.Y., Jeong, D.W., Im, S.J., Choi, E.J., Lee, S.H., Baek, S.Y., Kim, Y.J., Lee, J.G., Yi, Y.H., Bae, M.J., & Yune, S.J. (2012). Analysis of questioning technique during classes in medical education. *BioMed Central, BMC Medical Education*, 12(39), 1-7.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge University Press.

Cotton, K. (1988). Classroom questioning. *School Improvement Research Series*, 5, 1-22.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications.

Daslin, F. H., & Zainil, Y. (2020). Teachers' use of wait time: A case study of questioning strategies in SMAN Padang. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(4), 718-732. <https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v9i4.110338>

- DeTure, L. R., & Miller, A. P. (1985). The effects of a written protocol model on teacher acquisition of extended wait-time. *ERIC*, ED 245 923.
- Dilber, E. (2022). *A conversation analytic study on teacher interactional competence through talk management in semi-instructed EFL context* (Publication Number. 772554) [Doctoral dissertation, Gazi University, Ankara, Türkiye]. National Thesis Center.
- Drew, P., & Heritage J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work* (pp.3-65). Cambridge University Press.
- Duell, O. K. (1994). Extended wait time and university student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(2), 397-414. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312031002397>
- Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 49, 193-220.
- Fagan, E. R., Hassler, D. M., & Szabo, M. (1981). Evaluation of questioning strategies in language arts instruction. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 15, 267-273.
- Fanselow, J. F. (1977). Beyond Rashomon: Conceptualizing and describing the teaching act. *TESOL Quarterly*. 11 (1), 17-39. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3585589>
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2009). *Talking, listening and teaching: A guide to classroom interaction*. Corwin.
- Fowler, T. W. (1975). An investigation of the teacher behavior of wait-time during an inquiry science lesson. *ERIC*, ED 108 872.
- Girgin, U. (2017). *Reconsidering the use of a minimal 'non-lexical' response token through 'embodiment': A second language teacher's deployment of 'Mm hm' as a third-turn receipt* (Publication Number. 508318) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Newcastle upon Tyne, the UK]. National Thesis Center.
- Girgin, U., Acar, Y., Akbaş, E., Yavuz, E., Altan, A., Boran, M., . . . Moralı, G. (2020). Konuşma çözümlemesi yöntemi: Veri toplama ve çözümleme süreçlerinde geçerlik, güvenirlik ve etik. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 37(1), 381-402. <https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2020063458>
- Girgin, U., & Brandt, A. (2020). Creating space for learning through 'Mm hm' in a L2 classroom: Implications for L2 classroom interactional competence. *Classroom Discourse*, 11(1), 61-79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1603115>
- Goodwin, C. (1986). Between and within: Alternative sequential treatments of continuers and assessments. *Human Studies*, 9, 205-217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00148127>

- Goodwin, M. H., & C. Goodwin. (1986). Gesture and co-participation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, 62(1/2), 51-75.
- Goodwin, C. (2013). The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46, 8-23.
- Hazel, S., Mortensen, K., & Rasmussen, G. (2014). Introduction: A body of resources—CA studies of social conduct. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.10.007>
- Heath, C. (1992). Gesture's discreet tasks: Multiple relevancies in visual conduct and in the contextualisation of language. In P. Auer & A. di Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualisation of language* (pp.101-127). John Benjamins.
- Heinze, A., & Erhard, M. (2006). How much time do students have to think about teacher questions? An investigation of the quick succession of teacher questions and student responses in the German mathematics classroom. *ZDM*, 38(5), 388-398. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02652800>
- Hellermann, J. (2003). The interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: Teacher repetition in feedback moves. *Language in Society*, 32(1), 79-104.
- Hellermann, J. (2005). Syntactic and prosodic practices for cohesion in series of three-part sequences in classroom talk. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38(1), 105-130. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3801\\_4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3801_4)
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In K. Fitch, & R. Sanders (Eds.), *The handbook of language and social interaction* (pp.103-147). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Heritage, J. (2012). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1), 30-52.
- Holley, F. M., & King, J. K. (1971). Imitation and correction in foreign language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 55, 494-498.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Polity Press.
- Huth, T., Betz, E., & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2019). Rethinking language teacher training: Steps for making talk-in-interaction research accessible to practitioners. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(1), 99-122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1570529>
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp.269-293). Penguin Books.

- İnceçay, G. (2010). The role of teacher talk in young learners' language process. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 277-281.
- Ingram, J., & Elliott, V. (2014). Turn taking and 'wait time' in classroom interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 62, 1-12.
- Jefferson, G. (1989). Preliminary notes on a possible metric which provides for a 'standard maximum' silence of approximately one second in conversation. In Roger, D., Bull, P. (Eds.), *Conversation: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp.166-196). Multilingual Matters.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H., Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*, (pp.13-34). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef>
- Kamdideh, Z., & Barjesteh, H. (2019). The effect of extended wait-time on promoting Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(3), 183-200. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12312a>
- Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A Conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson, (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp.167-180). Routledge.
- Kääntä, L. (2010). *Teacher turn-allocation and repair practices in classroom interaction: A multisemiotic perspective* (Publication Number. 978-951-39-3811-6) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Jyväskylä, Finland]. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/22993>
- Kääntä, L. (2012). Teachers' embodied allocations in instructional interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 3(2), 166-186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2012.716624>
- Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on language and social interaction*, 35(3), 277-309.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(4), 366-372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05291.x>
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. Yale University Press.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lebeau, Ian. (2014). *New Language Leader Pre-Intermediate CourseBook*. Pearson.

- Lee, Y-A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(6), 1204-1230. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.11.003>
- Lerner, G. H. (2004). Collaborative turn sequences. In G. H., Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp.225-256). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.12ler>
- Liddicoat, A. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. Continuum.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mak, B. (2011). An exploration of speaking-in-class anxiety with Chinese ESL learners. *System*, 39(2), 202-214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.002>
- Margutti, P. (2004). *Classroom Interaction in an Italian primary school: Instructional sequences in pedagogic settings* (Publication Number. 428534) [Doctoral dissertation, University of York, the UK]. White Rose eTheses Online.
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 491-500. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-14-x>
- Maroni, B. (2011). Pauses, gaps and wait time in classroom interaction in primary schools. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(7), 2081-2093.
- McHoul, A. W. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, 7(2), 183-213.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Harvard University Press.
- Mondada, L. (2018). Multiple temporalities of language and body in interaction: Challenges for transcribing multimodality. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(1), 85-106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2018.1413878>
- Mondada, L. (2019). Transcribing silent actions: A multimodal approach of sequence organization. *Social Interaction Video-Based Studies of Human Sociality*, 2 (1). <https://doi.org/10.7146/si.v2i1.113150>
- Moorhouse, B. L., Li, Y., & Walsh, S. (2021). E-Classroom interactional competencies: Mediating and assisting language learning during synchronous online lessons. *RELC Journal*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220985274>



- Mortensen, K. (2012). 'Visual initiations of repair – some preliminary observations', in Ikeda, K. and A. Brandt (Eds.), *Challenges and new directions in the micro-analysis of social interaction* (pp.45-50). Division of International Affairs, Kansai University.
- Mortensen, K. (2016). The body as a resource for other-initiation of repair: Cupping the hand behind the ear. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 49(1), 34-57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2016.1126450>
- Moskowitz, G. (1976). The classroom interaction of outstanding foreign language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 9(2), 135-143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1976.tb02639.x>
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Prentice-Hall.
- Olbertz-Siitonen, M. (2015). Transmission delay in technology-mediated interaction at work. *PsychNology Journal*, 13(2-3), 203-234.
- Park, Y. (2013). The roles of third-turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(2), 145-167. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt006>
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language, learning and documenting learning in conversation analytic SLA research. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising learning in applied linguistics* (pp.105-126). Palgrave MacMillan.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2011). Developing 'methods' for interaction: A cross-sectional study of disagreement sequences in French L2. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp.206-243). Multilingual Matters.
- Peräkylä, A. (2004). Making links in psychoanalytic interpretations: A conversation analytical perspective. *Psychotherapy Research*, 14(3), 289-307. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptr/kph026>
- Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in Relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. Mouton De Gruyter.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shaped. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp.210-228). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rasmussen, G. (2013). Inclined to better understanding—the coordination of talk and “leaning forward” in doing repair. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 30-45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.10.001>



- Rice, D. R. (1977). The effect of question-asking instruction on preservice elementary science teachers. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 14(4). 353-359.
- Ro, E., & Kim, H. (2024). Pre-service teachers' hinting practices in managing responses in a microteaching context. *Linguistics and Education*, 84, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2024.101345>
- Roehler, L.R., & Cantlon, D.J. (1996). Scaffolding: A powerful tool in social constructivist classrooms.
- Rowe, M. B. (1972). Wait-Time and rewards as instructional variables: Their influence on language, logic, and fate control. *National Association for Research in Science Teaching*, 11(2).
- Rowe, M. B. (1986). Wait time: Slowing down may be a way of speeding up!, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 43-50.
- Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp.21-27). Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Saxton J., Miller C., Laidlaw L., & O'Mara J. (2018). *Asking better questions: Teaching and learning for a changing world*. Pembroke Publishers.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70(6), 1075-1095.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289-327. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289>
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom : A conversation analysis perspective*. Blackwell.
- Seedhouse, P. (2008). Learning to Talk the Talk: Conversation analysis as a tool for induction of trainee instructors. In S. Garton & K. Richards (Eds.), *Professional encounters in TESOL* (pp.42-57). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230594173\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230594173_3)
- Seedhouse, P., & Walsh, S. (2010). Learning a second language through classroom interaction. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising*

*learning in applied linguistics* (pp.127-146). Palgrave Macmillan.  
[https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230289772\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230289772_8)

Sert, O. (2011). *A micro-analytic investigation of claims of insufficient knowledge in EAL classrooms* (Publication Number. 400475) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Newcastle upon Tyne, the UK]. National Thesis Center.

Sert, O. (2013), “Epistemic status check” as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings’, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 45(1), 13-28.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.10.005>

Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.22046.33600>

Sert, O. (2019). Classroom interaction and language teacher education. In S. Walsh, & S. Mann (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teacher education* (pp.216-238). Routledge.

Sert, O., & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education*, 27(6), 542-565. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.739174>

Shrum, J. L., & Tech, V. (1985). Wait-time and the use of target or native languages. *Foreign Language Annals*, 18, 305-313.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.

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

Stahl, R. J. (1994). Using "think-time" and "wait-time" skillfully in the classroom. *ERIC*, ED 370 885.

Süt, A. M. (2020). Wait time in an English for academic purposes (EAP) context: A conversation analytic perspective. *Language Teaching and Educational Research (LATER)*, 3(1), 149-162. <https://doi.org/10.35207/later.698861>

Swift, J. N., & Gooding, T. (1983). Interaction of wait time feedback and questioning instruction on middle school science teaching. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 20(8), 721-730.

Şimşek, A. (2022). *A study on the functions and sequential organizations of EFL teachers' gesture use in video mediated interaction: A conversation analytic*

*approach* (Publication Number. 722902) [Master's thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Türkiye]. National Thesis Center.

- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. Sage Publications. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849208895>
- Tobin, K. G. (1980). The effect of an extended teacher wait-time on science achievement. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 17(5), 469-475.
- Tobin, K. (1986). Effects of teacher wait time on discourse characteristics in mathematics and language arts classes. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23(2), 191-200. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312023002191>
- Van Lier, L. (1994). *The classroom and the language learner. Ethnography and second-language classroom research*. Longman.
- Van Lier, L. (1996) *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. Longman.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 3-23. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168802lr095oa>
- Walsh, S. (2003). Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom through teacher self-evaluation. *Language Awareness*, 12(2), 124-142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410308667071>
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203827826>
- Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748645190>
- Walsh, S. (2014). Developing classroom interactional competence. *Language Issues*, 25(1), 4-8.
- Walsh, S., & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 247-266. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12005>
- Walsh, S., & Mann, S. (2015). Doing reflective practice: A data-led way forward. *ELT Journal*, 69(4), 351-362. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv018>

- Walsh, S., & Sert, O. (2019). Mediating L2 learning through classroom interaction. In X. Gao (Ed.), *Second handbook of English language teaching* (pp.737-755). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02899-2\\_35](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02899-2_35)
- Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(4), 577-594.
- Waring, H. Z. (2016). *Theorizing pedagogical interaction: Insights from conversation analysis*. Routledge.
- Waring, H. Z., Reddington, E., & Tadic, N. (2016). Responding artfully to student-initiated departures in the adult ESL classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 33(1), 28-39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2015.12.001>
- Wasik, B. A., & Hindman, A. H. (2018). Why wait? The importance of wait time in developing young students' language and vocabulary skills. *The Reading Teacher*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1730>
- White, J., & Lightbown, P. M. (1984). Asking and answering in ESL classes. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 40(2), 228-244. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.40.2.228>
- Yaqubi, B., & Rokni, M. P. (2012). Teachers' limited wait-time practice and learners' participation opportunities in EFL classroom interaction. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 4, 127-161.
- Yatağanbaba, E., & Yıldırım, R. (2016). Teacher interruptions and limited wait time in EFL young learner classrooms. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232(1), 689-695. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.094>
- Young, R. 2008. *Language and interaction: A resource book*. Routledge
- Zainil, Y., Amri, Z., & Ratmanida. (2023). 'Wait Time' in EFL classrooms: Teachers questioning strategy. *PICEMA 2021, ASSEHR* 683, 227-236. [https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-11-4\\_23](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-11-4_23)

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A. Ethical Approval

BAŞVURU NO: 375

#### ERCİYES ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER ETİK KURULU PROJE ONAY FORMU

Projenin Adı	"Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Yapılan Sınıflarda Uzatılmış Bekleme Süresinin İncelenmesi: Bir Konuşma Çözümlemesi Perspektifi" "Examining Extended Wait-Time in EFL Classroom: A Conversation Analytic Perspective"
Projenin Niteliği	Yüksek Lisans/Uzmanlık/Doktora Tezi
Proje Araştırmacıları	Duygu GÜNEŞ (Sorumlu Araştırmacı) Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ufuk GİRGİN (Danışman)
Sorumlu Araştırmacının Haberleşme Bilgileri	Duygu GÜNEŞ (Sorumlu Araştırmacı) Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ufuk GİRGİN (Danışman) E-posta adresi: [Redacted]

#### KARAR:

Etik Kurulumuza başvuran *Duygu GÜNEŞ'in, "Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Yapılan Sınıflarda Uzatılmış Bekleme Süresinin İncelenmesi: Bir Konuşma Çözümlemesi Perspektifi" "Examining Extended Wait-Time in EFL Classroom: A Conversation Analytic Perspective" adlı çalışması değerlendirilerek aşağıdaki sonuca ulaşılmıştır.*

Proje etik açıdan uygun bulunmuştur. ☒

Projenin etik açıdan geliştirilmesi gerekmektedir. ☐

Proje etik açıdan uygun bulunmamıştır. ☐

15/09/2022

ADI SOYADI

İMZA

Etik Kurul Başkanı	Prof. Dr. Atabey KILIÇ	[Redacted Signature Area]
Etik Kurul Başkan Yrd.	Prof. Dr. Kasım KARAMAN	
Üye	Prof. Dr. Celal YILDIZ	
Üye	Prof. Dr. Mustafa KARAGÖZ	
Üye	Prof. Dr. Hakan AYDIN	
Üye	Prof. Dr. Mikail AKBULUT	
Üye	Prof. Dr. Habibe ŞAHİN	
Üye	Prof. Dr. Ahmet HASKÖSE	
Üye	Prof. Dr. İlkey ŞAHİN	
Üye	Prof. Dr. Burak ADIGÜZEL	
Üye	Prof. Dr. Oktay BEKTAŞ	
Üye	Doç. Dr. Mehmet Ali BAHAR	
Üye	Doç. Dr. Ömer KURTBAG	



## Appendix B. Jefferson Transcription Conventions (2004)

Symbol	Definition and use	Key (s)
[yeah] [okay]	Overlapping talk	
=	End of one TCU and beginning of next begin with no gap/pause in between (sometimes a slight overlap if there is speaker change). Can also be used when TCU continues on new line in transcript	
(.)	Brief interval, usually between 0.08 and 0.2 seconds	
(1.4)	Time (in absolute seconds) between end of a word and beginning of next. Alternative method: "none-one-thousand-two-one-thousand...": 0.2, 0.5, 0.7, 1.0 seconds, etc.	
<u>Word</u> Wo <u>:rd</u>	Underlining indicates emphasis Placement indicates which syllable(s) are emphasised Placement within word may also indicate timing/direction of pitch movement (later underlining may indicate location of pitch movement)	
wo::rd	Colon indicates prolonged vowel or consonant One or two colons common, three or more colons only in extreme cases.	
↑word ↓word	Marked shift in pitch, up (↑) or down (↓). Double arrows can be used with extreme pitch shifts.	↑ Wingdings 3 (104) ↓ Wingdings 3 (105) ↑ ALT+24 ↓ ALT+25
. , _ ˆ ?	Markers of final pitch direction at TCU boundary: Final falling intonation (.) Slight rising intonation (,) Level/flat intonation (_) Medium (falling-)rising intonation (ˆ) (a dip and a rise) Sharp rising intonation (?)	ˆ ALT+168
WORD	Upper case indicates syllables or words louder than surrounding speech by the same speaker	
°word°	Degree sign indicate syllables or words distinctly quieter than surrounding speech by the same speaker	° ALT+248
<word	Pre-positioned left carat indicates a hurried start of a word, typically at TCU beginning	
word-	A dash indicates a cut-off. In phonetic terms this is typically a glottal stop	
>word<	Right/left carats indicate increased speaking rate (speeding up)	
<word>	Left/right carats indicate decreased speaking rate (slowing down)	
.hhh	Inbreath. Three letters indicate 'normal' duration. Longer or shorter inbreaths indicated with fewer or more letters.	
hhh	Outbreath. Three letters indicate 'normal' duration. Longer or shorter inbreaths indicated with fewer or more letters.	
whhord	Can also indicate aspiration/breathiness if within a word (not laughter)	
w(h)ord	Indicates abrupt spurts of breathiness, as in laughing while talking	
£word£	Pound sign indicates smiley voice, or suppressed laughter	
#word#	Hash sign indicates creaky voice	
~word~	Tilde sign indicates shaky voice (as in crying)	
(word)	Parentheses indicate uncertain word; no plausible candidate if empty	
(( ))	Double parentheses contain analyst comments or descriptions	

## Appendix C. Mondada Conventions for Multimodal Transcriptions (2018, 2019)

* *	Descriptions of embodied actions are delimited between
+ +	two identical symbols (one symbol per participant and per type of action)
Δ Δ	that are synchronized with correspondent stretches of talk or time indications.
*--->	The action described continues across subsequent lines
--->*	until the same symbol is reached.
>>	The action described begins before the excerpt's beginning.
--->>	The action described continues after the excerpt's end.
.....	Action's preparation.
----	Action's apex is reached and maintained.
.....	Action's retraction.
ric	Participant doing the embodied action is identified in small caps in the margin.
fig	The exact moment at which a screen shot has been taken
#	is indicated with a sign (#) showing its position within the turn/a time measure.

## Appendix D. Time Management (Extract 1), What Advice (Extracts 3 and 6)

**STUDY SKILLS**  
TIME MANAGEMENT

**1a** Are you good at time management? How do you know this?

**1b** Look at these expressions about time. Which expressions suggest problems with time? Which describe positive feelings about time?

- 1 I've got all the time in the world.
- 2 There aren't enough hours in the day.
- 3 Time's running out.
- 4 I've got time on my hands.
- 5 Time's on my side.
- 6 It's a race against time.

**1c** Why will time management be important for you if you continue your English studies beyond Pre-intermediate level?

**2a** Work in small groups. Look at these problems some students are having with time management. What advice would you give them?

- 1 I'm often late for appointments, or sometimes I miss appointments completely.
- 2 I spend a lot of time looking for my notes. I can never find anything.
- 3 I sometimes study for a long time, but I don't feel I'm learning anything. I read the material, but nothing's happening – it's not going in.
- 4 I can't finish all the things I need to do in the day.

**2b** 12.6 Listen to some students and their tutor discuss the problems above. Do they mention any of your ideas?

**3b** Make sure you spend more time outside class on your priorities. What can you do to improve the top two in your own time? With a partner, compare your list from Exercise 3a and your ideas.

**4** Discuss with a partner. Look at this list of activities. Which can you change to give yourself more time to work on your priorities?

- sleeping
- personal care (e.g. washing, dressing)
- eating and drinking (including preparation of meals, snacks, coffee breaks)
- travelling
- time at college
- time at work
- time with family
- housework
- socialising with friends
- sport/leisure activities
- (non-work) time on the internet

**5a** How can you use technology (your computer and your phone) to improve your time management?

*Online calendars are good because you can switch quickly between your daily, weekly and monthly schedules so it's easy to see what's happening in your life.*

*If I see a useful book, I can take a photo of the cover with my phone so I don't have to write down all the details about the book there and then (author, publisher, etc.).*

**5b** How can technology have a negative effect on our time? Think about things like social networking, long web searches, etc.

*Don't waste time checking social networking sites too*

## Appendix E. A Million Dollars (Extracts 2 and 5)

12 LANGUAGE REFERENCE

**GRAMMAR**

G1 **SECOND CONDITIONAL**

You use the second conditional to talk about the result of an action. The action is unreal, i.e. it can't happen or is very unlikely to happen.

*If we practised more, we would be better at hockey.*  
(= We don't practise, so we aren't good at hockey.)

*If we had more time, we would practise.*  
(= We don't have the time, so we don't practise.)

*If I was rich, I'd buy a sailing boat.*  
(= I'm not rich, so I can't buy a sailing boat.)

It is also possible to use *If I/he/she were* in the second conditional.

*If she were younger, she'd become a sports teacher.*  
*If I were you, I'd start taking some exercise.*

You can also use the second conditional to talk about possible future actions, but the actions are unlikely to happen.

*What would you do if you won a million dollars?*  
*If I won a million dollars, I wouldn't go to work any more!*

If-clause (condition)	Main clause (result)
If + past simple,	would / wouldn't + infinitive without to
If they <b>showed</b> more interest.	they'd (would) get more help.
If I <b>didn't get</b> the job.	I'd (would) be really...

Use *too much* with uncountable nouns and *too many* with countable nouns.

*I've got **too much work** at the moment.*  
*This company has got **too many problems**!*

Use (not) *enough* with both countable and uncountable nouns.

*We didn't have **enough good sportspeople** at the last games.*  
*Have you got **enough time**?*

You can also use *too* and (not) ... *enough* with adjectives.

*Mark doesn't do any sport. He's **too lazy**.*  
*James will win the race. He's **fast enough**.*  
*Gill won't pass the exam. She's **not clever enough**.*

Be careful of the word order with *too* and *enough*.

*too much / too many / enough + noun: We haven't got **enough people** for the team.*  
*too + adjective: I'm **too tired**.*  
*adjective + enough: You aren't **quick enough**.*

**KEY LANGUAGE**

KL **ANSWERING COMPLEX QUESTIONS**

Er, ..., Hmm, OK, Right, Well, ...

Let me see, ...

Let me think, ...

I think I'd ...

That's a difficult one

That's a tricky question

To be honest, I'd ...



## Appendix F. Modern Women (Extracts 4 and 7)

### Unit 12 Sport

#### SPEAKING



**4 Evaluating claims** Discuss these questions with a partner.

- 1** 'The advertisers missed a wonderful opportunity,' claims Sean Gabb.

Did they? Which points in the text weaken Sean's claim? Can you think of any more arguments against this claim? What would the consequences be of more adverts for women during football games?

- 2** 'Modern women are as interested in these things as modern men, so perhaps there were enough adverts aimed at women.'

Do you agree with Dan's claim about modern women? What differences do you see between male and female consumer habits? How do adverts show that they are aimed at men and/or women?

- 3** 'During the last World Cup, 42% of the viewers were female.'

Who do you think watches more sport, men or women? Why? Do the TV viewing habits of your classmates support your claim?

#### GRAMMAR

##### TOO AND ENOUGH

**5a** Look at these sentences. Which three describe a problem or mistake?

- a There were too many adverts for men.
- b This is too much money.
- c There were enough adverts.
- d There weren't enough adverts for female fans.

**5b** Which of the phrases above mean you:

- 1 have the right amount of something?
- 2 need more of something?
- 3 need fewer things?
- 4 need less of something?

**5c** We can also use *too* and *enough* with adjectives. Find the four examples in the article.

**5d** Choose the correct word to complete these grammar notes.

*Too* comes *before/after* nouns and *before/after* adjectives.

*Enough* comes *before/after* nouns and *before/after* adjectives.

➡ Language reference and extra practice, pages 124–125

**6a** Put the words in *italics* in order to make sentences.

- 1 I *enough* / *free time* / *have* during the week.
- 2 I *have* / *too* / *homework* / *much* each week.
- 3 I *earn* / *don't* / *money* / *enough* to live a comfortable life.
- 4 *The* / *are* / *buses* / *too* / *and* / *trains* / *crowded* in the rush hour.
- 5 *There* / *enough* / *sports* / *aren't* / *facilities* in my local area.
- 6 *My national* / *good* / *football* / *team* / *is* / *enough* to win the World Cup.

**6b** Are the sentences true for you, your city and/or your country? Tell your partner.

## Appendix G. L2 Classroom Modes (Walsh, 2006)

<i>Mode</i>	<i>Pedagogic goals</i>	<i>Interactional features</i>
Managerial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ρ To transmit information.</li> <li>ρ To organise the physical learning environment.</li> <li>ρ To refer learners to materials.</li> <li>ρ To introduce or conclude an activity.</li> <li>ρ To change from one mode of learning to another.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ρ A single, extended teacher turn which uses explanations and/or instructions.</li> <li>ρ The use of transitional markers.</li> <li>ρ The use of confirmation checks.</li> <li>ρ An absence of learner contributions.</li> </ul>
Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ρ To provide language practice around a piece of material.</li> <li>ρ To elicit responses in relation to the material.</li> <li>ρ To check and display answers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ρ Predominance of IRF pattern.</li> <li>ρ Extensive use of display questions.</li> <li>ρ Form-focused feedback.</li> <li>ρ Corrective repair.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ρ To clarify when necessary.</li> <li>ρ To evaluate contributions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ρ The use of scaffolding.</li> </ul>
Skills and systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ρ To enable learners to produce correct forms.</li> <li>ρ To enable learners to manipulate the target language.</li> <li>ρ To provide corrective feedback.</li> <li>ρ To provide learners with practice in sub-skills.</li> <li>ρ To display correct answers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ρ The use of direct repair.</li> <li>ρ The use of scaffolding.</li> <li>ρ Extended teacher turns.</li> <li>ρ Display questions.</li> <li>ρ Teacher echo.</li> <li>ρ Clarification requests.</li> <li>ρ Form-focused feedback.</li> </ul>
Classroom context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ρ To enable learners to express themselves clearly.</li> <li>ρ To establish a context.</li> <li>ρ To promote oral fluency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ρ Extended learner turns.</li> <li>ρ Short teacher turns.</li> <li>ρ Minimal repair.</li> <li>ρ Content feedback.</li> </ul>

## Appendix H. SETT Interactures (Walsh, 2006)

### SETT key

<i>Interactional feature</i>	<i>Description</i>
(a) Scaffolding	(1) Reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution) (2) Extension (extending a learner's contribution) (3) Modelling (correcting a learner's contribution)
(b) Direct repair	Correcting an error quickly and directly
(c) Content feedback	Giving feedback to the message rather than the words used
(d) Extended wait-time	Allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for students to respond or formulate a response
(e) Referential questions	Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer
(f) Seeking clarification	(1) Teacher asks a student to clarify something the student has said (2) Student asks teacher to clarify something the teacher has said
(g) Confirmation checks	Making sure that teacher has correctly understood learner's contribution
(h) Extended learner turn	Learner turn of more than one clause
(i) Teacher echo	(1) Teacher repeats a previous utterance (2) Teacher repeats a learner's contribution
(j) Teacher interruptions	Interrupting a learner's contribution
(k) Extended teacher turn	Teacher turn of more than one clause
(l) Turn completion	Completing a learner's contribution for the learner
(m) Display questions	Asking questions to which teacher knows the answer
(n) Form-focused feedback	Giving feedback on the words used, not the message

## ÖZGEÇMİŞ

### KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER

<b>Adı Soyadı:</b>	Duygu GÜNEŞ
<b>Uyruğu:</b>	Türkiye Cumhuriyeti

### EĞİTİM

Derece	Kurum	Mezuniyet Tarihi
Yüksek Lisans	Erciyes Üniversitesi	
Lisans	Gazi Üniversitesi	2012
Lise	Yunus Emre Anadolu Öğretmen Lisesi	2008

### İŞ DENEYİMLERİ

Yıl	Kurum	Görev
2018-Halen	Ergenekon Ortaokulu	İngilizce Öğretmeni
2013-2015	Kapadokya Meslek Yüksekokulu	Öğretim Görevlisi
2012-2013	Gazi Üniversitesi	Öğretim Görevlisi

### YABANCI DİL

İngilizce (98,75)

### YAYINLAR

Güneş, D., & Girgin, U. (2023). A micro-analytic investigation into EFL teachers' extended wait time practices in L2 English classrooms. *3<sup>rd</sup> International ILTERG Conference Abstract Book*, 84.