

## THE INTERACTIONAL FEATURES OF ENGLISH CLASSROOM DISCOURSE IN THE MUĞLA CONTEXT

Perihan KORKUT (PhD)  
Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University  
[pkocaman@mu.edu.tr](mailto:pkocaman@mu.edu.tr)

Abdullah ERTAŞ (Assist.Prof.Dr)  
Atılım University  
[aertas@gmail.com](mailto:aertas@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** In the literature, there is a call for research with accounts for research for localization of teaching practices (Çakıroğlu & Çakıroğlu, 2003; Walsh, 2006; Sert, 2010). As a response to that call, this study sets out to explore possible areas of improvement in the language teacher training program based on real classroom data in the context of Muğla. Lessons from 10 state school English teachers of varying experience and 7 teacher trainees from Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University were recorded, transcribed and analyzed according to Walsh's (2006) "Self Evaluation Teacher Talk (SETT)" framework. A qualitative, ethnographic research perspective is adopted. The trustworthiness of the research is ensured by various strategic undertakings. The findings confirmed the same pedagogic goals and interactional features pertaining to each mode described in the SETT framework. There have been observed, however, additional pedagogic goals in managerial, materials and classroom context modes along with some context specific interactional features.

\*This study is based on a PhD dissertation accepted at Gazi University.

### INTRODUCTION

The research gap this research addresses is that teacher education is not localized. A common problem is that "education faculty give their teaching too little attention, do not model what is known about effective teaching (...) and stay away from public school classrooms" (Altan, 1998, p.407). There is virtually no lesson devoted to preparing the teacher candidates for the special interactional demands of the language classrooms in the cultural context of the particular classrooms they will work. In the program of ELT departments, there are lessons towards proficiency but these tend to aim developing students' general English proficiency. It is automatically assumed that they will be able to manage the classroom, conduct communication exercises, present new language and do all these in English without any special training. However, non-native teachers may actually need explicit training about the specific language areas as Willis warned us back in 1981,

The usual pattern of teacher initiation, student response, teacher follow up is often disturbed because of misunderstandings, need for correction and clarification. Teacher initiations are often made up of several speech 'acts' each performing a different but necessary function; sudden switches from meaningful use of language to mechanical practice of the target forms can be confusing for the students – even native speaker teachers sometimes have problems here. On the whole, the non-native teacher is expected to be able to handle classroom English without any special training. (p.43)

Moreover, where training in terms of implementing the teaching techniques which are specific to ELT, trainers tend to use course materials which are based on the western perception of teaching-learning situations. In other words, the ideal lesson plans and good practices that are presented in the methodology books might be judged as "good practices" according to the author's own cultural values. As Çakıroğlu and Çakıroğlu (2003) state, however,

"the knowledge produced in Western world has been built up over many years of intellectual and practical experience, conflicts, concerns and many other phenomena that characterize these

societies (...) this knowledge (...) may sometimes conflict with the structure of the Turkish society or at least are not understood in the same way (p. 261).

Thus, the need for providing teacher education according to the culture-specific interactional features of our own context dictates for us teacher educators look into the real classrooms and base our education on them. Sert (2010) also emphasizes this need in the following lines:

Instead of directly adopting suggested western methodologies, CA based studies should be performed to see how unique interactional structures of Turkish language classrooms emerge. A framework like SETT, incorporated to the teacher education programs according to the contextual needs may reveal different interactional features for different pedagogical goals compared to its UK version. Therefore, using CA to analyze teachers' talk and learners' talk in Turkey, and building the bricks of language teacher education on this framework will be very useful (p.80).

As an answer to that call, this research sets out to see the interactional features of English classroom discourse in the Muğla context. Using Walsh's (2006) Self Evaluation Teacher Talk (SETT) as a guiding framework, it investigates the pedagogical purposes and the interactional features that emerge as a result of modes analysis on the collected data from 10 different English Language Teachers working at public schools in the Muğla city center.

## INVESTIGATING THE CLASSROOM DISCOURSE

The early efforts to understand the classroom discourse were the interaction analysis (IA) systems and most of them were developed for the purposes of teacher training rather than research. IA approaches, which are based on behavioral psychology, typically use observation instruments and coding systems. Some prominent examples are Flander's Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC), Moskowitz's Foreign Language Interaction System (FLINT), Jarvis's drill language categories and real language categories, Politzer's system developed according to the ALM ideal among early systems. Discourse based Interaction systems include Bellack et.al (1966), Fanselow's Foci for Observing Communications Used in Settings (FOCUS), Allwright's macro analysis and micro analysis system, and Allen, Fröchlich and Spada's Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching Observation Scheme (COLT) (as cited in Ellis, 2012). The advantage of both the early systems and discourse based interaction systems is that they are relatively easy to use and that they provide common terminology for the spreading and discussion of the conclusions.

Walsh (2006) offers a different division than Ellis (2012) and divides the observation instruments into two categories. The first category is system-based approaches under which Bellack et al; FIAC; FLINT and COLT are counted. Walsh (2006) argues that these system based approaches can give only a partial picture of the classroom discourse and offers ad hoc approaches which have the advantage of permitting "a finer grained understanding of a specific feature of the discourse." (p.45) Self Evaluation Teacher Talk (SETT), which was a product of conversation analytic (CA) study, is put under this category.

Ad hoc approaches to classroom observation give participants ownership of the research design process and greater insights into the issues under investigation. By focusing on the detail of the interaction, such approaches allow practitioners access to and understanding of complex phenomena which might otherwise take years of class experience to acquire. Moreover, ad hoc interaction analysis allows attention to be devoted to the microcosms of interactions that might so easily be missed by the 'broad brush' descriptions provided by systems- based approaches (Walsh, 2006 p.44).

Self Evaluation Teacher Talk (SETT) is based on the idea that the teacher's talk is variable according to the pedagogical focus and that the concept of a single L2 classroom discourse is too broad. There is a "reflexive relationship between pedagogy and instruction in the L2 classroom" (Seedhouse, 2004, p.16), thus "the pedagogical goal in each mode inevitably shapes the interactional features of the language classroom" (Sert,

2010, p.72). SETT comprises of four distinct classroom modes called Managerial Mode, Materials Mode, Skills and Systems Mode, and Classroom Context Mode. Each mode is described in terms of its pedagogical focus and interactional features. In his own words, Walsh (2003) describes SETT as follows:

The framework is intended to be representative rather than comprehensive. The four modes depicted are quite clearly delineated by pedagogic goals and interactional features; while there are some similarities, there are also differences which make description possible. Yet the modes do not claim to account for all features of classroom discourse, nor are they sufficiently comprehensive to take account of each and every pedagogic goal. The main focus is on teacher-fronted classroom practice: interactions that are not teacher-fronted, where learners work independently of the teacher are not described. Rather, the framework is concerned to establish an understanding of the relationship between interaction and learning; specifically, the interface between teaching objectives and teacher talk. In essence, as a tool for teacher education, the framework has to enable teachers to describe interaction relatively easily and unambiguously. (p.127)

Although SETT is primarily intended for teacher's self-reflection, it can also serve, like in the present study, as a framework to explore the classroom interactions of other teachers. Another study which used SETT in this way is Humphries (2014) on code-switching in two Japanese contexts. Still another study is Howard (2010) in which a comparison of observed and non-observed lessons of two teachers is presented to see the possible effects of observer's paradox. The internal features of the lessons were analyzed using the SETT framework. Walsh & O'Keeffe (2007) used modes analysis on their data and worked only on the classroom context mode using both CA and Corpus Linguistics (CL). At the end of their analysis of the student interactions, they offered a list of classroom applications of the classroom context mode. Similarly, Walsh, O'Keeffe and McCarthy (2008) used modes analysis for vague category markers (VCMs) such as "so on", "so forth", and "etc" in academic discourse. SETT has been used as a data analysis tool recently by Yang (2014). In his study, he investigated the discourse markers in teacher's spoken discourse using a multi-layered analytical approach which contained corpus linguistics (CL), conversation analysis (CA) and "L2 classroom modes analysis" as analytical layers (p.292). In addition, SETT is used in variety of other contexts such as young learners (Wang, 2012) and on-line, (not face to face) lecture discourse (Lee, 2010).

## METHODOLOGY

As mentioned earlier, the main question of interest in this paper is finding out the pedagogical purposes and interactional features of English lessons. The scope of the study is limited to Muğla context. A qualitative research design is used; therefore, no attempt to generalize the results will be made. This part will begin with a description of the research context. "Qualitative research findings are rarely directly transferable from one context to another" (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p.180). Thus, the duty of determining if the results of this research match to their context is left to the audience. For this comparison to be healthy, researchers of qualitative methods are required to provide a "thick description" of the context in which they worked (Mackey & Gass, 2005 p.180). In order to provide enough degree of thickness, this part will begin with a detailed description of the research context, participants and data collection procedures. Then, issues specific to qualitative research such as research ethics and trustworthiness of the research will be discussed. Describing the limitations of the research contributes to its trustworthiness, so the section will be finalized by a discussion of limitations of this study.

### Setting

The research took place in the state schools of different levels in Muğla. Since English teaching begins as early as 4th grade and continues till the end of high school education, all of the schools in the city centre are visited by the researcher. The project is explained to the English teachers working there to ask for their participation in the study. If the teachers accepted to participate, an observation date was scheduled. 19 teachers from various schools were scheduled to be observed in the 2011-2012 spring semester. These include 7 primary schools and 8 high schools. Another arm of the research laid on the 4th grade students of the ELT Department in Muğla Sıtkı

Koçman University. Specifically, the microteaching presentations of some students during the practicum were recorded in order to triangulate the findings and validate the content proposal. The trainees' data for this research was collected during the 2013-2014 fall semester. The faculty had sent the school experience students to only the primary schools. The researcher had been given 3 groups of school experience students, each attained to a different mentor at a different school. Thus, the trainees worked with 3 mentors at 3 different primary schools. The school experience is on the last year of the curriculum. This means that trainees are considered to be nearly ready for actually beginning teaching as a profession. They have got and usually passed most of the important methodological courses of the curriculum by this time. Thus, it can be argued that the observations have been timely.

### **Participants**

The trainees who participated in this study were chosen according to convenience sampling technique. To define, "this category of sample relies on available subjects – those who are close at hand or easily accessible. For example, it is fairly common for college and university professors to use their students as subjects in their research projects" (Berg, 2001 p.32). There were a total number of 15 trainees enrolled in the practicum course. The trainees whose lessons formed the trainees' data (TR's Data) were picked from among this group according to the suitability of their schedule to the researcher's schedule. In addition, the researcher tried to choose trainees who had a good attendance record. The TR's Data was collected from a total of 7 trainees, 4 of whom are males and 3 females.

The English teachers who were used for the formation of teachers' data (T's Data) were reached after a very careful and grueling process. The first step was visiting all the schools in the city center of Muğla. The researcher met the English teachers at each school and explained broadly the topic of the research and how the observations will be used. An initial observation date is set with the 19 ELT teachers who accepted to participate. The second step utilized purposive sampling to choose 10 of these 19 teachers. The 10 teachers were chosen in the direction of advice from 3 different field experts. The experts were asked to choose the best and most promising ones for the research project. The expert board is assumed as capable of doing this selection because all of them have publications that have conversation analysis as their data analysis methodology. The chosen group of 10 teachers consisted of 4 males and 6 females (T's Data). 6 of the 10 teachers worked at a primary school, 4 of them, at a secondary level school.

In summary, 7 trainees and 19 teachers, a total of 26 people, participated in this study. 7 of the trainees and 10 of the teachers had their lessons video-recorded. These 17 participants constitute the major group of participants who provided the bulk of the data for this research.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

Data was collected via non-participant observation, video recordings and field notes. The researcher used an observation form and video recordings during the initial data collection before the expert board's opinion. This phase also served as the piloting of the recording system. The primary data of this research comprised of two sets of video recordings. First, the recordings of the English teachers were used as a main data (T's Data). In order to obtain this data, the researcher first scheduled an observation date with the teachers. The choice of which class will be observed was left to the teachers. Two consecutive lessons were recorded per teacher. Only the second lessons are used for transcription and analysis. The purpose of having an extra first lesson was two-fold. First, the researcher wanted to habituate the classroom to mitigate the effects of observer's paradox. Secondly, the first lessons were used as a cross-check for confusing data in the second lessons. Longer periods of observation gave the researcher the opportunity to get a better feeling of the teacher's teaching style, thus better enabling her to interpret the incidents that took place in the second lessons. The second important set of data came from the recordings of the trainees' presentations within the practicum. These demonstration lessons by the trainees took place in the presence of their mentors. As in T's Data, the researcher scheduled the observation time and class beforehand together with both the trainees and their mentors. The trainees were asked to take the recording equipment to the class before the actual recording took place. By this means, habituating the equipment into the classroom environment was aimed. On the day of actual data collection, the mentors introduced the researcher to

the class assuring them that she is present in the lesson in order to observe the trainee, and not them. The researcher turned on the recorder a few minutes before the onset of the presentation and turned it off a few minutes after the end of the presentation so as not to miss any important event. As a result, T's Data consisted of 27h: 22m: 22s of footage whereas the TR's Data lasted 18 h: 37m: 20s. These recordings are transcribed by the researcher using the Jefferson's transcription system. At the end of the transcription process, the T's Data consisted of 58798 words while the TR's Data was 16369 words. In sum, the whole transcription consisted of 75167 words.

### **Analysis of the Data**

This study is more akin to the "modes analysis" as described by Walsh (2006). The researcher began by taking an "unmotivated looking" stance. Mazur (2004) offers a step by step process for doing this. The first step is reading and re-reading the data carefully to identify sequences. "A sequence has usually ended when speakers are no longer responding to a prior action (initiation, repair), or topic" (Mazur, 2004 p.1085). After selecting either a purposive or an arbitrary segment, the second step is characterizing the sequence. Questions such as "what is the speaker doing in this turn?" or "What is the meaning of this interaction?" are asked. The final step is considering the rights, obligations and expectations constituted in the talk. At this step, unique patterns are documented and observed.

In terms of T's Data, the researcher began by preparing the data for analysis. This included color-coding the lessons according to the modes described in the SETT framework and combining field notes in the form of hand-written notes on the margins of the transcription. "A modes analysis recognizes that understanding and meaning are jointly constructed, but that the prime responsibility for their construction lies with the teacher" (Walsh, 2006, p. 63). Thus, the second step was to identify the purpose and nature of each move by the teacher. These interactional features are coded and marked on the text like "teacher echo (coded as I1 and I2); display question (coded as M1 and M2) Focusing on meaning or content (coded as C), etc. ". These representations made the patterns more visible. By this way, the interactional patterns and unique characteristics of interactions in each mode were identified. Once the researcher got an initial impression of a pattern, she checked it against data to find further instances. These ideas are then discussed in the data analysis part using extracts. The extracts are chosen very carefully. The researcher looked for a convenient extract that best demonstrates the situation and the shortest sequence that allows for the most number of issues to be discussed.

The same procedure is done for the TR's Data. The researcher transcribed it, prepared it for analysis, and carefully looked for patterns and evidence in the data. Since this data was smaller than T's data, the findings are compared to those of T's Data very often. This was done not to generalize them over every T's and TR's but to make sure that the situation is understood more clearly.

### **Research Ethics and Trustworthiness**

The researcher accepts all the responsibility to anticipate and address the ethical issues that may arise in this study. The consents of the participants are granted at every level of the study. Their privacy is protected by not using any names and by not giving unnecessary information that could reveal the participants' identities. The recordings are kept under password protection and are not shared with third parties in any way. In addition the researcher tried her best to maintain the cost-benefit balance for participating in this study.

The quality of this research will be justified using Lincoln & Guba's Taxonomy. (as cited in Dörnyei, 2007 ). These are credibility (instead of internal validity), transferability (instead of external validity), dependability (instead of reliability) and confirmability (instead of objectivity). The credibility of this research was ensured via several maneuvers. Shenton (2004) says that adoption of research methods well established the methods of data analysis should be derived, where possible, from those that have been successfully utilized in previous comparable projects increases credibility. Using the SETT framework was a step taken for this purpose. SETT is originally designed for teachers (i.e. non-academics) to analyze their own lessons. It was used to understand the classroom interactions by the teachers (Moser, Harris & Carle, 2012; Walsh, 2003) and even by trainees (Sert, 2010) in several studies. Shenton (2004) explains further that "prolonged engagement" is another way of

increasing credibility (p. 65). This means developing an early familiarity with the culture of the participating organizations. The researcher recorded more than one lesson for each participant. The first observations were not used for analysis. These were for “habituation” that is, for introducing herself to the environment as much as possible so that the results would not be influenced. Moreover, the observation schedule was distributed through the semester as far as possible. In addition, the researcher triangulated the data in terms of both procedures and participants. The issue of transferability was addressed by providing thick description of the research. Dependability is related to the question what would happen if we repeated the study. Shenton (2004) emphasizes that the text should include sections devoted to the research design and its implementation, the operational detail of data gathering and reflective appraisal of the project, so that other researchers can replicate it if they wish. This was provided by thick description of the research process, just like transferability. A final criterion, confirmability was attained by the discussion of results. In the relevant sections, the researcher compared her findings with other research, discussed the preliminary theories that were falsified and discussed the limitations of the study. By these means, the researcher aimed to provide some transparency of the process. In addition, the researcher always made very clear in her written discourse what are the actual findings and what are the researcher’s personal contentions.

### **Limitations**

Although the researcher took many steps to ensure the qualities of reliability and validity in her research, there have been some limitations that must be addressed. First limitation is the number of participants. Only 10 teachers’ lessons were recorded. Although they were chosen as the best teachers among the volunteers by the board of experts, they were nevertheless only ten teachers. A finer picture of the situation could have been emerged if the number of participants increased. Similarly, it was possible to make recordings of only 7 trainees, all of whom come from the same background. (i.e. ELT department of Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University) If it were possible to collect data from presentations of more trainees, or if it were possible to include trainees from other backgrounds, many issues that remained as question marks in this research would be enlightened. Additionally, this research depends on the analyses of the data in a turn-by-turn fashion and from an emic perspective in ethnographic research. Other techniques of analyses such as discourse analysis, corpus concordance analyses and interaction analyses could also have been used to further refine the areas and identify the contents. Such different data analysis procedures could have produced different results since each look at the data from different perspectives.

### **A SAMPLE DATA ANALYSIS**

Because of space limitations, full data analysis cannot be provided in this report. Thus, analysis of one extract will be presented as an example to reflect the full data analysis process. The following extract comes from the managerial mode in teacher 2’s lesson. This extract is chosen because it is the first extract in the analysis process. T2’s lessons are analyzed in the same way for other modes too and a mode-by-mode analysis is done in the same way for each of the other teachers. All results are compared with trainees’ data for triangulation purposes.

In his lesson, T2 tries to maximize the use of English in his managerial mode using three main instructional strategies. The first strategy is translating an utterance or part of an utterance. He repeats the same message in two languages. The second strategy is talking to himself aloud in English. He prefers using English for turns or part-of-turns which do not require a next turn. The third strategy is that he establishes routines to minimize the need for any Turkish during the instruction phase of a particular exercise.

Extract 1 depicts more than one typical pedagogical goals of the managerial mode, namely, to organize the physical learning environment, to refer learners to materials, and to introduce an activity. In addition Extract 1 sets an example for his use of the first and second strategies.

**Extract 1**

- 1 **T2** because of the television and television that's it and we have a car we go somewhere  
2 else ok and now we got back to- do we have anything else what's the time *saat kaç saate*  
3 *bakalım*  
4 **S** *üç dakika var*  
5 **T2** ok *peki o zaman birazcık şöyle yapalım* ((opens a Google visuals page searchs sports))  
6 *şunlardan bazı sporlardan şu soruyu soralım bakalım*  
7 **S** *sporlardan mı*  
8 **T2** *evet sporları kullanabiliriz resimler şurda hangi sporlar var hemen hemen hepsi var*  
9 *tennis bu tennis basketball ah this one*  
10 **S** *pon pon kızlar*  
11 **T2** oh cheerleaders *pon pon kızlar cheerleaders cheerleaders değil mi emre sen bilirsin*  
12 *nasıl yapıyor onlar böyle hani* ((wiggles his arms))  
13 ((laughter))  
14 **T2** heh heh just a joke I used to play this one golf golf, basketball *bu soruları sormanızı*  
15 *isteyeceğim birkaç spor yapalım resmini gösterdiğim sporu arkadaşına soracaksın*  
16 you're gonna ask when I show ok for example we've got a lot of sports here can you  
17 see that can you see can you see it do you understand can you see that *şu da*  
18 *azıcık büyüsün görülebiliyor mu çocuklar*  
19 **S** *evet*  
20 **T2** *so orayı kullanacağım orası güzel neredeydi o kaçırdık mı onu*  
21 **S** *biraz daha aşağı*  
22 **T2** *biraz daha mı aşağıda şurda ok ha evet this one*  
23 **S** *volleyball*  
24 **T2** *volleyball did you use to play volleyball ok and you answer yes or no bugün ne oldu*  
25 *herkes uyuyor (...)*

In the Extract 1 above, we can see his train of thought and how he comes to the decision of introducing a new activity. The moment he decides that the activity is over is when he says “that’s it” in line 1; “ok and now we got back to-do we have anything else” in line two. He switches to the managerial mode in order to introduce a new activity at the end of line 2. He wants to set a new task, so he begins by asking the time first in English, then in Turkish. The student in line 4 identifies the question as a request for the remaining time and answers accordingly; “üç dakika var” (3 minutes left). Then, he opens a Google page to set a question and answer session with the pictures. The first part of the instruction is given in line 6: “şunlardan bazı sporlardan şu soruyu soralım bakalım” (let’s ask this question from these pictures these sports in the pictures). Through lines 6-13 we see how he shares the interactional space with one of the students sitting in the front row. The student is apparently interested in the upcoming task and joins the teacher’s think aloud process in line 7 by asking about the instruction: “sporlardan mı” (about the sports?) T2 seems to be deeply engaged in the task of finding suitable pictures from Google page until the student reacts to one of the pictures which depicts basketball cheerleaders by saying “pon pon kızlar” (cheerleaders) in an audible way in line 10. T2 takes up the turn and gives the English equivalent of the word. He draws the attention of the other students to the word by making a joke which hints that the student is a little too much interested in the cheerleader girls in lines 11 and 12. He says “değil mi emre sen bilirsin nasıl yapıyor onlar böyle hani” (lit. don’t you emre, you know how they do it like this). The laughter from the class can be considered as evidence that the attention is successfully drawn.

Through lines 1-13, his first strategy is visible. At various places in the interaction, he provides the English equivalent for what he says. For example, in line 2, he asks the time in English first. The conversational token “ok” is repeated with its Turkish equivalent “peki o zaman” in line 5, and “pon pon kızlar” translated into English, back to Turkish and back to English again in line 11. This strategy continues through the subsequent parts; for example, “can you see” in line 17 and “görülebiliyor mu çocuklar” (is it visible children?) in line 18.

The second strategy he uses is most visible after the 14th line. Seemingly, the utterances at the beginning of line 14 do not require a next turn. Still, he says them in an audible way and in English. This seems to be to increase the time that students are exposed to the language. Line 14 begins with “heh heh just a joke” which does not receive any next turn. The intonation of the teacher is fall tone, so he just uses this to finish the laughter. Then another piece of information which does not require an answer from the students comes; “I used to play this one

golf” He wants to expose the students to language that will be required in the upcoming task, so he makes an implicit modeling here by thinking aloud about the pictures in English.

In line 15, the second important element of the instruction is given in Turkish, and it is repeated in English in line 16. Students had been told that they would be asking questions related to the pictures. Now, they are told that they will ask the question upon the visual cue from the teacher: “resmini gösterdiğim sporu arkadaşına soracaksın” (you’ll ask the sport I show to your friend) in line 15 and “you’re gonna ask when I show ok” in line 16. The instruction is completed when the question to be asked is provided in line 24: “did you use to play volleyball and you answer yes or no”.

Through lines 14-25 we can observe many instances where the teacher uses English tokens as he speaks. For example line 20 begins with “so”, line 22 contains “ok” and “this one”. The communicative functions of these utterances are easily accessible from the surrounding Turkish, and they do not require a response in the next turn. Thus, these can be considered as part of his strategy of thinking aloud in English to increase the amount of language that the students get exposed to.

## RESULTS

All of the driving principles of SETT were all confirmed in this study. Namely, Walsh (2006) argues that the classroom context is composed of four different modes. “Using the term mode encompasses the interrelatedness of language use and teaching purpose” (Walsh, 2006, p.62). This study confirmed that teaching purpose and the nature of interaction are related. That is, there is an “interface” between what we say and why we say it (Seedhouse, 2004). As far as the observations revealed, the English classrooms work in differing micro-contexts for both the teachers in T’s Data, and the trainees in TR’s Data. Given the multiplicity of different other studies which provided support for a variable approach (Johnson, Jarvis & Robinson, Kumaravadivelu as cited in Walsh, 2006; van Lier, 1988, Seedhouse, 2005; Walsh & O’Keeffe, 2010; Tsay et.al., 2011), it can be safely claimed there is not a single type of discourse, but varieties of discourse within it in any culture or in any classroom.

In SETT, the number of the modes are identified as four, but Walsh (2006) admits that “there are almost certainly other modes which could be incorporated” (p. 64). It was discovered that in the context of this particular study, all of the four modes exist as described in SETT. There are, however, some cases where the modes have additional pedagogic goals (managerial mode), or two modes merge together to form a hybrid mode (while line-by-line analysis during skills and systems mode) and sub-mode forms in which the interactional features are completely different (classroom context mode). In addition, the pedagogic goal practicing sub-skills is listed in the skills and systems mode in SETT, but in T’s Data and TR’s Data sub-skills are typically referred to during materials mode. Some key findings about the pedagogic orientations and interactional features during each mode in the data are summarized in the following table.



Table 1. Pedagogic Goals and Interactional Features in the English Classroom Discourse in the Muğla Context

Mode	Pedagogic Goals	Interactional Features
Managerial Mode	Giving instructions and homework Arranging the physical environment Managing the behavior of students Transition between the phases of lesson	A single extended teacher turn in L1 or L2 Short, formulaic language for familiar situations (routines) Transitional markers both in L1 and L2 Learner contribution in the form of clarification request, offer and collaborative thinking
Materials Mode	Conducting the material (becoming the voice of the material) Making the material accessible (becoming the inner voice of students) Opportunistic teaching	I-R-F pattern Form focused feedback Error correction Scaffolding Translation
(the line between materials mode and skills and systems mode gets blurred)		Both modes have the same interactional features
Skills and Systems Mode	Bringing the focus on form. Providing language practice Making explanations	Teacher echo metalanguage
Classroom Context Mode	Sharing opinions, feeling and experiences Communicating in the shared history of the classroom community	Mostly in L1 Teacher-led Topic nomination by learners but topic termination always by teacher Topic returns to conventional language work
	(a sub-mode?) Providing feedback on students' performance	Mostly in L1 Initiated by teacher Not always produces a next turn

In terms of proportion, classroom context mode was found the least in the data where the most common modes were materials mode and skills and systems mode. This finding was in line with Lee (2010) in which the most frequent mode was the materials mode and the classroom context mode was excluded because it was not found in the data. Similarly, the most frequent modes were materials mode and managerial mode in Wang's (2012) data. Also, in Miri and Qassemi's (2015) data, materials and skills and systems modes were the most frequent ones while "less amount of classroom interaction was devoted to the classroom context mode" (p. 159).

One of the impressions from the data of this research was that the age of the students can be a factor on the distribution of the modes. The teachers of young learners had to stay in managerial mode for longer stretches of time than those of high school learners. Wang (2012) also found that restless classes resulted in mode side sequences with managerial mode. It can be concluded then, that young learner classes need to spend more time in the managerial mode than older learners. The second mode that seems to have relationship with age was the classroom context mode. Both in T's Data and TR's Data classroom context mode existed in very little proportion, if any, when the pedagogic goal is sharing opinions, feelings and experiences.

In terms of interactional features, the closest to the descriptions in SETT both in terms of pedagogic functions and interactional features were the materials mode and the skills and systems mode. In the other two modes, however, some features differ. In the managerial mode, SETT's description sets forth an uninterrupted, extended teacher turn but it is not unusual in the data that learners share the interactional space and join the managing process. On the other hand, classroom context mode, which is characterized by fewer and shorter teacher turns in SETT, is always in control of the teacher in the data of this study. Teacher control, lack of referential questions and focus on meaning during the classroom context mode are also discussed in Miri & Qassemi (2015).

In terms of pedagogic goals, all pedagogic goals are confirmed to exist more or less in the data and within the described mode with the exception that sub-skills are not addressed in the skills and systems mode as described in SETT, but during materials mode. Also additional pedagogic goals were identified in terms of managerial

mode (arranging student behaviors), materials mode (opportunistic teaching) and classroom context mode (providing feedback on student's performance and communicating in class history). Since the interactional features are very similar, it is not uncommon in the data that these modes occur together or in mode side sequences. Especially, line by line translation for opportunistic teaching carries the pedagogic goals and interactional features of both modes. In the classroom context mode, two additional sub-modes were found. Especially providing feedback on students' performance is completely different in terms of the nature of interaction than the description in SETT.

The role of mother tongue is not accounted for in SETT, however, in this study it appeared repetitively in all four modes and in a multiplicity of ways. In managerial mode, L1 is used for complex instructions and homework. This finding is confirmed in other studies such as Sariçoban, (2010); Yatağanbaba and Yıldırım, (2015), and Sali, (2014) who also found that using L1 for instructions is a common practice in Turkey. Similarly "dealing with procedural trouble" is listed as one of the pedagogical functions of code switching in Üstünel (2009, p.114). Mother tongue comes up as an interactional feature again in materials and skills and systems modes in the form of translation. Teachers used translation at the level of words, phrases and sentences as they are practicing or explaining something. It was offered both by students and by teachers and used frequently as a strategy. Moreover, in this data, a special way of using translation which blurred the line between the materials mode and skills and systems mode is discovered. Moreover, this mode is also found in another researcher's data. Ilin (2014) set out to find out the problems with the practicum program. Part of Ilin's (2014) data holds that mentors who were observed by practicum trainees are reported to "have developed a habit of conducting all the activities in the classroom in mother tongue without a visible necessity. Furthermore, mentors almost translate the entire coursebook and they even check the students' vocabulary knowledge using mother tongue" (p.192). In the same vein, Daşkın (2015) found very similar results to this study in that most of the modes appeared parallel to Walsh's description with the exception that teachers used translation in all modes. Finally, in the classroom context mode, L1 comes up again as a central and very important interactional feature. Almost entire classroom context mode in the data takes place in Turkish. Code switching problem is shown as the reason for our failure to teach English by the Turkish Ministry of Education (2013) and it is described as follows in the program for English lesson:

While it is understood that there are many variables at work in this ongoing problem, it is believed that one of the main reasons for the failure of such a large number of Turkey's students to master competence in English lies in the fact that the language is presented to them as a subject to be learned in school – an academic requirement to be met – rather than as a means for communication. (p.2)

Since the teachers see English as a subject, the skills and systems mode and materials mode take place in English while managerial mode and classroom context mode tend to take place in Turkish.

The findings pertaining to the classroom context mode reinforces the contention of Ministry of Education that English is seen as a subject rather than a means of communication in our schools. As mentioned earlier in this discussion, the classroom context mode appears the least among the other four modes in the data. One reason for this scarcity might be that the teachers' effort to showing the researcher worthwhile lessons. This is a part of the observer's paradox and is validated in another study by Howard (2010). He compared model lessons which were planned to be observed by an observer and pedagogic lessons in which an observer was not present. He found that the model lessons followed a typical format causing fewer code-switches. The effort of the observed teachers was found to be evident in their concern to maintain an orderly classroom atmosphere, which resulted in significantly more managerial mode during the model lessons. In addition, teachers spoke in more words during model lessons (Howard, 2010). So, what these findings sum up to might be that the teachers might have avoided the classroom context mode on purpose because they did not see it as a legit part of the lesson.

When we stop and think what is excluded because labeled as not legit is the things that exist in the communicative history of the students with the teacher. This explains why students are allowed so little topicalisation. Although it falls out of the scope of this study, one thing that meets the eye is that methodologically Turkish ELT classes are still under influence of GTM and ALM and no trace of CLT could be

seen at all. Despite all the teacher education since 1998 (World bank project) and all the materials designed according to CLT. Teachers find a way of using the book in the GTM or ALM way. It makes us think, may be CLT just does not fit to our perception of what a good lesson is culturally.

## CONCLUSION

Walsh (2006) presented a general framework for handling the classroom discourse in SETT but it was impossible to see if these findings would apply to our research context until we actually observe and check it. Indeed, the findings of this research showed that although most modes were congruent, some differences in the perception of certain exchanges, especially classroom context mode have been identified. Markee (2015) emphasized the need to “engage in comparative re-production research in order to make broad statements about the generality and prototypicality of the qualitative organization of particular practices across languages, cultures and institutional contexts” (p. 1). To put in another way, the problem with these types of research is that generalizing is not possible. The knowledge is attained only by cumulating of the experience. It is hoped that this research can contribute a drop to the sea of research pertaining to classroom discourse.

## REFERENCES

- Altan, M. Z. (1998). A call for change and pedagogy: A critical analysis of teacher education in Turkey. *European Journal of Education, 33*(4), 407-417.
- Berg, B.L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Çakıroğlu, E., & Çakıroğlu, J. (2003). Reflections on teacher education in turkey. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 26*(2), 253-264.
- Daşkın, N.C. (2015). Shaping learner contributions in an EFL classroom: Implications for L2 classroom interactional competence. *Classroom Discourse, 6*(1), 33-56.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Howard, A. (2010). Is there such a thing as a typical language lesson? *Classroom Discourse, 1*(1), 82-100.
- Howard, A. (2010). Is there such a thing as a typical language lesson? *Classroom Discourse, 1*(1), 82-100.
- Humphries, S. (2014). Codeswitching in two japanese contexts. In R Barnard, & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives* (p. 65-76). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- İlin, G. (2014). Practicum from the ELT student-teachers' eye: Expectations and gains. *International Journal of Language Academy, 2*(1), 191-207.
- Lee, E.H. (2010). An analysis of online lecture discourse of a Korean NNS teacher and an American NS teacher. *Linguistic Research, 27*(1), 209-229.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Markee, N. (2015). Are replication studies possible in qualitative second/foreign language classroom research? A call for comparative re-production research. *Language Teaching*. Available on CJ02015.doi:10.1017/502614448150000099
- Mazur, J.M. (2004). Conversation analysis for educational technologists: Theoretical and methodological issues for researching the structures, processes, and meaning of on-line talk. In D. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology* (p. 1073-1098). New York: McMillan.
- Miri, M., & Qassem, Z. (2015). Delving into EAP teachers' classroom behavior: Construction or obstruction of learning opportunities in EFL context. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes, 3*(1), 149-164.
- Moser, J., Harris, J., & Carle, J. (2012). Improving teacher talk through a task based approach. *ELT Journal, 66*(1), 81-88.
- Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System, 42*, 308-318.
- Sarıçoban, A. (2010). Problems encountered by student teachers during their practicum studies. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*, 707-711.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005). “Task” as a research construct. *Language learning, 55*(3), 353-570.
- Sert, O. (2010) A proposal for a CA-integrated English language teacher education program in Turkey. *The Asian EFL Journal, 12*(3), 62-97.

- Shenton, A.K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22, 63-75.
- T.C. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. Talim Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı. (2013). *İlköğretim Kurumları (İlkokul ve Ortaokullar) İngilizce Dersi (2-3-4-5-6-7-8 sınıflar) Öğretim Programı*. Retrieved, May 27, 2014 from <http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/www/guncellenen-ogretim-programlari/icerik/151>
- Tsay, J.J., Judd, A.B., Hauk, S., & Davis, M.K. (2011) Case study of a college mathematics instructor: Patterns of classroom discourse. *Educ Stud Math*, 78, 205-229.
- Üstünel, E. (2009). *The sequential organization of code-switching in EFL classrooms*. Saarbrücken: Verlag Dr. Müller.
- van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner: Ethnography and second language classroom research*. London: Longman.
- Walsh, S. (2003) Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom through teacher self evaluation. *Language Awareness*, 12(2), 124-142.
- Walsh, S. (2006) *Investigating classroom discourse*. New York: Routledge Publishing.
- Walsh, S., & O’Keeffe, A. (2007). Applying CA to a modes analysis of higher education spoken academic discourse. In H. Bowles & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and language for specific purposes* (p.101-141). Peter Lang: Bern.
- Walsh, S., & O’Keeffe, A. (2010) Investigating higher education seminar talk. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 4(2), 141-158.
- Walsh, S., O’Keeffe, A., & McCarthy, M. (2008). “...post-colonialism, multi-culturalism, structuralism, feminism, post-modernism and so on and so forth”: A comparative analysis of vague category markers in academic discourse. In A. Adel & R. Reppen (Eds.), *Corpora and discourse: The challenges of different settings* (p. 9-29). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wang, P.L. (2012). *The investigation of classroom modes and interactional features in young learners’ English classrooms*. MA Thesis, Department of Applied English, School of Education and Applied Languages, Ming Chuan University, Taiwan.
- Willis, J. (1981). The training of non-native speaker teachers of English: A new approach. In *ELT Documents 110 – Focus on the Teacher*. London: British Council.
- Yang, S. (2014). Interaction and codability: A multi-layered analytical approach to discourse markers in teacher’s spoken discourse. In J. Romeo-Trillo (Ed.), *Yearbook of corpus linguistics and pragmatics 2014* (p. 291-313). Springer: Springer.
- Yatağanbaba, E., & Yıldırım, R. (2015). EFL teachers’ code-switching in Turkish secondary EFL young language learner classrooms. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 7(1), 82-101.