Türkiyede İngilizce Öğretiminde Sınıf İçi Etkileşime Dair Sistematik İnceleme

ELT Classroom Interaction in Turkey: A Systematic Review

Gizem ŞİMŞEK[1], Meral CEYLAN ÇAPAR[2]

ÖZ: Uluslararası kapsamda, ikinci dil öğretiminde sınıf içi etkileşime dair çalışmaları rapor eden incelemeler olmasına rağmen bugün itibariyle kendisini Türk bağlamına yerleştirecek bir inceleme bulunmamaktadır. 2023 yılı ulusal eğitim politikasında, yabancı dil eğitimine özel bir odaklanma ile öngörülen değişiklik, dil öğretiminin bağlamsal belirtimini ve lokalizasyonunu içerir ve böylece ülke düzeyinde sınıfta neler olup bittiğine daha yakından bakmak için bir ihtiyaç doğmuştur. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma, yöntem seçimleri ve araştırma bağlamları açısından alandaki son eğilimleri ve gelişmeleri bulmak için Türkiye bağlamında İngilizce sınıf etkileşimi araştırmasına bakmaktadır. Bu doğrultuda doküman incelemesi veri toplama tekniği olarak kullanıldı. Doküman incelemesi için iki veri tabanı ve bir index kullanıldı ve arama terimleri 'sınıf etkileşimi', 'Türkiye'de sınıf etkileşimi', 'L2 sınıf etkileşimi', 'Türkiye'de L2 sınıf etkileşimi' ve 'sınıf etkileşimsel yeterlilik'olarak seçildi. Dahil etme ve dışlama kriterlerinin dikkatli bir şekilde uygulanmasından sonra, inceleme için 16 çalışma seçildi ve yöntemlerine, araştırma bağlamlarına ve odak noktalarına göre analiz edildi. Sonuçlar, eğilim açısından, konuşma analizi yöntemine ve üniversite ortamına ve genç öğrenci bağlamlarına yönelik çalışmaların birbirinden farklı ve farklı konu alanları ile birlikte olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu bulgular doğrultusunda, mevcut inceleme, Türkiye'deki İngilizce sınıf etkileşimi araştırmalarının geçmişine ve günümüze ışık tutmaya ve gelecekteki yönleri de önermeye çalışmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: İkinci dil öğretimi, İngiliz dili öğretimi, sınıf içi etkileşim, konuşma çözümlemesi

ABSTRACT: While there are studies of international scope on L2 classroom interaction, there is no review as of today within the Turkish context. The envisioned change in the national educational policy until 2023 with a special focus on foreign language education involves contextual specification and localization of language teaching, and thus creates a special need to take a closer look at what is happening inside the classroom on a country basis. For this reason, the present study looks at English language classroom interaction research in the Turkish context to find out the recent trends and developments in the area in terms of methodological choices and contexts of investigation. To do so, document review is adapted as a data collection technique. Search terms were selected as 'classroom interaction', 'classroom interaction in Turkey', 'L2 classroom interaction', 'L2 classroom interaction in Turkey', and 'classroom interactional competence'. Studies were found using three databases and an index. After carefully applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria, 16 studies were chosen for the review and analyzed in terms of methodologies, research contexts, and findings. Results showed that in terms of methodology, studies were

[1] Öğr.Gör./Milli Savunma Üniversitesi, gizemsimsek.096@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-6495-9275 (Başlıca Yazar)

[2] Dr./Anadolu Üniversitesi, meralceylan@anadolu.edu.tr, ORCID 0000-0003-2884-1971

inclined to employ Conversation Analysis and they were conducted predominantly in a university setting with adolescent participants along with various subject areas. In line with these findings, the present review tries to shed light on the past and present state of English language classroom interaction research in Turkey and attempts to propose future directions as well.

Keywords: Second language, English language teaching, classroom interaction, conversation analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

ELT classrooms gained a new perspective with the development of technology, especially audio recording in the 1960s. This innovation led to an alteration in the research area of language learning in terms of transcribing and analyzing classroom discourse in detail. With the improvement of video recording and the Internet, there has been a huge amount of data available in ELT classroom settings all around the world (Jenks & Seedhouse, 2015), which generates a profitable source for the field of English language teaching.

Observing classroom interaction is not just defining the status quo, it is a way to provide healthy interaction, teaching and learning. It enhances both teacher and student behaviors in many aspects such as the practice of formative assessment (Can Daşkın & Hatipoğlu, 2019), creating space for learning (Girgin & Brandt, 2020), waiting time for student reaction (Alsaadi & Atar, 2019), feedback practice in the language classroom specifically learners' receiving feedback (Vattoy & Gamlem, 2020), and willingness to participate (Evnitskaya & Berger, 2017). Teachers can also examine how their teaching affects students' speaking in the target language by focusing on actual classroom interaction (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). Thus, they can make changes in their teaching approach, methodology even in techniques through this observation with a wider variety of discourse types. Nevertheless, the benefits of observing the classroom interaction are not limited to students' ability to speak. Moreover, the existing literature provided that the pre-service English language teachers would benefit from analyzing classroom interaction (Aşık & Kuru Gönen, 2016; Balaman 2018; Sert, 2010; Üstünel, 2014) in terms of shaping the language learning process, for the sake of example, specifically shaping learner contributions in an activity (Can Daşkın, 2015).

Examining classroom interaction has crucial importance and implications for language teaching and learning. It has been observed that there has not been a review study that examines the research conducted in the Turkish context to fill the gap. Hence, the present paper will try to investigate classroom interaction studies in Turkey and comment on the analysis of these studies.

1.1. Research on Foreign Language Classroom Interaction

A seminal 1997 paper (Firth & Wagner) in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) "On Discourse, Communication, and (Some) Fundamental Concepts", a drop in the ocean of the language learning field, created such circles in the research community that, 10 years after its publication, it still had the attention paid to the 2007 special response issue of the Modern Language Journal. It proposed a dramatic change from the prevailing cognitive, thus individualistic understanding towards increasingly "social, discursive approaches" to the phenomenon of language learning (p. 287). While what is later called the social turn in SLA might be marked by that 1997 paper, their second paper published in the abovementioned special issue provided empirical findings to name language learning as "a social accomplishment" (Firth & Wagner, 2007, p.807), which makes the language classroom the hive of that accomplishment.

Classroom interaction research has its pillars in many disciplines; as broad as sociolinguistics and pragmatics, and as specific as discourse analysis, conversation analysis, ethnomethodology and so on. The common ground of these disciplines is that they all define language as social interaction. Hence, they promote the Vygotskian approach in second language acquisition.

The leading methodology applied in classroom interaction research is discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is basically examining language use including not only language form but also language function as well. It also contains both spoken interaction and written texts (Demo, 2001). Discourse analysis focuses on patterns and applications in communication to promote language

acquisition through analyzing how interlocutors use language in the social context (Alsoraihi, 2019). Classroom is one of those social contexts that have vital importance in terms of language acquisition. Employing social interaction, analyzing the classroom has far-reaching implications for the relationship between teacher and student, additionally for its impacts on the learning process (Woodward-Kron & Remedious, 2007). Furthermore, Alwright (1984) explains that classroom interaction is important regarding the operation of learning cooperatively, thus, teachers and students become operators of the learning process.

Classrooms are composed of various contexts. Foreign language (L2) classroom contexts may vary in different situations which may lead to distinctive interactions. One of the prominent scholars in this field of study, Seedhouse (2004) defines four L2 classroom context modes namely, "form and accuracy", "meaning and fluency", "task-oriented", and "procedural". In addition to this, another prominent scholar Walsh (2011) proposed four classroom context modes respectively, "the classroom context mode", "managerial mode", "skill and system mode", and "material mode". These modes indicate that there are different and suitable interactional features for each context mode. Nevertheless, some modes could be identified as embedded depending on the situation of the context.

Because interactional competence differs in each context and with different teachers, Walsh (2011) introduced *Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC)* which he defined as the qualification embraced by teachers and learners to adopt interaction as mediation and aid to language learning in the classroom. He also signified that to maintain the interaction and classroom management, a teacher should enhance CIC on the cause that features of CIC include teachers' employment of language to reach the language learning aims in the classrooms. In his work, Walsh (2012) clarifies the possible conditions that CIC influences language teachers with the following statements:

> *The ways in which interactants create space for learning, make appropriate responses 'in the moment', seek and offer clarification, demonstrate understandings, afford opportunities for participation, negotiate meanings. (p.12)*

Literature provides studies from all around the world that contribute to classroom interaction and CIC. For the sake of example, Weizheing (2019) aimed to examine the interaction between teachers and learners in China with regard to teachers' promotion of learners' communicative competence. He found out that communication accommodation strategies had a significant effect on the interaction between teachers and students. Another example can be given from Chile. Avila (2019) investigated the interlocutors' overlapping turns in a foreign language classroom. Results showed that teachers' overlapped turns affected students' initiations. What is more, aus der Wieschen and Sert (2018) studied Danish primary students' choice of language and its effects on their understanding. Their study revealed that those young learners use translations and reformulations to support their peers and explain the items in detail. Another study that examined student and teacher interaction is conducted by Vattoy & Gamlem (2020) in Norway. They investigated classroom interaction in terms of feedback practice and found out that there was a correlation between aspects of feedback and instructional dialogue, hence, providing evidence for extended feedback impact on students' language learning. Moreover, Seedhouse (2019) defined and analyzed distinct and unusual classroom contexts namely, *deviance, confusion, grappling* and *flouting*. He used the model and methodology outlined by himself in 2004 for data analysis, at the same time evaluating whether the model was still functioning. Based on these deviant trouble contexts, he proposed that inexperienced teachers should be enhanced in terms of constructing successful second language classroom contexts.

Yet another study carried out by Alsaadi and Atar (2019) investigated the impact of wait time in Saudi Arabia concerning two context modes defined by Walsh (2006), respectively, classroom context

mode and material mode. They discovered that extended wait time prompted language learning and boosted learners' responses in terms of quality.

Classroom interaction and some aspects of the teaching process have been studied in various contexts nearly all around the world. Turkey is also one of those contexts. For instance, in terms of the teaching process, Aşık and Kuru Gönen (2016) reported pre-service English teachers' interpretations of their own talk and teaching in language classrooms. Their study showed an increase in the pre-service teachers' awareness on three distinct levels: (i) what they do in the classroom, (ii) how they achieve these in the classroom, and (iii) how they utilize the language to achieve these in the classroom. Another classroom interaction study was conducted in Turkey by Seferoğlu (2008). The study examined the ways that a language teacher gives corrective feedback to EFL learners. Furthermore, the study also examined how learners respond and react to the feedback. Seferoğlu (2008) revealed that the teacher mostly utilized explicit correction specifically recasts and learners benefited from the teacher's corrective feedback, indicating that they also preferred self-correction.

While there are comprehensive reviews of the classroom interaction research in the international scope (Gardner, 2019; Markee & Kunitz, 2015), as Gardner himself suggests, classroom is an institutional context where practices are shaped within the contextual reality of their habitat. The question of "how", or more importantly, "why" can be answered through the external agents devising the classroom context. While the classroom has its inner agents (i.e. teacher, students, material, etc.) visible to the bare eye; those agents are in fact configured by larger norms that include educational policies, institutional culture, and administrative regulations. Considering the abovementioned spotlight on the foreign language classroom, in Turkey where the foreign language is in fact English, the realities of the English language classroom is expected to gain more and more importance.

Over and above, Johnson (1992) states that a case study aims to investigate the "complexity" and "dynamic nature" of specific subjects, and to find out relationships between aspects of the context. Additionally, Duff (2008) points out that the case study helps to develop "understandings about the nature of language learning". With this in mind, this present case study is critical to know the actual classroom process of language learning and its features by analysing current classroom interaction research established in Turkey.

Thus, this systematic review will try to shed light on where the research literature and its empirical findings stand on the issue expecting to provide implications for language learning pedagogy and future research by classroom interactions' fundamentality.

Built upon the significance and aims of the study, these are the research questions constructed in the systematic review:

1. What are the tendencies in the research on the English classroom interaction in Turkey?

   a. What are the tendencies in terms of the methodological choices?

   b. What are the tendencies in terms of the research setting and context?

2. What are the research issues in classroom interaction in ELT in Turkey?

2. METHODOLOGY

This review study aimed to analyze classroom interaction research conducted in Turkey as a qualitative study with a case study design. The case study is an empirical design that investigates a current phenomenon in its real-life context and is utilized in situations where the boundaries between the phenomenon and its content are not clearly defined, and where more than one source of evidence or data

is available (Yin, 1984, p.23 cited in Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2005, p.277). In this study, document review is used in terms of data collection techniques. Document review is an analysis of written texts containing information about the phenomenon or facts being investigated (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005, p. 187).

Firstly, within the scope of the document review research about discourse analysis and classroom interaction was scanned. Then, the subject was narrowed down as L2 classroom interaction in Turkey. In line with this subject, research questions were defined as stated in the previous part. While scoping the literature, it has been observed that neither a meta-synthesis nor a systematic review has been done on this area of research that is specifically focusing on the Turkish context. Then search terms are defined as 'classroom interaction', 'classroom interaction in Turkey', 'L2 classroom interaction', 'L2 classroom interaction in Turkey', and 'classroom interactional competence'. Studies were found by using the following databases and an index: (1) Anadolu University Library Electronic Sources (2) Taylor and Francis (3) ERIC - Education Resources Information Center. The reason why the first database is used is that the library of Anadolu University provides members and students remote access from outside of the campus besides contains numerous electronic databases. Taylor & Francis and ERIC were chosen because their interface is practical in terms of filter features. Studies were chosen according to inclusion and exclusion criteria explained in detail below.

During the screening of the studies and eligibility checks, they were examined according to the following inclusion criteria:

1. focusing on English language classroom interaction in Turkey,

2. published in a refereed journal (national and international),

3. published between 2008 and the present day, May 2020.

While the first inclusion criterion comes from the topic of investigation of the present study, the second criterion has been included since it marks the validity of the study and evaluates its suitability to be presented to the wider research community. The last inclusion criterion deserves a detailed explanation here. "With the benefit of 10 years of hindsight", as they claim, Firth and Wagner reshaped the prevailing debate they started in 1997 on the field's understanding of language (p. 800). This change in understanding had its fruits in terms of a methodological paradigm shift as well. We observed a flourish in the number of studies adopting more interactional approaches such as conversation analysis and interactional analysis. The present review thus takes 2008, the imminent year after Firth and Wagner's special issue as its starting point and scrutinizes the studies from that point until the present day.

Studies were eliminated according to the exclusion criteria:

1. studies outside the context of Turkey,

2. unpublished studies, MA theses, Ph.D. dissertations, book chapters, reviews and conference papers,

3. and studies in language classrooms other than English.

The exclusion criteria are mostly devised because of their mutual exclusivity with the inclusion criteria. The first inclusion criterion entails the elimination of the studies conducted with the data coming from abroad, which forms my first exclusion criterion. Similarly, the second inclusion criterion brings about the omission of the studies which did not undergo the peer review process. While some reviews and book chapters do go through peer-review, they do not necessarily have the purpose of empirical investigation of a phenomenon, that is why they were excluded from the present review. As for the third and last exclusion criterion, though the inclusion of all foreign language classrooms would be a

worthwhile enterprise, the studies conducted in Turkey are indeed limited to English language classrooms. In fact, there was only one (1) study conducted in a German language classroom in Turkey that has been excluded because of this. Thus, the present literature in the Turkish context does not suffice for my dataset to be generalized to all the foreign language classrooms.

Taking the aforementioned benchmarks into account, 16 studies that fit the criteria formed the dataset of the present study and these studies were tabulated below in the results section.

3. RESULTS

In terms of the first research question, thematic analysis yielded the information presented in the table below.

Table 1: *Research on classroom interaction*

Year	Author	Name of the Study
2008	Seferoğlu, G.	Insights from Turkish Learners of English on the Nature of Corrective Feedback in Classroom Interaction.
2014	Üstünel, E.	The sequential organization of classroom discourse in an EFL kindergarten classroom.
	Yuksel, D.	Teachers' treatment of different types of student questions.
2015	Can Daşkın, N.	Shaping learner contributions in an EFL classroom: Implications for L2 classroom interactional competence
2016	Aşık, A. & Kuru Gönen, S. A.	Pre-service EFL teachers' reported perceptions of their development through SETT experience
	Seymen Bilgin, S	Code-switching in English language teaching (ELT) teaching practice in Turkey: Student-teacher practices, beliefs and identity.
2017	Can Daşkın, N.	A conversation analytic investigation into L2 classroom interaction and informal formative assessment
	Sert, O.	Creating opportunities for L2 learning in a prediction activity.
	Yürekli, A.	Do "Current" Teaching Methodologies Really Work in Every Context?
2018	Balaman, U.	Embodied Resources in a Repetition Activity in a Preschool L2 Classroom
	Can Daşkın, N. & Hatipoğlu, Ç.	Reference to a past learning event in teacher turns in an L2 instructional setting
2019	Can Daşkın, N. & Hatipoğlu, Ç.	Reference to a past learning event as a practice of informal formative assessment in L2 classroom interaction
	Duran, D. & Sert, O.	Preference organization in English as a Medium of Instruction classrooms in a Turkish higher education setting
	Duran, D., Kurhilla S. & Sert, O.	Word search sequences in teacher-student interaction in English as a medium of instruction context
	Ölmezer-Öztürk, E.	Beliefs and practices of Turkish EFL teachers regarding oral corrective feedback: a small-scale classroom research study
2020	Girgin, U. & Brandt, A.	Creating space for learning through 'Mm hm' in an L2 classroom: Implications for L2 classroom interactional competence

Table 1 shows that the research on classroom interaction gathered momentum after 2014, with studies piling up from that date to today. The year 2019 was found to be the most prolific regarding classroom interaction studies. The tendency of the research will be explained through sub-questions:

3.1.   What are the tendencies in terms of the methodological choices?

Table 2: *Methodological choices of the studies*

Methodology	Studies	Data collection tools
CA	Balaman, U. (2018)	Video recordings
	Can Daşkın, N. (2015)	Video and audio tapes
	Can Daşkın, N. (2017a)	Video recordings
	Can Daşkın, N. & Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2019)	Video recordings
	Can Daşkın, N. & Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2019)	Video recording
	Duran, D. & Sert, O. (2019)	Video recordings Video recordings
	Duran, D., Kurhilla S. & Sert, O. (2019)	Video recordings
	Girgin, U. & Brandt, A. (2020)	Videorecordings classroom observation, questionnaires, interviews and artefacts
	Sert, O. (2017)	
	Üstünel, E. (2014)	
Others	Aşık, A. & Kuru Gönen, S. A. (2016).	Self-evaluation framework, diaries and semi-structured interviews
	Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. (2019).	Classroom observation and audio-recording, questionnaires and semi-structured interviews
	Seferoğlu, G. (2008).	Video-recordings and stimulated recall
	Seymen Bilgin, S. (2016).	CA and stimulated recall interviews
	Yuksel, D. (2014)	Classroom observation and video-recordings
	Yürekli, A. (2017).	Video recording of the classroom via Panopto software

As it can be seen from the table (Table 2), most of the studies (10) applied Conversation Analysis methodology. In one study from other methodology applications, Seymen Bilgin (2016) supplied stimulated recall interviews along with the CA method.

The studies in the other group employed distinct procedures to analyze data such as semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and video recordings of the classroom. It is noteworthy to mention that Ölmezer Öztürk (2019) used classroom observations, audio recordings, questionnaires, and semi-structured interviews which provide a data triangulation supporting the robust research design. In most of the other studies (3) respectively, Seferoğlu (2008), Yüksel (2014), Yürekli (2017) used video recordings while collecting the data. Nevertheless, those recordings were not transcribed and analyzed according to CA conventions, which puts these studies into the other group. Additionally, a notable study conducted by Aşık and Kuru Gönen (2016) differs from the rest of the studies. The study also administered video recordings, nevertheless, those video recordings were analyzed by pre-service English teachers who were trained in classroom interaction and its features, CA and transcription

conventions, and self-evaluation of teacher talk which the participants used after watching their video recordings of teaching experience. Herewith, the researchers investigated the reports about the self-evaluation process provided by the participant pre-service teachers.

3.2. What are the tendencies in terms of the research setting and context?

Table 3: *Study Context*

Context	Studies
EFL learners from Preparatory School in a university	Can Daşkın, N. (2015)
	Can Daşkın, N. (2017a)
	Can Daşkın, N. & Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2019)
	Can Daşkın, N. & Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2019)
	Seferoğlu, G. (2008)
EFL learners from different programs in a university	Duran, D. & Sert, O. (2019)
	Duran, D., Kurhilla S. & Sert, O. (2019)
	Girgin, U. & Brandt, A. (2020)
	Yuksel, D. (2014)
	Seymen Bilgin, S. (2016)
	Yürekli, A. (2017)
Pre-service English Teachers	Balaman, U. (2018)
	Üstünel, E. (2014)
	Aşık, A. & Kuru Gönen, S. A. (2016)
Others	Sert, O. (2017)
	Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. (2019)

As seen above, more than half of the studies were conducted in the university context. Five of the studies were administered in preparatory classrooms while six of them were accomplished in different university programs. It is worth noting that Balaman (2018) and Üstünel (2014) included very young learners in the study while Sert (2017) investigated interaction in a secondary school EFL classroom. Furthermore, the only study that analyzed in-service teacher perceptions and practices was by Ölmezer Öztürk (2019).

In terms of the last research question which was about research issues in language classroom interaction, the table below was prepared according to the findings.

Table 4: *Study Focus*

No	Studies	Study Focus
1	Balaman, U. (2018)	Demonstrated resources in a repetition activity
2	Can Daşkın, N. (2015)	Teachers' shaping learners' contributions
3	Can Daşkın, N. (2017a)	Informal formative assessment
4	Can Daşkın, N. & Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2019)	Reference to a past learning event

Table 4 (continued): *Study Focus*

No	Studies	Study Focus
5	Can Daşkın, N. & Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2019)	Reference to a past learning event and informal formative assessment
6	Duran, D. & Sert, O. (2019)	Teachers' turn designs
7	Duran, D., Kurhilla S. & Sert, O. (2019)	Word search sequences
8	Girgin, U. & Brandt, A. (2020)	Minimal response tokens
9	Sert, O. (2017)	Impact of prediction activities
10	Üstünel, E. (2014)	Basic sequence organizations
11	Aşık, A. & Kuru Gönen, S. A. (2016).	Pre-service English teachers' self-evaluation
12	Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. (2019).	Corrective feedback, teacher perceptions and practices
13	Yuksel, D. (2014)	Question types used by learners
14	Seferoğlu, G. (2008).	Students' perceptions about feedback
15	Seymen Bilgin, S. (2016).	Code switching practices
16	Yürekli, A. (2017).	Interaction patterns, content input, and question types

Table 4 summarizes the findings of research issues handled in the selected studies. As seen above, all of the studies inspected different issues related to language classroom interaction. The reason for this could be that the classroom context is dynamic and sophisticated.

One noteworthy feature of the distribution of the topics should be highlighted here. Out of 16 studies included in this review, 14 of them focus on teachers' contribution to classroom interaction while only 2 of them specifically look at learner contribution.

4. DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to conduct a systematic review concerning English language classroom interaction studies. In line with this purpose, 16 studies were chosen according to certain inclusion and exclusion criteria. These 16 studies were analyzed in terms of their methodology, setting and context, and focus point The results showed that in the examination of classroom interaction, most of the studies conducted in the Turkish context applied the CA methodology. One reason behind this employment could be the above-mentioned international tendency towards more micro-analytical approaches to the language. The analytical perspective of CA operates as a strong framework to derive conclusions from the data and nothing but the data. Thus, it ignores all the commentary that does not find evidence within the dataset. This feature of CA might have made it a powerful candidate among other methodological approaches to the social understanding of language with its reliability. Another point worth mentioning here is that one of the common aims was *naturally occurring interaction* in the language classroom which is also within CA's general scope. What Huth (2011) describes in his study supports this interpretation:

> *CA is basically concerned with explicating the systematic properties that organize the back and forth of naturally occurring talk. CA seeks to describe how speakers and hearers make*

> *sense of each other's conduct as talk unfolds from turn to turn, and how speakers display their understanding of each other's talk in their talk. (p.299)*

In line with this interpretation, CA requires unintentional and unmotivated analysis before examining interaction which explains its emic perspective. Through unmotivated looking, the researcher leaves his or her mindset in addition to the cultural background behind during the analysis procedure. To put it in a different way, the emic perspective signifies administering participants' viewpoint rather than the analyst's. (Richards & Seedhouse, 2005) The emic perspective is applied with the micro-analytic approach to the language classroom. Sert (2015) summarized that classrooms could be investigated by acknowledging the naturally occurring interaction in the classroom by the micro-analytic perspective with the following lines:

> *So as to uncover epistemic and pedagogical phenomena, by paying close attention to participants' utterances, nonverbal details of talk, suprasegmental features of language, gaze movements, gestures, and orientations to classroom artefacts.(p.2)*

He also emphasized that this interpretation could be operated from an *emic* perspective. Thus, it has been approved that researchers approach analysis of interaction without a *priori* concept in their mind which justifies the results of the third research question in the present systematic review that studies had different subject areas rather than a common specific issue. Lastly, classrooms are dynamic and sophisticated contexts. Hence, it is reasonable that studies had various research issues which indicate that there is still a lot to discover in language classrooms utilizing interaction since language learning and teaching do not solely compose of the topics investigated.

Another finding in this present systematic review was that nearly all of the studies were conducted at the university level. A strong reason behind this could be the issues of data access and ethics. Especially after the enaction of the Personal Data Protection Law in Turkey, the difficulty of getting permission from school administration and consent from the parents of the young learners became a major obstacle to data access.

An implication should be underlined before future suggestions that these studies had a common scope in the field of study which is the necessity of classroom interaction analysis along with enhancement of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) (Walsh, 2002 cited in Sert (2017).

Sert (2017) emphasized that CIC is an essential part of classroom interaction by examining extracts in which teachers triggered learner contributions. Furthermore, Sert (2010) proposed a *Conversation Analysis Integrated English Language Teacher Education Program.* In the study, he shed light on the process of analyzing classroom interaction via conversation analysis and how those aspects can be applied to the English Language Teaching Program. In line with Sert's (2010) proposal, the study of Aşık and Kuru Gönen (2016) promoted the instruction of classroom interaction in English language teaching. Thus, awareness of classroom interaction, its aspects and utilization should be enhanced between both language teachers and learners.

With regards to limitations, this qualitative review analyzed studies administered in Turkey. Another limitation was the data collection tools, in other words, only two databases and an index were used in the collection procedure. For further research, studies could be selected from various settings and contexts which would be helpful in terms of understanding diverse interactions in different classrooms. Furthermore, a variety of databases can be adopted so that many more studies could be reached and analyzed.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it should be noted that in terms of the research context, among 16 studies, only 3 of them, namely, Balaman (2018), Sert (2017) and Üstünel (2014) administered the research with young learners, which creates a gap in the classroom interaction field in the Turkish context. Yet another imbalanced dispersion, in terms of the study focus is the gap in the students' contributions to the classroom interaction. While it is understandable that the field of teacher education requires such a perspective that looks at the teacher with a magnifying glass, the *language-as-an-action* perspective requires a special focus on the student's actions as well.

REFERENCES

Allwright, R. L. (1984). The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Learning. *Applied linguistics*, 5(2), 156-71.

Alsaadi, N. S. M. & Atar, C. (2019). Wait time in material and classroom context modes. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research, 6*(1)*,* 53-69.

Alsoraihi, M. H. (2019). Bridging the Gap Between Discourse Analysis and Language Classroom Practice. *English Language Teaching, 12*(8)*,* 79-88.

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

aus der Wieschen M.V. & Sert, O. (2018) Divergent language choices and maintenance of Intersubjectivity: the case of Danish EFL young learners, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.*

Avila, M. O. C. (2019). Exploring teachers' and learners' overlapped turns in the language classroom: Implications for classroom interactional competence. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 4,* 581-606.

Balaman, U. (2018). Embodied Resources in a Repetition Activity in a Preschool L2 Classroom. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language) 12,* 27-51.

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

Can Daşkın, N. (2017a). A conversation analytic investigation into L2 classroom interaction and informal formative assessment. *ELT Research Journal 2017, 6(1), 4-24.*

Can Daşkın, N. & Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2019). Reference to a past learning event in teacher turns in an L2 instructional setting. *Journal of Pragmatics, 142, 16-30.*

Can Daşkın, N. & Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2019). Reference to a past learning event as a practice of informal formative assessment in L2 classroom interaction, *Language Testing, 36(4),* 527–551.

Duff, P. A. (2008). *Case Study Research in Applied Linguistics.* Newyork, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum/ Taylor & Francis.

Duran, D. & Sert, O. (2019). Preference organization in English as a Medium of Instruction classrooms in a Turkish higher education setting. *Linguistics and Education, 49,* 72–85.

Duran, D., Kurhilla S. & Sert, O. (2019). Word search sequences in teacher-student interaction in an English as medium of instruction context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 1747-7522.*

Demo, D. A. (2001). Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers. *ERIC Digest.*

Evnitskaya, N. & Berger, E. (2017). Learners' Multimodal Displays of Willingness to Participate in Classroom Interaction in the L2 and CLIL Contexts. *Classroom Discourse, 8*(1)*, 71-94.*

Gardner R. (2019) Classroom Interaction Research: The State of the Art. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 52*(3), 212-226.

Girgin, U. & Brandt, A. (2020). Creating space for learning through 'Mm hm' in a L2 classroom: Implications for L2 classroom interactional competence. *Classroom Discourse, 11*(1), 61-79.

Jenks, C. J. & Seedhouse, P. (eds.) (2015) *International Perspectives on ELT Classroom Interaction.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, D. M. (1992). *Approaches to research in second language learning.* New York: Longman.

Markee, N. & S. Kunitz (2015), 'CA- for- SLA studies of classroom interaction: quo vadis?', in Markee, N. (ed.), *Classroom Discourse and Interaction*, Malden, MA: Wiley- Blackwell.

MoNE (2018b). Education vision 2023. Ankara: MoNE Publications

Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context.* New York: Routledge.

Richards, K. & Seedhouse, P(eds) 2005: *Applying Conversation Analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. (2019). L2 classroom contexts: deviance, confusion, grappling and flouting. *Classroom Discourse, 10*(1)*,* 10-28.

Seferoğlu, G. (2008). Insights from Turkish Learners of English on the Nature of Corrective Feedback in Classroom Interaction. *The New Educational Review 16*(3), 101-111.

Sert, O. (2010). A Proposal for a CA-Integrated English Language Teacher Education Program in Turkey. *Asian EFL Journal, 12*(3), 62-97*.*

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

Sert, O. (2017). Creating opportunities for L2 learning in a prediction activity. *System, 70,* 14-15*.*

Vattøy, K. D., M. Gamlem S. M. & Rogne W. M. (2020). Examining students' feedback engagement and assessment experiences: a mixed study. *Studies in Higher Education.*

Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2005). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri.* Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yin, R. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods (1st ed.).* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.

Üstünel, E. (2014). The sequential organization of classroom discourse at an EFL kindergarten classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 141,* 115 – 118.

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

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

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

Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualizing Classroom Interactional Competence. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 6* (1), 1-14.

Weizheng, Z. (2019). Teacher-Student Interaction in EFL Classroom in China: Communication Accommodation Theory Perspective. *English Language Teaching, 12*(12)*,* 99-111.

Woodward-Kron, R. & Remedios, L. (2007). Classroom Discourse in Problem-Based Learning Classrooms in The Health Sciences. *ARAL: Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 9*(1),9-18.