Sakarya University Journal of Education Faculty

Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi

Mikro-Öğretim ve Uygulama Okulu Sınıf Ortamındaki Sınıf Söyleminin Karşılaştırmalı Bir İncelemesi

Ali İLYA*

Makale Bilgisi	ÖZ
Geliş Tarihi: 03.07.2022 *Kabul Tarihi*: 23.11.2022 *Basım Tarihi*: 30.12.2022	Sosyokültürel Kuramın doğuşu, bireyleri belli bir sosyal yapılanmanın üyeleri olarak ön plana çıkarmıştır. İlgili kuram, bireylerin en iyi diğerleriyle etkileşim içerisinde öğreneceklerini savunmuştur ve dil öğrenimi de bunun bir parçasıdır. Etkileşimin dil öğrenimindeki yerini, etkileşim içerisindeki konuşmanın doğasını ve çeşitli ortamlardaki konuşmaların özelliklerini irdeleyen araştırmalar yapılmıştır. Etkileşimin öğrenme sürecindeki öneminin kavranmasını takiben, öğretmenlerin dil kullanımı ve sınıftaki etkileşimi yönetme becerileri de ön plana çıkmıştır. Bu bağlamda öğretmenlerin sınıf içi söylemlerine yönelen çalışmalar ağırlıklı olarak ortaya konmuşsa da mikro-öğretim ortamlarıyla uygulama okullarındaki gerçek sınıf ortamındaki söylemi karşılaştırmalı olarak inceleyen çalışmaların sayısı kısıtlı kalmıştır. Açıklanan ihtiyaçtan doğan bu çalışma, öğretmen adaylarının uygulama okullarındaki gerçek sınıf ortamı ile mikro-öğretim bağlamı içerisindeki söylemini karşılaştırmalı olarak incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Üç öğretmen adayının, iki farklı ortamdaki öğretim uygulamaları kaydedilmiş, sınıf-içi etkileşimlerin transkripsiyonu çıkarılmış ve detaylı bir çözümlemesi yapılmıştır. Ayrıca bir öğretmen adayıyla video temelli görüşme yapılmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçları mikro-öğretim ve gerçek sınıf ortamındaki sınıf söylemi arasında bazı farklılıkları ortaya koymuştur. Öğretmen konuşma süresindeki eşitsizlik, öğrenci katılım oranındaki farklılık, etkileşimin organizasyonu iki bağlam arasındaki başlıca farklar olmakla beraber, söylemin birlikte yapılandırılmasının öğrenme sürecindeki etkisi ortak nokta olarak ön plana çıkmıştır. **Anahtar sözcükler:** Sınıf-içi etkileşim, sınıf söylemi, mikro-öğretim, öğretmen yetiştirme
doi: 10.53629/sakaefd.1140040	Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

* *Dr. Araştırma Görevlisi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü Sakarya-Türkiye, ailya@sakarya.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-9997-9244

A Comparative Analysis of Classroom Discourse in Microteaching and Practice School Contexts

Article Information	ABSTRACT
	The rise of the Sociocultural Theory has featured individuals as members of a social group. It primarily asserts that individuals learn best in relation to other people, and language learning is not an exception. A great number of research studies have been conducted to investigate the role of interaction in language learning, nature of talk in interaction, and different aspects of conversations in diverse settings. Subsequent to the discovery of the power of interaction; teachers' use of language, and skills in managing the interaction in the classroom have also gained importance. Many studies solely focused on the interactions and classroom discourse of in-service teachers in real classroom settings. However, the number of studies comparatively analyzing the classroom discourse managed by pre-service teachers (PSTs) in the microteaching and real classroom settings has remained scarce. The present research emerges out of this need to explore PSTs' classroom discourse in microteaching and practice school contexts in a comparative manner. Three PSTs' teaching implementations in two different settings were recorded, the interactions were transcribed, and committed to an in-depth analysis. In addition, one PST was invited to a stimulated-recall interview. The results of the current study demonstrated certain differences between microteaching and practice school contexts in terms of the classroom discourse. Inequalities in the amount of teacher talk in two contexts, difference in the rate of students' participation, the organization of the interaction were among the major differences while the co-construction of classroom discourse and its effects on the learning process were among the commonalities.
	Article Type: Research Article

1.INTRODUCTION

The rise of the Sociocultural (S-C) Theory further featured interaction as the primary source of input and "the genesis of language" (Saville-Troike, 2012, p. 118). Interaction, from the viewpoint of the Sociocultural Theory, is not only a facilitative but also a causative force in acquisition (Vygotsky, 1978). Learning is viewed as a social process in which the learner himself/herself is actively involved. The S-C Theory stands out with its claim that individuals construct their knowledge base in social settings in an interaction (Saville-Troike, 2012). Along with the move from teacher-centered education to student-centered education, the significance of interaction shined out more, and interaction in language classrooms drew considerable attention on the grounds that classrooms present tremendous opportunities for the learners to speak up, participate in communicative activities, and learn through interaction in such social pedagogical settings (Cullen, 1998).

The current emphasis on the role of interaction in language learning has added credence to the social constructivist theory, which acknowledges students and teacher as the co-owners of the classroom discourse (Walsh, 2003). Although participants appear on the stage with different agendas in the background, they act with the common goal of language learning and cooperatively construct the discourse (Vygotsky, 1998; Walsh, 2003). However, teachers take the primary responsibility of developing classroom communicative competence that depends on the idea that occasions for learning are collaboratively created but mainly led by teachers (van Lier, 1988, 1996; Walsh, 2003). Thus, it is essential for teachers to be able to accurately make on-the-spot decisions and take advantage of opportunities to let the students become active stakeholders of the classroom discourse. However, it has been observed that although teachers are well aware of the importance of students' involvement in classroom interaction, they are not efficient enough in promoting, directing, and manipulating student talk, hence Cullen (2001) argues that a close analysis of selected extracts from the transcripts of classroom interactions may largely contribute to teachers' professional development.

The necessity of raising teachers' awareness of the nature and structure of classroom interaction, especially teacher talk, for professional development brings the idea of laying emphasis on analyzing the classroom discourse in pre-service teachers' (PSTs) teaching implementations into the forefront. In the pre-service teacher education programs, microteachings give a chance of bridging the gap between theory and practice by encouraging PSTs to implement recently learned teaching techniques and strategies in a simulated environment (Skinner, 2012). Microteaching practices, which are often videotaped, provide a means for PSTs and teacher trainers to reflect on many aspects of their own teaching sessions including classroom interaction and teacher talk (I'Anson, Rodrigues & Wilson, 2003). Teaching implementations at practice schools as a part of Practicum

courses further help PSTs test, observe, and develop their teaching skills. Simbo (1989) asserts that teaching implementations at practice schools carried out subsequent to microteachings are less anxiety provoking owing to PSTs' previous experience; hence, it may reasonably be inferred that PSTs' skills at managing the classroom discourse and teacher talk may be improved, or the inherent characteristics of the two separate settings may lead to differently structured interactions. So, a comparative analysis of classroom discourse and teacher talk in microteachings and teaching implementations at practice schools may reveal valuable insights; however, the number of such research studies is still scarce. To fill this gap, the present study aims to analyze the teacher talk and classroom discourse in PSTs' microteachings and teaching implementations at practice schools comparatively.

1.1. Classroom Discourse and the Role of Teacher Talk

Hatch (1978) righteously states that interaction is not as neat as it is thought in the classroom, and it does not follow an exactly predictable order, thus by its nature it is quite complex and is worth a detailed consideration. Learners are not considered either as "processors of input" or "producers of output, but as speaker/hearers involved in developmental processes which are realized in interaction" (Ohta, 2000, p. 51). From this perspective, language acquisition cannot solely be explained through internal mechanisms of an individual, but it is seen as a developmental process governed by the interaction between the individual and environment (Ohta, 2000). An understanding of language acquisition then necessitates a thorough investigation of the interaction among novice learners themselves, and between learners and experts or more proficient users of language (Ohta, 2000). It was also noted that classrooms should be separated from other natural settings due to their distinctive characteristics, being goal-oriented, and operating under certain rules imposed both on learners and teachers; and thus, they should be explored in their own rights (Seedhouse, 1996; van Lier, 1988). Teachers play a vital role through their talk in students' language learning process as in many cases how interaction is characterized in a classroom heavily depends on how teachers shape their talk (Suratno, 2019).

The complexity and unpredictability of classroom discourse notwithstanding, Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) cycle (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) as one of the well-established classroom discourse moves describes typical interaction patterns in a regular classroom. In the first stage of the cycle, teacher initiates a conversation through a question or a prompt. It is followed by the second move, students' response to the prompt or question of the teacher. Response could be in the form of both verbal or non-verbal language. In the last move, teacher provides feedback on students' response (Ho, 2007). This three-stage sequence is also called as triadic dialogue (Lemke, 1990), triadic dialogue genre (Wells, 1999), and Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) cycle (Hall & Walsh, 2002). In the IRF cycle, interaction in a classroom is hierarchical and sequential at the same time (Wells, 1993; Hellermann, 2003). It is hierarchical because it is the teacher who initiates a conversation, and it is sequential because it follows an order of the interactants. IRF is the most commonly employed interaction pattern; however, its effectiveness is heavily based on teachers' mastery in managing the exchanges, stimulating students' participation, and implementing each of the stages properly (Sadker & Sadker, 1991). For instance, Musumeci (1996) displayed that teachers dominate the classroom interaction to a large degree, give very little chance to the students to initiate conversational exchanges, or to modify their output, and tend to fill in the gaps instead of scaffolding students to repair their utterances themselves. Therefore, it is important for teachers to gain awareness of their own talk and how they characterize classroom discourse. The study conducted by Walsh (2002) yielded some implications for the betterment of the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom settings; raising teachers' language awareness for a tighter link between pedagogic purpose and language use, a need for avoiding filling in the gaps in learners' discourse, encouraging teachers to reflect on their own verbal behavior through video and audio-recordings, and a pivotal need for the teacher education programs to lay more emphasis on the use of language in teaching sessions. Walsh (2002) underlines the requirement for the teacher education programs to prioritize training on language use in classroom as one of the implications. Likewise, Johnson (1995) says that "teachers control what goes on in the classrooms primarily through the ways in which they use the language" (p. 9). Li and Walsh (2011), in a similar vein, revealed that teachers' beliefs regarding the definition and function of language shape their ways of managing the classroom interaction, hence it is essential for pre-service teacher education programs to raise PSTs' awareness of teacher talk and its role in classroom discourse, and train them in theory and practice. PSTs' microteachings and teaching implementations at practice schools stand as opportunities to that end.

1.2. Microteaching Implementations and Interactional Analysis

"Experience without theory is blind, but theory without experience is mere intellectual play" says Immanuel Kant to underscore the interplay between theory and practice. The quote applies to the area of language teaching as well. Although in the earlier periods, teaching skills were believed to be the reflections of the innate qualities (Schulz, 2000), the recent reforms in the English Language Teaching (ELT) curricula have proved the legitimacy of the shift from transmission mode in which teacher is described as "a tap pouring water into an empty vessel" (as qtd. in Richards & Renandya, 2002, p. 46) to the reciprocal inquiries that prioritize collective effort in developing professional identities of teachers and a base on practicality (Richards, 2008). The lingering question of "what to teach" was altered by a tougher one that is "how to teach" (Siu, 1999), and the key to the alternative answers was nothing else than experience. The new trend away from the traditional to social constructivist models led to the birth and growth of the term, microteaching (Allen & Fortune, 1965).

Fortune, Cooper, and Allen (1967) define microteaching as "preliminary experience and practice in teaching, as a research vehicle to explore training effects under controlled conditions, and as an in-service training instrument for experienced teachers" (p. 1). The definition underlines the prominent characteristic features of microteaching; being a preparatory process in which PSTs test their teaching skills with the aim of getting better at applying theory into practice, being an experimental tool that lets PSTs check the usefulness of various teaching strategies, being a safe environment due to the supervision of an experienced trainer, and being an instrument to teach how to teach. It involves the basic skills in "communicating, explaining, questioning, organizing," and so forth (Babalola, 2010, p. 94). Besides, Bell (2007) argues that through microteaching PSTs learn from their own experience. As a laboratory method, microteaching helps PSTs better diagnose the complexities of the teaching process, and come up with alternative solutions to the problems identified throughout the implementation sessions (Can, 2009). In this way, PSTs not only consolidate theoretical knowledge but also test different dimensions of teaching through the first-hand experience. Due to the extensive reflection processes, microteaching also contributes to the development of critical thinking skill that is another indispensable requirement of a qualified teacher (Popovich & Katz, 2009).

In addition to the studies that feature the leading benefits of microteaching practices, some others turn their angels to their drawbacks. The pseudo environment in which microteaching sessions are carried out is the most common criticism directed at the technique. Stanley (1998) mentions the unwillingness of the PSTs to participate in the practices due to its artificiality. The same study also points to the exhaustion PSTs suffer from while preparing the materials. It also refers to the time constraints that make it challenging for PSTs to attend the microteaching sessions. Cripwell and Geddes (1982) touch on the budgetary concerns and difficulties with providing the necessary equipment in addition to the ones mentioned above. The study of Lederman and Gess-Newsome (1991) is also consistent with the previous ones as it presents the similar negative aspects as the motive behind PSTs' reluctance to take part in the microteaching implementations.

As an integral part of microteaching, interaction in the classroom has also been dealt with in the research studies. Nurmasitah (2010) explored the characteristics of classroom interaction in microteachings to check if the practices in the researched context met the criteria of Walberg's teaching effectiveness. 42 fifth year Science Education Study Program PSTs and a lecturer participated in the study. FIA and Walberg's teaching effectiveness elements were utilized as the two instruments of data collection. The study revealed that PSTs were sufficiently involved in the interaction in the microteachings, and the most frequently observed classroom characteristic was content cross. Almost 22% of the class time was found to be devoted to PSTs' participation in classroom interaction. Teaching effectiveness elements that were prominent in the microteaching practices were listed as academic learning time, cooperative learning, higher order questions, classroom atmosphere, use of reinforcement, cues and feedback, direct instruction, advanced organizers, democratic classroom, and indirect teaching. In another study, Skinner (2012) approaches the issue of classroom discourse in microteaching practices through the lens of Zimerman's identity categories. The study differs from many others with its comparative analysis of microteaching and real teaching settings in terms of discourse in relation to changing identities. Moreover, it embraces specifically the viewpoint of the applied Conversation Analysis (CA) with its acknowledgment of classroom as separated from other natural settings due to its being goal-oriented. It was yielded that transportable identities occur more in the microteaching sessions. The dominance of transportable identities in microteaching setting allotted more space for interaction as supposed students felt themselves more comfortable with interacting with the PST on the stage. It was also suggested that moving between different transportable identities may help PSTs get out of the IRF cycle and maintain a more active participation of the

learners. It was concluded with the most basic implication that microteaching and real teaching settings were distinct from each other in terms of the dominance of different types of identities adopted by PSTs.

So far, the concise literature review has established the role of teacher talk in classroom discourse, and introduced microteaching and other teaching implementations as vehicles for linking theory and practice in a socially constructed setting. It has been underlined that interaction opportunities should be managed well by the teachers to let the students get the stage more frequently, and it could only be achieved by means of practice that inherently involves reflexivity. Although studies focusing either on teacher talk, classroom discourse, or microteaching are quite many in number; the ones addressing teacher talk in microteaching and teaching implementations at real settings such as practice schools in a comparative manner have remained few, and the need to increase the number of such studies further illuminate the practice. To respond to this need, this research study intends to analyze teacher talk in microteaching and real classroom settings in a comparative manner. The following research questions guide the study:

1. How is the classroom discourse structured in microteaching and practice school contexts by the PSTs?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

Stake (2010) states that human affairs work differently in different situations, thus their exploration requires a context-sensitive viewpoint. Accordingly, qualitative research or "the science of the particular" (Stake, 2010, p. 26) was adopted for the current study as it mainly sets out to understand the characteristics of classroom discourse and teacher talk in two distinct settings in a particular context. The study was designed as a case study as it was bounded in terms of time (a specific academic term), sample (3 PSTs), context (a particular English teacher education program and two types of settings), and phenomenon (classroom discourse).

2.2. Setting and Participants

The present research study was carried out in the Department of English Language Teaching at a state university in Turkey. The four-year undergraduate program offers skills-based courses in the first year for the students who either successfully complete the preparatory education or are exempted from it with a score of 80 out of 100 on the language proficiency test that measures the four skills of the English language. According to the regulations approved by the Senate and the Council of Higher Education in Turkey, 80 on the proficiency test applied by the university is equal to the same score on a national test, YDS. OSYM -Testing, Selection, and Placement Center- applying the test of YDS, considers 80 as equal to B1-B2 on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Thus, the participants can be considered to be at B2 or a level above. The second year of the four-year program offers theory-based courses in the field of English Language Teaching. In the third-year, PSTs begin to take applied courses in addition to the theoretical ones. In the fifth term, the PSTs are introduced to the concept of microteaching in the courses entitled Language Teaching through Literature and Teaching Speaking and Listening Comprehension Skills. In each of these two courses, PSTs perform two microteaching presentations. In the sixth term, the participants of the current research were studying in, PSTs are taking three courses that require them to perform microteachings; Teaching English to Young Learners, Teaching Reading and Writing Skills, and School Experience. For the last of these three courses, PSTs visit assigned practice schools to observe the real classroom settings, complete the weekly tasks, and perform a teaching session. The fourth year of the program is more practice-based with two separate ten-credit Practicum courses, in each of which PSTs perform 3-5 full teaching sessions.

The participants of the research were chosen according to the homogenous sampling technique (Creswell, 2014) among the PSTs taking the course Teaching Reading and Writing Skills (Section A) that has been taught and coordinated by the researcher himself. The three participants were the ones who took both Teaching Reading & Writing Skills and School Experience from the researcher as the instructor, because in this case the researcher had the chance to ask them to repeat the same lesson at the practice school subsequent to necessary modifications upon the feedback received from the peers and the instructor on microteaching. They were all regular students in their sixth term and they voluntarily participated in the study as approved through the

informed consent forms they signed. The participants were all at the age of 22 and they were all males. None of them had teaching experience in an actual classroom setting previously.

2.3. Data Collection

The three PSTs were first taught about how to teach reading and writing skills in the first seven weeks of the spring semester in the 2016-2017 academic year in Teaching Reading and Writing Skills course. Then, they were asked to prepare a lesson plan in accordance with Shrum and Glisan's (1994) adaptation of the Hunter and Russell (1977) model to teach reading and writing skills in an integrated way. The participating PSTs all prepared a lesson to be appropriate in a high school context, so other students in the microteaching environment were supposed to act as adolescents. The PSTs themselves chose the topics to be covered. The topics covered by the PSTs are as follows:

PST A: The role of cohesive devices-B1
PST B: Extracting the main ideas in a text and drawing a diagram-B1
PST C: Skimming and scanning/Writing about the main themes in a text-B1

PSTs first taught at the university context in a microteaching environment, and then they repeated the same class session in the real classroom settings at practice schools after they revised their plans on the basis of the feedback they received from the researcher and peers. Each class session lasted between 30 and 40 minutes both in the microteaching and practice school settings. The class sessions were video-recorded and then transcribed according to the conventions of Jefferson (2004). Following an analysis of the transcriptions, one volunteering PST was chosen for a stimulated-recall interview. The PST was shown some exploitable scenes from both teaching implementations, and the interview was audio-recorded. To sum up, the database of the research is composed of the following;
-        106 minutes of teaching in microteaching setting
-        120 minutes of teaching in practice school settings
-        33-minute-long stimulated-recall interview
-        Transcripts of teaching sessions at practice schools (5651 words in total)
-        Transcripts of microteachings (10186 words in total)
-        Transcripts of the stimulated recall interview (3741 words in total)

2.4. Microteaching Implementations

PSTs all followed the model proposed by Allen and Ryan (1969) that involves the stages of planning, teaching, observation and criticism, re-planning, re-teaching, and re-observation (Arsal, 2015). In the first stage, the PSTs made up their minds on the attainment targets, selection of the material, activities, and other details concerning the teaching process. In the next stage, the plan was implemented in a structured setting, and it allowed the students to bridge the gap between the theory and practice. The third stage involved the observation of the process with an aim to identify the strengths, weaknesses, and other features. Lastly, the performance was evaluated, and possible ways of improving it were discussed both with the researcher and other peers. Lastly, all the previous stages were repeated in the practice school settings.

2.5. Data Analysis

The data collected in the form of video and audio recordings was transcribed verbatim. Adopting an emic perspective, the data was qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed to explore the nature and structure of the classroom talk in two distinct settings i.e. practice school context and microteaching. Discourse Analysis (DA) was employed for explanation and interpretation as it foregrounds the role of context in meaning construction process. More specifically, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) model of interaction analysis was followed. Although it might limit the analysis due to the traditional view of classroom interaction, it is among the most well-established models of analysis and the classroom interaction in most cases demonstrates a typical cycle of IRF. The data was repeatedly read to gain a deeper insight through an unmotivated lens. Single cases were identified, compared with similar ones in the same collection, and any deviant cases were marked as the initial points to challenge the established hypotheses formed on the previously collected instances. All ethnographic and demographic characteristics of the specific content and participants were kept separate from the analysis. Then, data were

coded and quantified when deemed necessary. The analysis was illustrated through sample authentic extracts from both contexts, and interpretations were comparatively presented.

3. RESULTS

An in-depth analysis of the classroom interactions occurring in the six class sessions of the PSTs revealed a number of points regarding the nature of talk in interactions in two separate settings. Initially, it was observed that class sessions were planned in a quite communicative way. In all the lesson plans, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) was presented as one of the approaches adopted. It might be explained in relation to the expectations of the department they were studying in and their knowledge of the set of criteria in the rubric by which they were assessed by the instructor. Although the contents and the target proficiency levels were the same in both settings, PSTs were respectably more dominant in the practice school contexts. Table 1 displays the amount of teacher talk in six class sessions:

Table 1
Amount of teacher talk of three PSTs in two settings

Teacher Talk		MT Setting	Practice School Setting	Average
PSTs	A	32%	76%	54%
	B	46%	72%	59%
	C	40%	61%	51%
AVERAGE		39%	70%	55%

Note: MT Setting=Microteaching Setting

As can be seen in Table 1, students were quite more active than the PSTs in the microteaching setting; however, the active involvement of the students remarkably declined in the practice school contexts. The gap in the amount of teacher talk in the two settings was interpreted in the stimulated-recall interview by PST-B through the comfort they felt while speaking in microteachings, thus he stated that the PSTs generally did not hesitate to engage in the classroom interaction. Moreover, PST-B added that they had problems with adopting their roles as students and adjusting their manners in compliance with the expectations in microteachings. Extract 1 from a microteaching setting exemplifies PST-B's remarks:

> Extract 1
> *From PST-B's microteaching session*
>
> 1 PST: Okay guys (+) So (+) Attention please! (+) Do you think why we travel?
> 2 Songül: to learn different culture
> 3 Ezgi: to see kangaroos.
> 4 PST: Yes!
> 5 Ali: Teacher!, to escape from people.
> 6 Can: to see ((unintelligible))
> 7 Ezgi: to see historical places.
> 8 Burcu: to see koala
> 9 PST: koala?
> 10 Burcu: yes!
> 11 Mehmet: parrot!
> 12 PST: Exotic animals, (+) you are talking about.
> 13 Hakan: At [Horse]!
> 14 Oğuzhan: At egzotik mi [If horse is an exotic animal?]?
> 15 Yusuf: Egzotik at var [there are exotic horses].

In Extract 1 above, the interaction did not follow the IRF cycle that is generally observed in a typical classroom setting. PST-B initiated an interaction with a question, and then students responded to the question without raising their hands to ask for permission. PST-B interfered with the interaction with some feedback as in Lines 4-9-12; however, the conversation did not follow a neat order. It was not only the PST who responded to the

students, they themselves engaged in an interaction with one another in a humorous way as in Lines 13-14-15. Extract 2, which presents the dialogue in PST-B's class repeated in the practice school context, further reveals how discourse was differently structured when the context changed:

Extract 2
From PST-B's repeated lesson in the practice school context

1 PST: Do you know people (+) go on travelling when they feel that they ha- have- they should be renergized (++) because (++) work (+) and schools may be sometimes tiring. (+) that is why we travel. Do you think you sho- you need travelling?
2 LL: Ye:s
3 PST: Pekii (+) [OK] Why do you think- why do you need do you ever ((unintelligible))
4 L7: (raising her hand) To have a change in our lives.
5 PST: To have a change in our lives (+) Yes! What else?
6 L7: To relax
7 PST: What?
8 L7: Relax
9 PST: To relax we travel, what else?
10 L7: Exploring and discovering new places?
11 PST: Ye:s
12 PST: So. As you can see there are many reasons that drive us to travel. (++) Okay but guys? (+) Do you really want to learn if you really need to travel? (+) I mean. There are symptoms of travelling (++) and in this video you will learn why you should travel. Because it will give some reasons to you to travel.
13 PST: Oka:y (+) While- While watching the video you will take some notes (++) because you are going to write down (+) all these factors that drive us to travel.

PST-B's small talk in Extract 1 was replaced with a much longer talk in Extract 2 that is typical in a real classroom setting. It also deviated from the former sequence in terms of the number of participants. In Extract 1, 9 students were engaged in the interaction following a question posed by the PST. On the other hand, in Extract 2, PST-B was interacting only with one student, and IRF cycle was followed, interaction seemed quite in an order. In Line 4, L7 asked for permission to speak up unlike the students in the microteaching atmosphere. Without turning to other students or waiting for others to participate, PST-B directly moved on to the video recording students were going to watch as a part of a second type activity.

Another theme observed in the comparison of the lessons in microteaching and practice school contexts was the unwillingness of the students to participate and use English. Extract 3 from PST-A's class session in the practice school setting illustrates the theme:

Extract 3
From PST-A's repeated lesson in the practice school context

1 PST: [I want you to] look at those texts and tell me what is wrong?
2 L2: What is wrong?
3 PST: What is wrong yes. What is the problem over there? Obviously, there is a
    problem.
    ((silence))
4 PST: I want you to compare two texts.
    ((silence for some more time))
5 L2: ((unintelligible))
6 PST: Did you find anything?
7 LL: ((silence))

In Extract 3, the only intelligible interaction between the PST and a student was for the negotiation of the meaning. In Line 2, L2 repeated what the PST just said with a questioning intonation, and PST-A elaborated on what he previously said to make the input understood by the student. However, in the remaining part of the interaction, students kept their silence for a long while. It might also be because of the fact that they didn't understand the instruction, and the fixed roles they might adopt prevented them from asking the teacher to

clarify the instruction. Extract 4, a similar dialogue that occurred in the microteaching of PST-A, discloses the contrast between the two settings in terms of students' participation:

Extract 4
From PST-A's microteaching session

1 PST: ((distributing the papers)): Hushh!
2 PST: ((making a two with his left hand)): So. (++) You see there are two versions
    of the message. Okay? There are two versions. So-
3 Can: ((without raising his hand)): I do not get it.
4 PST: I want you to (++) think (++) [what is wrong?] with these two messages?
5 LL: Hmmmm…
6 Ali: ((without raising his hand)): Teacher, instagram bildiriminiz var.
7 PST: ((approaches Ali)): Yes.
8 Ali: (hhhh)
9 LL: ((unintelligible))
10 PST: ((pointing out Oğuzhan)): Yes, Oğuzhan.
11 Oğuzhan: The first one is-
12 Songül: ((without raising her hand)): Haaa şey değil-
13 ((PST silences her with a sign that means stop))
14 Oğuzhan: ((continues to speak)): The first one is (not like texting), the second one is (+)
    like you are chatting (++) like conversation!

In Line 3, Can took the turn without waiting for the transition relevance place (TRP) (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005), which may be explained again through the identities adopted by the interactants. In Line 6, another student, Ali took the turn and responded with an unexpected turn constructional unit. In other words, an orderly sequence, or adjacency pairs, is composed of some expected utterances. For instance, an invitation might be responded in a positive or negative way; however, responding to an invitation with a comment on the interlocutor's clothing is not adjacent to the former utterance. In Line 4, PST-A explained the task and expected the students to confirm him or ask for clarification, but in Line 6, Ali commented on the screenshot on the activity sheet. In Extract 3, the video analysis showed that PST-A experienced problems due to the silence of the students, on the contrary, in Extract 4, he had difficulties with muting them.

As another occurring theme, collaboration for a pedagogical goal through co-constructed discourse was illustrated in Extract 5 that was from PST-A's microteaching session. It demonstrates how the PST and learners work together for a pedagogical goal:

Extract 5
From PST-A's microteaching session

1 Ezgi: Ulaşım [Transportation].
2 PST: Ulaşım! [Transportation!] What is "ulaşım", why don't you speak in English?
3 Ali: Travelling!
4 Burak: Driving!
5 Ezgi: Transportation.
6 PST: Transportation, ye:s, (+) it is the exact translation. Well done, Ezgi. You are
    my favorite student today.
7 Ali: Be like Ezgi!

PST-A and students were working on a relevant term in the sequence, the English equivalent of the Turkish vocabulary item; "ulaşım." To respond to PST-A's question concerning the target language equivalent of the Turkish word, three students uttered an L2 word. Students were getting exposed to three different closely related words, and PST-A, rather than providing the word himself, tried to elicit it from the students and they achieved the goal altogether at the end. Then, the PST praised the student uttering the closest answer as the last stage of the IRF cycle in Line 6. Extract 6 from PST-C's lesson in the practice school setting provides another example for the collaboration among the classroom members for achieving a pedagogical goal:

Extract 6
From PST-C's lesson in the practice school context

1 PST: OK. Could be. Yes, Buğra.
2 Buğra: I am good feel.
3 PST: You good feel?
4 Buğra: Yes. Because it is my seventy school.
5 PST: Seventh?
6 Buğra: Yes, it is my seventh school.

PST-C in Line 3 corrected the utterance that was erroneous in terms of the word order; however, the student did not correct his mistake but communication did not break down either. In Line 5, PST-C corrected the student's mistake in numbers, and just in the following pair, the student gave the correct form of the previous utterance.

Another arising theme in the data analysis was the inadequacy of microteachings for PSTs to get prepared to teach in practice school setting. Extract 7 displays an example from in-class interaction in PST-B's lesson in the practice school context. It was observed that the PST was so self-focused, and was not able to carry out the requirements of the twofold identity of speaker-hearer:

Extract 7
From PST-B's lesson in the practice school context

1 PST: Good morning class!
2 LL: Good morning teach:er!
3 PST: Why don't you stand up?
   class stands up
4 PST: Show some respect please (+) I am the teacher here. How are you today?
5 LL: Fine thanks and yo:u
6 PST: I am also fine. did you see the bulletin board?+ mm the poster in the bulletin
   board (+) in the corridor?
7 L1: Hocam [Teacher] can we sit down?
8 L2: Hocam [Teacher] can we sit down?
9 PST: There is an announcement (++) You can see it in the smart board. You don't
   need to look out the door. But this- (((uninteligible)))
10 LL: Sit down, sit down!
11 LL: hhh.
12 L3: Can we sit down?
13 PST: Oh sorry- you can sit down!
14 LL: hhh.
15 PST: I am a bi- I am a bit anxious right now (+) because it is my first time in school
   experience (+) O:kay. What this poster reminds you of?

The interaction sequence in Extract 7 shows that PST-B ignored the role of hearer in the interaction. It seems that the PST at first felt disturbed as he thought that his identity as a teacher was not acknowledged by the students. Then, he warned the students of their perceived disrespectful behavior and asked them to stand up as a sign of respect in Line 3; however, he forgot to invite them back to their seats. Although some students tried to warn PST-B as in Lines 7-8-10-12 a few times, he ignored them as the PST was so much concerned about the subject matter. In the stimulated recall interview, PST-B identified the scene as "*cringe*," and said that "*I was so anxious, this was my first experience in a real classroom, I was afraid that I couldn't do it, students would not respect me as a teacher, there would be problems with classroom management, and I would lose face in front of the students.*" He also added that "*my being late and problems with the smart board also played a role in my failure at the beginning.*"

In the stimulated-recall interview, PST-B reported that microteaching session he executed at the faculty did not prepare him for the lesson in the practice school context, and explained the reasons in Extract 8 below:

Extract 8
Excerpt from the stimulated recall interview of PST-B

Hmm… Actually, hocam, it proves … what what we have said all the time. I believe that in our microteachings we, I mean my friends and you as a student, really exaggerate. When we plan our lessons, believe me, we focus more on the problems that will happen in the microteachings, not the activities, materials, or other things. It was not too difficult to teach normally but in a classroom where everyone is speaking altogether at the same time and moving from one side to another, it is almost impossible to manage the classroom and teach them something. Before the first term, I thought that microteachings would be easy because all of them are my friends and real teaching would be difficult but I saw that real setting is easier. Our friends do not speak like real students so we cannot adopt the role of a teacher and everything seems so fake then. How can I think an adult as a child? LOL!

PST-B, in Extract 8, pointed to the artificiality of the microteaching and stated that students couldn't act accordingly. He thought that classroom management challenged the PSTs more than it should have, and it distracted them from concentrating on the teaching itself. Lastly, he stated that the relationship between microteaching and real setting did not come out as he previously expected. Extract 9 from PST-B's microteaching session supports his claims in the stimulated recall interview with regards to the pseudo environment and exaggerated manners. In Extract 9, peers of the performing PST, who were supposed to act as students, were sabotaging the PST's lesson through irrelevant comments, use of slang, and use of the mother tongue. Although the PST tried hard to follow the lesson plan, the students continued to interrupt the PST. It is obvious that the typical IRF pattern was completely abandoned here, and it got quite challenging for the PST to manage the classroom:

Extract 9
From PST-B's microteaching session

1 Burak: Hocam, şimdi abi take us diycez, kamyona bincez ama şimdi kamyonla gidicez. [Teacher, now we would ask to take us, get on a truck but now we would go by a truck.]
2 PST: Speak English Burak.
3 Burak: Truck driver hocam [teacher], (+) kamyoncuya nasıl güvenicez [how can we trust the driver]?
4 PST: I don't say that you should use truck drivers, Burak. And if you- if you really want to find a way, you can find. (+) You can go under a tree (+) and pee.
5 Burak: Hocam İtalya'dan geliyolar, gebzede indirip tecavüz edip öldürüyorlar. [Teacher, they come from Italy but they are raped and murdered in Gebze].
6 PST: But guys, we are talking about travelling to other count- other places not travelling to Turkey.
7 Burak: Hocam bağcıları geçemeyiz ki. [Teacher we cannot go beyond Bağcılar].
8 Songül: When- when in Europe-
9 Yusuf: ((unintelligible))
10 PST: Do you really want to know! Do you really want to know?
11 LL: Yes!
12 LL: ((they talk altogether in an incomprehensible way))
13 Ali: Teacher valla anlatın da biz de bilek de gidek. [Teacher, please tell how and let us know how to go].
14 PST: We have a guide- We have a guide here written by a traveller, and believe me- believe me- Yusuf!
15 Yusuf: Yes!
16 PST: For real he travels for free and he has a blog or some kind of thing.
17 Ali: Dinleyin lan hocayı! [Listen to the teacher!]
18 PST: Okay, you take these Burak, and you take these Ali ((gives worksheets)
19 Ali: Hep de ben veriyorum ya. [I distribute the worksheets all the time!]
20 PST: Burak, you also distribute the paper.
    Burak and Ali distribute the papers

4.   DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

Interaction, both as a means and an end of language learning, has occupied a considerable space in SLA literature. Classroom, as a social environment, has also been explored in terms of discourse and characteristics of teacher talk and its role in fostering students' learning. The S-C Theory views the individual as a member of a social group and claims that s/he is learning best through interaction with others. DA, as an approach to the analysis of interaction within contextual boundaries, may reveal significant insights into various characteristics of the classroom discourse. The present study has examined the classroom discourse in two different settings; microteaching and practice school context. The analysis has yielded quite meaningful results regarding the differences between two settings and the nature of interaction in them.

It was found that in microteaching settings interactions do not unfold naturally. Pomerantz and Fehr (1997) propose that how interactants package their actions and take turns may implicate certain roles, relationships, and identities. Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) also illustrate that talk among students themselves in group work activities are more similar to colloquial conversations, and it is claimed that power relations affect the packaging of verbal actions and turn-taking. So, students in the practice school context are required to act within certain norms, and accordingly, the roles are more strictly defined, the power is not equitable with the teacher. However, in microteaching contexts, the PSTs in a. way lose the privilege of the teacher role in the practice school context as all the members of the classroom are peers and they have difficulties with adopting the student role and act accordingly. The unequal distribution of teacher talk in two contexts point to the power relations in a classroom (Oral, 2009), how students and PSTs position themselves to each other. The result validates the study by Skinner (2012) having found that in microteaching contexts transportable identities are observed more frequently, which leads to a more active involvement of the students.

It was also revealed that in both settings students and PSTs co-construct the meaning and they altogether contribute to the language learning process through turn taking, negotiation, and repair. Markee (2000), and Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) view the conversation in the classroom as the co-construction of the teacher and learners. They further assert that all the members of the classroom learn together through the interaction and construct the knowledge cooperatively. In parallel with this explanation, in both settings, at many times PSTs and learners cooperated with one another as speaker-hearers as Ohta (2000) states to construct the meaning and attain the targets in accordance with the goal-oriented nature of the institutional interaction.

On the basis of the results, it could be implied that microteachings should be organized in a more naturalistic way to reflect the situation in the real setting since the main motive behind implementing them is to prepare PSTs for the real teaching settings. Additionally, it was once again proved that identities either overtly or covertly identified in a certain context significantly determine the way/s in which interactants communicate each other. It was solidified that in real settings students are quite reluctant to participate in the class discussions, thus it is difficult for a language teacher to design communicative tasks there. Having established by a significant number of research studies on speaking problems of Turkish EFL learners (e.g. Öz, Demirezen, & Pourfeiz, 2015; Koçak, 2010), students are quite unwilling to communicate in the target language due to varying reasons. It might be because of the exam-oriented system, students' habits generated in school-based mentor teachers' lessons, or insufficient amount of acquaintance between PSTs and students due to the limited amount of time they spent at the practice schools. Irrespective of the reasons behind, the discrepancy between microteaching and practice school contexts in terms of students' rate of participation challenged the PSTs as previously reported.

Although the current study revealed valuable insights into the nature of classroom discourse in microteaching and practice school contexts, it has several limitations. The research was focusing only on three PSTs' class sessions taught at a specified level which was high school. Following studies may investigate the situation at different levels, especially at the level of young learners. The dynamics of the specific university context may have affected the results, so implementation of the microteachings at a different university context may present different results. Furthermore, as this is a case study, it reports on the results obtained in a particular setting, and it is difficult to produce generalizations for other teacher education programs and other PSTs. As another limitation, the data was collected simultaneously with the teaching of the course, so the researcher's role was twofold, which might limit the viewpoint. As the last limitation, the researcher was the only coder, which might lead to potential bias in data analysis; however, spending prolonged time on the field, member checking sessions, and repeatedly reading the transcripts to ensure that no points were missed were among the strategies employed to enhance trustworthiness.

Research and Publication Ethics Statement

As the data for the particular study was collected before 2018, it is not a must to present an Ethics Committee Approval. All the participants were informed about the scope of the research, their rights, and other ethical considerations. Data confidentiality was ensured, and an informed consent form was received from all the participants.

Contribution Rates of Authors to the Article

The study was conducted by a single author.

Statement of Interest

In line with the statement of Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), I hereby declare that I had no conflicting interests regarding any parts of this study.

5. REFERENCES

Allen, D. W., & Fortune, J. C. (1965). Microteaching: a new procedure in education. *School of Education*, Stanford University, Stanford.

Arsal, Z. (2015). The effects of microteaching on the critical thinking dispositions of pre- service teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online), 40*(3), 140-153.

Babalola, B. K. (2010). Mediated micro-teaching as a realistically efficient mode of teaching practice. *Journal of Research in Education and Psychology, 1*(2), 93-97.

Bell, N. D. (2007). Microteaching: What is it that is going on here?. *Linguistics and Education, 18*(1), 24-40.

Can, V. (2009). A microteaching application on a teaching practice course. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 4*(2), 125-140.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Cripwell, K., & Geddes, M. (1982). The development of organizational skills through micro- teaching. *ELT Journal, 36*(4), 232-236.

Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *English Language Teaching Journal 52*, 179–187.

Cullen, R. (2001). The use of lesson transcripts for developing teachers' classroom language. *System, 29*(1), 27-43.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. P. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Fortune, J. C., Cooper, J. M., & Allen, D. W. (1967). The Stanford summer micro-teaching clinic, 1965. *Journal of Teacher Education, 18*(4), 389-393.

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

Hatch, E. (1978). Acquisition of syntax in a second language. In J. Richards (Ed.), *Understanding second and foreign language learning* (pp. 34-70). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

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

Ho, Y. S. (2007). Bibliometric analysis of adsorption technology in environmental science. *Journal of Environmental Protection Science, 1*(1): 42746.

Hunter, M., & Russell, D. (1977). How can I plan more effective lessons. *Instructor, 87*(2), 74-75.

I'anson, J., Rodrigues, S., & Wilson, G. (2003). Mirrors, reflections and refractions: The contribution of microteaching to reflective practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 26*(2), 189-199.

Jefferson, G. (2004): Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In L. Gene (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 13-31.

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

Koçak, M. (2010). A novice teacher's action research on EFL learners' speaking anxiety. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 3*, 138-143.

Lederman, N. G., & Gess-Newsome, J. (1991). Metamorphosis, adaptation, or evolution?: Preservice science teachers' concerns and perceptions of teaching and planning. *Science Education, 75*(4), 443-456.

Lemke, J. L. (1990). Talking science: Language, learning and values. *The Physics Front*, 276.

Li, L., and S. Walsh. (2011). 'Seeing is Believing': Looking at EFL Teachers' Beliefs through Classroom Interaction. *Classroom Discourse 2*(1): 39–57.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. United Kingdom: Routledge.

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

Nurmasitah, S. (2010). *A study of classroom interaction characteristics in a geography class conducted in English: The case at year ten of an immersion class in SMA N 2 Semarang*. (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Diponegoro).

Ohta, A. S. (2000). Rethinking interaction in SLA: Developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning, 4*, 51-78.

Öz, H., Demirezen, M., & Pourfeiz, J. (2015). Willingness to communicate of EFL learners in Turkish context. *Learning and Individual Differences, 37*, 269-275.

Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B. J. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. *Discourse as Social Interaction, 2*, 64-91.

Popovich, N. G., & Katz, N. L. (2009). A microteaching exercise to develop performance-based abilities in pharmacy students. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 73*(4), 73.

Richards, J.C. (2008). Second language teacher education today. *RELC Journal, 39* (2), 158-177.

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sadker, M. P. & Sadker, D. M. (1991). *Teachers, school and society, (2nd Ed.)* New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. (2012). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schulz, R. A. (2000). Foreign language teacher development: MLJ perspectives—1916–1999. *The Modern Language Journal, 84*(4), 495-522.

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

Simbo, F.K. (1989). The effects of microteaching on student teachers' performance in the actual teaching practice classroom. *Educational Research 31*(1): 195–200.

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

Siu, M. (1999). New roles for design teachers. *Education Today, 49*(1), 25- 30.

Skinner, B. (2012). Changing identities: an exploration of ESL trainee teacher discourse in microteaching. *Classroom Discourse, 3*(1), 46-64.

Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work.* New York & London: The Guilford Press.

Stanley, C. (1998). A framework for teacher reflectivity. *TESOL, 32*, 584-591.

Suratno, A. (2019). IRF patterns revisited: An analysis of classroom interaction. In N.T.X. Lan, B.T.T. Quyen, H.C.M. Hung, & M.M. Tien (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th opentesol international conference 2019 innovation and inspiration: Building the future of language education* (pp. 488-505). Ho Chi Minh City: Publishing House of Economics.

Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. New York, NY: Longman.

Van Lier, L. (1996*). Interactioning the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. New York: Longman.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the Development of Children, 23*(3), 34-41.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1998). "Infancy". The Collected Works of LS. Vygotsky: Child Psychology, edited by R. W.Rieber's, 207–241, Vol. 5. New York: Plenum Press.

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

Walsh, S. (2003). Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom through teacher self-evaluation. *Language Awareness 12* (2): 124–142.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. London: Routledge.

Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 5*, 1-37.

Wells, G. (1999*). Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

6. GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Sosyokültürel Kuram bireyleri belli bir sosyal grubun üyeleri olarak ele almış, etkileşim içerisinde öğrenmenin önemini daha da ön plana çıkarmıştır. Dil öğrenimi alanında da kuşkusuz etkileşimin yadsınamaz bir yeri bulunmaktadır. Öğretmen merkezli eğitim sisteminin yerini öğrenci merkezli bir sisteme bırakmasıyla öğrenme sürecinde etkileşime daha da fazla vurgu yapılmış ve sınıflar öğrenenlerin birbirleriyle etkileşim halinde, sosyal bir ortamda bilgiyi işbirliği içerisinde oluşturdukları ortamlar olarak görülmüştür. Bu doğrultuda, Sosyal Yapılandırmacı Kuram öğretmeni ve öğrencileri sınıf içerisindeki söylemin ortak sahipleri olarak nitelemiştir. Her ne kadar katılımcılar art alanda farklı niyetlerle sınıf içi söyleme katkı sağlasalar da hepsinin pedagojik bir amaç etrafında toplandıkları bir gerçektir. Bu noktada öğretmenler, sınıf içindeki söylemi yönlendiren, buna katkıda bulunmayı teşvik eden ya da söylemi kısıtlayabilen, konuşma sırasını düzenleyen ve daha başka birçok sorumluluk üstlenen kişiler olarak etkileşimin doğasının belirlenmesinde en önemli rolü üstlenmişlerdir. Öğretmenlerin profesyonel gelişimine katkıda bulunmak amacıyla sınıf içi etkileşimler kayıt altına alınmış, çözümlenmiş ve mezuniyet öncesi dönemden başlamak üzere öğretmenlerin sınıf içi iletişim yeterliğinin geliştirilmesi hedeflenmiştir. Bu çalışmalar etkileşimin yapısının ne denli karmaşık olduğunu ve belli bir düzende ilerlemediği için kontrol edilmesinin de zor olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu zorluk alanda yapılan çalışmalara ivme kazandırmış ve sınıf içi etkileşimin yapısını ve kalitesini incelemeyi amaçlayan, farklı öğretim ortamlarında yürütülen çalışmaların ortaya konmasını tetiklemiştir. İlk çalışmalar etkileşimin dil edinimi sürecinde önemli bir rol oynayıp oynamadığı sorusuna yanıt ararken, sonraki çalışmalar bir adım daha öteye giderek etkileşimin yapısını, daha çok hangi dil alanlarına katkı sağladığını ve bireylerin sürece dahil olmalarıyla kendilerinin dil becerilerinde gözlenen değişimin ne boyutta ve ne yönde olduğunu incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Önceki dönemlerde bireylerin içsel mekanizmalarına vurgu yapılırken, sonraki çalışmalarda bireylerin içsel mekanizmaları ile dışsal faktörlerin etkileşimi tartışılmış ve dil öğrenme sürecinde etkileşimin rolünün dil girdisi sağlamaktan çok daha öte olduğu görülmüştür. Öğrenenlerin etkileşim içerisinde hipotezlerini test etme, anlamı müzakere etme, gelişimsel bir süreçte dili "konuşan ve duyanlar" olarak üstlendikleri çok boyutlu kimlikleri ile yapılandırarak öğrenme imkanlarının olduğu görüşü egemen olmuştur. Öğrenme sürecinde etkileşimin rolüne atfedilen artan önem öğretmen adaylarının, deneyimsiz ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin bu doğrultudaki yeterliklerinin yeniden gözden geçirilmesini, geliştirilmesini, kendilerinde buna dair farkındalık oluşturulmasını ve bu düzlemde daha fazla sayıda araştırma yürütülmesini sağlamıştır.

Etkileşimin ön planda olduğu, bir öğrenme ve öğretme aracı olarak tanımlanan mikro-öğretim uygulamaları bu çerçevede ön plana çıkmıştır. "Ne" öğretilmesi sorusunun yerini "nasıl" öğretilmeli sorusuna bırakması, öğretme becerisinin doğuştan gelen bir yetenek olarak görülmekten çıkıp deneyimle geliştirilmeye açık bir beceri olarak değerlendirilmesi, kuram ile uygulama arasında var olan bir köprü ihtiyacı ve öğretmen adaylarının gerçek sınıf ortamıyla tanışmadan önce simülasyon ile öğretim sahnesine ilk adımı atmalarına imkan sağlaması göz önünde bulundurularak mikro-öğretim uygulamaları öğretmen yetiştirme programlarının vazgeçilmez bir parçası haline gelmiştir. Mikro-öğretimin bir benzetmeye dayanıyor olmasından dolayı gerçek sınıf ortamını yansıtıp yansıtmayacağı ve burada elde edilen deneyimin öğretmenlik mesleğindeki yeterlikler açısından faydalı olup olmayacağı tartışmaları hala devam etmektedir. Her ne kadar mikro-öğretim uygulamaları içerisindeki ve gerçek sınıf ortamındaki etkileşim birbirinden bağımsız olarak farklı çalışmalarda incelenmiş olsa da iki ortam içerisindeki etkileşimi karşılaştırmalı olarak inceleyen çalışmaların sayısı son derece kısıtlı kalmıştır. Bu ihtiyaca cevap vermek üzere yürütülen bu araştırma İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının uygulama okullarındaki gerçek sınıf ortamları içerisinde yaptıkları uygulamaları ile mikro-öğretim ortamındaki uygulamalarını sınıf içi etkileşim bağlamında ele almıştır. Araştırmaya Türkiye'de bir devlet üniversitesinde, İngilizce Öğretmenliği Lisans Programında üçüncü sınıf öğrencisi olan üç öğretmen adayı katılmıştır. Homojen örneklem tekniği kullanılarak seçilen üç kişi Okul Deneyimi ve İngilizce Okuma ve Yazma Becerilerinin Öğretimi derslerinin her ikisini de araştırmacıdan almış olup, böylece mikro-öğretim ortamındaki uygulamalarını gerçek sınıf ortamında tekrarlama fırsatı bulmuşlardır. Araştırmanın veritabanını mikro-öğretim ortamında yapılan 106 dakikalık uygulama, uygulama okulundaki gerçek sınıf ortamında yapılan 120 dakikalık uygulama, 33 dakikalık mülakat ile bunların transkripsiyonları oluşturmuştur. Vaka çalışması türünde nitel bir araştırma olarak kurgulanan araştırmanın verileri Söylem Çözümlemesine tabi tutulmuştur. Çözümleyenden ziyade etkileşim içerisinde yer alanların bakış açılarının ön plana çıkaran emik bir bakış açısıyla veriler analiz edilmiştir.

İki farklı ortam içerisindeki etkileşimin nicel bir bakış açısıyla çözümlenmesi öğretmen adaylarının gerçek sınıf ortamında mikro-öğretim ortamına göre çok daha baskın olduklarını ortaya koymuştur. Bu iki ortam arasındaki öğretmenin ve öğrencilerin etkin olduğu süreye ilişkin önemli fark katılımcılar tarafından mikro-öğretim ortamlarının yapaylığı ile açıklanmıştır. Etkileşim içerisinde katılanların kendilerine ait rolleri nasıl tanımladıkları ve aralarındaki ilişki söylemlerini nasıl kurguladıklarını ve dil kullanımlarını doğrudan etkileyebilmektedir. Bu doğrultuda, mikro-öğretim ortamı içerisinde ortaya çıkan diyaloglar ve öğrenci rolünü üstlenen öğretmen adaylarının gerçek ortamdaki öğrencilere göre çok daha baskın olması mikro-öğretim ortamında öğretmen adaylarının öğrenci rolünü benimsemekte zorlandıklarını, öğretmen rolünü üstlenen arkadaşlarını gerçek ortamdaki bir öğretmen gibi algılayamadıklarını göstermektedir. Aynı zamanda, gerçek sınıf ortamındaki öğrencilerin sınıf içi etkileşime çok daha az katkı sağlamış olmaları Türkiye bağlamında yürütülen birçok çalışma ile ortaya konulduğu üzere dil öğrenenlerin konuşmaya yönelik isteksizlikleri, yabancı dilde iletişim becerilerinin yetersizliği ya da öğretmen adaylarıyla gerekli yakınlığı sağlayamamış olmaları ile açıklanabilir. Gerçek sınıf ortamındaki konuşma sırası çok daha düzenli ve bitişik sözceler ile beklendik bir düzen içerisindeyken mikro-öğretim ortamında diyalogların bir düzen içerisinde olmadığı, katılanların söz sırasını beklemeden diğerlerinin konuşmalarını keserek söyleme dahil oldukları gözlenmektedir. Her iki ortamdaki etkileşimlerde de öğrenmenin katılanların ortak ürünü olarak ortaya çıktığı da varılan bir diğer sonuçtur. Öğretmen adaylarıyla yapılan mülakatlar da mikro-öğretim ortamının yapaylığına, öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen ve öğrenci rollerini benimsemekte zorlandıklarına, öğretmen adaylarının öğretimden çok sınıf yönetimi anlamında zorlandıklarına, beklentilerinin aksine mikro-öğretim ortamının kendilerini gerçek sınıf ortamından daha fazla zorladığına işaret etmektedir.

7.   APPENDICES

Transcription Conventions (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005, p. 226-227)

PST: pre-service teacher
L1: learner identified as Learner 1
LL: several or all learners simultaneously
Name: participant identified by name
(+): a pause of between 0.1 and 0.5 of a second
(++): a pause of between 0.6 and 0.9 of a second
letter-why: dash also used to indicate short pause
foo-: an abrupt cut-off of the prior word or sound
[: indicates the place where overlapping talk starts
]: indicates the place where overlap terminates
?: rising intonation, not necessarily a question
word,: comma indicates a continuing intonation
word.: full stop indicates falling or stopping intonation
yea::r: colons indicate lengthening of the preceding sound; the more colons the greater the extent of lengthening
hh: outbreath, more h's indicate longer outbreath
.hhh: inbreath, more h's indicate longer inbreath
(hhhh): laughter
((comment)): transcriber's comments including the ones on non-verbal actions
((unintelligible)): a talk that is unintelligible
(word): unclear or probable item