ILTERG

INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION RESEARCH GROUP

2nd ILTERG CONFERENCE

BOOK OF PROCEEDINGS

October 16-17, 2020

The 2nd ILTERG Conference is held online.

2nd ILTERG CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT

Gonca YANGIN EKŞİ	Gazi University	Turkey

ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

Asuman Aşık	Gazi University	Turkey
Burçak Yılmaz Yakışık	Gazi University	Turkey
Büşra Çelen	Gazi University	Turkey
Fatıma Nur Fişne	Gazi University	Turkey
Müzeyyen Nazlı Güngör	Gazi University	Turkey
Serhan Köse	Gazi University	Turkey
Samed Yasin Öztürk	Gazi University	Turkey
Yusuf Emre Yeşilyurt	Gazi University	Turkey
Murat Şükür	Gazi University	Turkey

CONFERENCE SECRETARIAT

Büşra Çelen	Gazi University	Turkey
Müzeyyen Nazlı Güngör	Gazi University	Turkey
Samed Yasin Öztürk	Gazi University	Turkey
Yusuf Emre Yeşilyurt	Gazi University	Turkey

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Abdulvahit Çakır	Ufuk University	Turkey
Asuman Aşık	Gazi University	Turkey
Bena Gül Peker	Gazi University	Turkey
Burçak Yılmaz Yakışık	Gazi University	Turkey
Ceylan Yangın Ersanlı	Samsun Ondokuzmayıs University	Turkey
Dinçay Köksal	Çanakkale Onsekizmart University	Turkey
Sumru Akcan	Boğaziçi University	Turkey
Yasemin Bayyurt	Boğaziçi University	Turkey
Dorota Werbińska	Pomeranian University	Poland
Gonca Ekşi	Gazi University	Turkey
İskender Hakkı Sarıgöz	Gazi University	Turkey
Maria Pilar Agustín Llach	Universidad de La Rioja	Spain
Lili Cavalheiro	University of Lisbon	Portugal
Luis Guerra	University of Evora	Portugal
Malgorzata Ekiert	Pomeranian University	Poland
Müzeyyen Nazlı Güngör	Gazi University	Turkey
Olga Mateus Gonçalves	University of Evora	Portugal
Ricardo Pereira	University of Lisbon	Portugal
Serhan Köse	Gazi University	Turkey

INTERRUPTING THE EXTENDED WAIT-TIME: PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS' PRACTICES

Cihat Atar

Sakarya University

cihatatar@sakarya.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

This study investigates how pre-service English teachers interrupt extended wait-time in English as a foreign language classroom contexts. Utilizing extended wait-time is an indicator of Classroom Interactional Competence, and thus it is an essential skill for efficient language teachers. In the literature, there are quite a few studies on how extended wait-time works and the benefits it offers in classrooms. The current paper, on the other hand, focuses on the cases in which the pre-service teachers interrupt and cut the extended wait-time short. This study has a qualitative methodological design analyzing five video recordings via Conversation Analysis methodology. The participants are five pre-service English teachers and their students in public primary and secondary schools. A collection of interrupted extended wait-time instances was formed from the data, and the instances were analyzed considering the sequential analysis, turn-taking and repair mechanism of Conversation Analysis. The findings suggest that the pre-service teachers interrupt extended wait-time in five main ways that are rephrasing, (partial) repetition, providing candidate responses, giving verbal and non-verbal cues and giving the turn to another student. This study offers insights into how exactly extended wait-time is interrupted, which provides implications for understanding the management of classroom interaction and training pre-service/in-service teachers regarding Classroom Interactional Competence.

Keywords: *extended wait-time, interrupting the extended wait-time, classroom interactional competence, micro teaching, conversation analysis, English language teaching.*

INTRODUCTION

Teachers' language use in the classroom is a significant factor that determines students' uptake. Until 2000, the focus in classroom studies was on quantification, and teachers' interactional style was assessed according to the categories of resources they used. After the social turn in social sciences (Firth & Wagner, 2007), the qualitative aspects of classroom interaction has gained importance in comparison to quantitative and rationalist approaches that prevailed the field of English language teaching for a long time. One outcome of this approach is the idea that interaction is organized just like grammar and formal aspects of languages are. Accordingly, the concept of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) has been put forward (Walsh, 2006, 2011). CIC includes a set of practices giving way to more engaging classrooms such as maximizing interactional space, shaping learner contributions, using wait-time effectively and effective elicitation. Utilization of extended wait-time is one of the main practices in CIC, and it is shown to be helpful in various studies in the field of Education and English Language Teaching more specifically (Alavi, Pourhaji, & Yaghoubi, 2016; Alsaadi & Atar, 2019; Atar, 2020; Barnette et al., 1995; Cullen, 1998; Donald, 2010; Kamdidah & Barjesteh, 2019; Li, 2011; Nunan, 1991; Stahl, 1994; Süt, 2020; Tsui, 1996; Walsh, 2002, 2006; Wangru, 2016; Wasi'ah, 2016; Yaqubi & Rokni, 2012; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2016).

The term wait-time refers to the deliberate pauses that are between teachers' and students' turns (Rowe, 1986) and extended wait-time (EWT) is the pause of 3-5 seconds allocated for the other interlocutor(s) to respond. There are various studies on the types of wait-time. As the researcher who coined the term wait-time, Rowe (1974, 1986) later suggested that there are two kinds of wait-time. The first one (i.e. wait-time I) begins with the silence of the teacher after asking a question, and it finishes when a student answers the question or when the teacher starts talking again. The second one (i.e. wait-time II) on the other hand starts when the student finishes his/her response, and it ends when the teacher starts making a comment. While wait-time I provides the students with the time needed to focus on the question, wait-time II enables them to elaborate on their answers (Blosser, 2000). Similarly, Fowler (1975) divided wait-time into four which are: 1) teacher reaction wait-time (which is a pause preceded by student talk and followed by teacher talk), 2) student reaction wait-time (which is a pause preceded by teacher talk and followed by student talk), 3) teacher-initiated wait-time (an example would be student talk preceded and followed by a period of silence), and 4) student-initiated wait-time (which is defined as a pause followed and preceded by teacher talk)." This study focuses on student reaction wait-time as it provides a more specific basis in comparison to Rowe (1974,

1986) whose definition is mainly based on teachers' perspective considering the structure of EWT.

In the following paragraphs, the relevant literature will be reviewed. First, the studies focusing on the effect of EWT will be mentioned. Then, the studies that discuss some of the reasons why teachers do not apply EWT will be summarized. Finally, in line with the goal of this study, the findings of the studies that mentioned some of the ways how teachers interrupt EWT will be analyzed.

In the literature there are many studies that suggest that EWT has beneficial effects on students' number and length of responses, although the number of studies on English Language teaching contexts is limited. However, there is an increase after 2000 (Alavi, Pourhaji, & Yaghoubi, 2016; Alsaadi & Atar, 2019; Atar, 2020; Barnette et al., 1995; Donald, 2010; Kamdidah & Barjesteh, 2019; Li, 2011; Nunan, 1991; Süt, 2020; Tsui, 2001; Walsh 2006; Walsh & Li, 2013; Wangru, 2016; Wasi'ah, 2016; Yaqubi & Rokni, 2012; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2016). The majority of the studies in the literature suggest that it has positive effects. Tsui (2001) reported that EWT use decreased lack of responses from students and Kamdidah and Barjesteh (2019) suggested that it increased students' willingness to communicate. Similary, Alavi et al. (2016) found that EWT increased students' self-selection and voicing their own issues. However, a few studies underlined some issues (e.g. Ahmad et al., 2020; Ingram & Elliot, 2016; Myhill, 2006). For instance, the effect of the pedagogic goal (e.g. meaning and fluency vs. form and accuracy) and the question types should be considered. Also, it may be argued that higher order cognitive questions are more appropriate for the use of EWT while EWT use may not be that efficient after low order questions as they depend on factual information or definitions of concepts (Doerr, 1984; Gooding et al., 1983, 1984; Tobin, 1985). Ingram and Elliot (2016) undertook a study on EWT via Conversation Analysis (CA), and they suggested that the benefits of EWT should not be taken for granted. In general they agreed with the fact that EWT could give way to more elaborated student responses; however, they argued that the implementation of EWT was still dependent upon local management, and it should be a part of teachers' decision-making process. In other words, they did not agree with the idea that EWT is always beneficial, and they suggested that local variables (e.g. what comes before and after) might have an impact on it. On the other hand, for example, Duell (1994) argued that EWT had a negative effect on students' performance, which resulted in lower high-level attainment. To sum up the studies on the efficiency of EWT, it may be suggested that most of the literature suggests that EWT has a beneficial effect in classrooms. Some studies argue that

there may be some other variables that need to be taken into consideration, yet no study seems to argue that EWT may have detrimental effects.

There are various studies on EWT in classrooms since 1970s, and they have found that teachers usually apply a wait-time of around 1 second (Gooding et al., 1984; Honea, 1982; Rowe, 1986; Swift & Gooding, 1983, Walsh, 2011). What could be the reason for this case, then? There are some studies in the literature that offer some insights into this situation. For instance, Black et al. (2003) argued that teachers found it hard to lengthen the wait-time, and they could not apply it. Atar (2020) undertook a mixed methods experimental study in which he tested the effect of awareness raising via a framework on pre-service English teachers' EWT use. In his study, in the interview data, the participants suggested that they did not apply EWT and kept it short as they believed that the students' level was very low. As the level was low, they assumed that the students would not be able to understand the questions, and they did not give EWT to let them think. In another study, Ingram and Elliot (2016) suggested that teachers interpreted long silence/wait-time as a trouble and as a result, they avoided implementing EWT. Beyerbach (1988) also suggested that teachers provided limited EWT as they thought that they had many materials to cover.

The final group of studies includes those which focused on how exactly teachers interrupt and cut the EWT short. To the knowledge of the researcher, there is not a study which specifically focuses on this issue in an English language teaching (ELT) context. However, one study in an ELT context and some studies in other fields mentioned some of the ways teachers interrupted EWT as a secondary finding. In an EFL context, Yatağanbaba and Yıldırım (2016) found that teachers interrupted students' turn or provided limited wait-time by using candidate responses and code-switching. Rowe (1972) found that teachers in general used an EWT of around 1 second. Rowe (1972) also suggested that the teachers did repetition and rephrasing or gave the answer themselves in science classroom contexts. Similarly, Bonnstetter (1988) suggested that in science classrooms, it was a good idea to avoid rephrasing and yes-no questions to have EWT. Wasik and Hindman (2018) suggested that rephrasing and teachers' giving the answer himself/herself were found as the practices to interrupt EWT. They suggested that as students were learning English, it could be helpful to give them additional time to think about their responses and reflect upon their word choices in expressing their ideas. This means that giving students EWT to provide a response increases their confidence, and they may become more willing to express their ideas. This finding is similar to Rowe's (1972) findings regarding rephrasing and teachers' giving the response themselves. In line with these studies,

Barnette et al. (1995) also suggested that classroom teachers cut EWT short and use repetition and rephrasing. They also found that teachers occasionally gave the turn to another student after a short pause without waiting for 3-5 seconds.

As discussed above, the studies in the literature researched whether teachers utilized EWT or not, and some studies aimed to investigate why and how teachers did not use EWT. However, to the knowledge of the researcher, no study in the literature specifically focused on how exactly teachers interrupted the EWT. There are several studies in English learning/teaching contexts; however, there is no specific focus on how exactly teachers interrupt and cut EWT short. When the studies that mentioned the practices of interrupting EWT as a secondary finding is checked (i.e. in the previous paragraph), the review shows that there are only a few studies that mentioned the practices of interrupting EWT. Only one of these studies was in an ELT context (Yatağanbaba &Yıldırım, 2016), and it did not directly focus on the ways teachers interrupted EWT. Consequently, it is concluded that there is a gap in the literature, and as the utilization of EWT is very vital as a part of Classroom Interactional Competence (Walsh, 2006, 2011), this study set out to investigate how PTs interrupt and cut teacher reaction EWT short in the classroom context and material modes (Walsh, 2006). In the classroom context mode, the aim is to maximize learners' involvement in the lessons and in this sense, it offers a more convenient space for students to speak and practice. As for the material mode, the aim is to ensure learning around a piece of material, task and activity. In order to do this, a qualitative research design was used in which data from classroom video recordings were collected and they were analyzed via CA to explicate how teachers interrupt EWT use. In accordance with this goal, the following research question was formed:

1) How do the pre-service teachers interrupt EWT in the classroom context and material modes in English as a foreign language micro teaching contexts?

METHODOLOGY

This study is a qualitative and descriptive study depending on the analysis of a case of pre-service teachers at a state university in Turkey. A case study aims to understand social phenomena within a single or small number of naturally occurring settings (Yıldırım & Şimsek, 2008). So, this study analyzes the practices of PTs with regard to interrupting EWT. Therefore, the study focuses on the action of breaking the EWT and how it is done by the PTs via CA. CA is a qualitative and inductive approach, and it is mainly the study of naturally occurring talk-in-

interaction (Liddicoat, 2011). Thanks to its deductive and emic approach, CA is used to observe and find out patterns in the use of language. Considering the qualitative focus of this study, CA provides an appropriate analysis tool as it lets the researcher unearth how the action of breaking EWT is implemented.

The Context and the Participants

The study was undertaken at a state university in Turkey with 3rd grade PTs in English Language Teaching Department. Purposive sampling was utilized, and PTs that studied ELT were chosen from. All the PTs were attending the School Experience course at the time of data collection. The School Experience course aims to have PTs do pedagogic observation, and they are expected to do micro teachings as well. This course is a part of the ELT curriculum in Turkey, and all the ELT PTs take this course. In this sense, the PTs in Turkey get a glimpse of the school environment, and this course is a pre-requisite of the Teaching Practice I and II courses in the 4th year in which they are expected to do observation and more teaching. The participants were 4 pre-service teachers. 1 participant was a woman while the other 3 were men. They did micro teaching in English lessons in public secondary schools.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected from public primary and secondary schools, and they consisted of 5 micro teaching sessions. To collect data, a video recorder was used, and the classes were recorded. Ethical approval was obtained from Sakarya University Board of Ethics on 07/10/2020 under number 61923333/050.99/, and anonymity throughout the study was ensured. After the data collection, the data were analyzed in accordance with the conversation-analytical steps suggested by Seedhouse (2004, p. 38-39). Here are the analysis steps:

-Unmotivated look at the data,

-An inductive search throughout the database to establish a collection of instances of the phenomenon,

-Establishing regularities and patterns in relation to the occurrences of the phenomenon to show that these instances are produced and oriented to by the participants as normative organization of the action,

-Finally, a more generalized account of how the phenomenon relates to interaction in the

broader sense is produced.

In accordance with these steps of CA, how PTs interrupted EWTs were observed, and the practices were investigated. To conceptualize interrupted EWT, in accordance with the suggestion of Rowe (1974), the EWT was considered as interrupted when a PT intervened after the initial question before 3 seconds. Hence, firstly, the cases of interrupted EWT in the data were identified to form a collection of instances. In forming the collection, the instances from material and classroom context modes were chosen, and those from managerial and skills and systems mode were excluded as they mainly display different characteristics (Walsh, 2006). This could decrease the validity and reliability of the analysis. The instances were analyzed one by one by paying attention to sequential analysis (Schegloff, 2007), turn-taking practices (Sacks et al., 1974), the repair mechanism and action formation (Liddicoat, 2011) to ensure that they were genuine instances that made an EWT relevant. Then, the extracts were transcribed according to CA transcription conventions of Jefferson (2004, see Appendix A). Having a systematic transcription is significant as it improves reliability and validity, and also it helps readers and other researchers to understand the extracts more easily.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the data demonstrated that twelve cases of interruption were observed, and these happened in five types of practices. These are, from the most common to the least common, rephrasing, (partial) repetition, providing candidate responses, giving verbal and non-verbal cues and changing the activity. It should be noted that these practices are not individual items, and they are often used together.

Extract 1 demonstrates two of the types of practices that PTs use to interrupt EWT: repetition and giving verbal and non-verbal cues. In this extract, in the beginning of a lesson, the teacher asks what the weather is like.

Extract 1 (2_1.54-2.13) What is the weather like?

```
01     PT2    : what is the weather like?
02            : (0.5)
03 →   PT2    : what is the weather like?
04            : (0.4)
05 →   PT2    : weather? ((opens the curtains))
06            : (0.9)
07 →   PT2    : (look) outside ((points outside))
08     SS     : sunny sunny
```

In line 1, PT2 asks what the weather is like. After a very brief pause (0.5 second), he repeats the question in line 3. In line 5, after a partial repetition, he opens the curtains. After a brief pause in line 6 again, he uses a verbal cue via ((look) outside) and uses a non-verbal cue by pointing outside in line 7. In the final line, the students altogether say that it is sunny.

This extract demonstrates how PTs break EWT via repetitions and cueing. PT2 almost does not let any of the students talk, and he does repetition, partial repetition, and verbal and non-verbal cueing one after another. Considering the whole class response in line 8, it may be suggested that students might have been able to provide the response if he had provided EWT in the initial lines. Also, the response of the students is a very limited one (i.e. a single word response). If they had been given some time for thinking (Stahl, 1994), they could have provided a more elaborated response. Therefore, the EWT not only restricts students' chances of taking the turn via self-selection, but also it may limit the response they offer.

The following extract is a typical instance which demonstrates the most common ways by which PTs cut the EWT short: rephrasing and repetition. In this extract, it is a classroom context mode (Walsh, 2011), and the class discusses some idioms and sayings written on the blackboard by the teacher. At this moment, they discuss "Health the best wealth".

Extract 2 (1_00.49-00:55) What do you think about this?

```
01    PT1    : what do you think about this?
02 →         (1.2)
03 →  PT1    : what do you say about this: (.) phrase (.) sentence
```

In line 1, PT1 asks a question to the whole class. However, after a short pause of 1.2 second, PT1 takes the turn again and repeats the question, and the rephrasing of the latter part follows with (phrase (.) sentence) in line 3. This brief extract was very typical in the data. After the initial question, PTs interrupted the students' thinking time by a rephrase and/or repetition. This was a classroom context mode, and the activity made some thinking time necessary as the question was a referential one. Hence, these practices interrupt students' think-time (Stahl, 1994), and it may discourage the students as they feel that they do not have enough time to prepare a response in this short time. Especially, considering the fact that this was a classroom context mode, they were expected to mention their ideas and do discussion. This practice was also observed in other studies, and it was suggested that especially novice teachers might break the EWT, because they were nervous (Atar, 2020; Honea, 1982). In addition, it was argued that PTs may cut the EWT short with rephrasing and repetitions as they think that the students' level is too low to understand the question (Atar, 2020). Finally, it should be noted here that

rephrasing and repetitions can be teachers' strategy for effective elicitation as a part of CIC (Walsh, 2011); however, the instances in this study were used to interrupt the EWT. If the PTs had provided EWT and used these resources only after that, this could be regarded as a strategy. In the current instances, they only block students' self-selection and limit the range of students' answers.

Extract 3 demonstrates another finding in the data. It is changing the activity abruptly. In this instance, the PT asks a question, but after a limited EWT, s/he changes the topic. In Extract 3, as in the previous extract, the class discusses some idioms and sayings written on the blackboard by the PT. After a few students' responses discussing the meaning of the saying "Health the best wealth", the PT asks "Anyone else?" to receive more answers.

Extract 3 (1_1.20) Anyone else?

```
01    PT1    : anyone else? ((looks around the class))
02 →         (0.6)
03    PT1    : sa:ying any ()
04 →         (0.8)
05 →  PT1    : no? okay
06 →         (0.5)
07 →  PT1    : now open the book please (0.6) page (.) fifty seven.
```

In line 1, PT1 asks if there are any more responses from the students and looks around the classroom. Then, after a brief pause of 0.6 second, he probably does some rephrasing. He provides another limited EWT in line 4 and changes the topics in line 7 after acknowledging students' non-response in line 5. In this extract, the PT invites the whole class to take the turn and respond; however, he breaks the EWT with a rephrasing and after that, he changes the topic by which an EWT is kept limited. As for the reason of this practice, the PT might have kept the EWT short thinking that there are other activities and tasks to cover. This is in line with the literature that suggested that teachers did not want to employ EWT thinking that they had many materials to cover (Beyerbach, 1988). However, a pause of 0.6 or 0.8 is naturally quite short and in fact, the PT changes the topic after looking at the students shortly. This may lead to negative student perceptions about contributing to the lessons. The PT invites them to talk, but after a very short pause, he changes the topic. Hence, the students may get the impression that the PT can easily change the topic, and they do not have to respond. Of course, it should be noted here that there were a few students' responses before this extract and accordingly, the PT might have thought that the discussion was enough. However, still this may have a negative effect on the students as some of them could be planning to respond.

Considering the analysis above, the 3 extracts have demonstrated most of the PTs common practices that were found to interrupt EWT. As argued in the Introduction section, the only study that mentioned practices of interrupting the EWT in ELT contexts is Yatağanbaba and Yıldırım (2016). They found that teachers interrupted students' turn and provided limited wait-time by using candidate responses and code-switching. Candidate responses were also observed in the current study although it is not very common. As for code-switching, no instances were observed though. Hence, it may be argued that the current study contributed to the literature by unearthing several different practices by which teachers interrupted EWT in ELT contexts. As for the few other studies undertaken in other contexts (e.g. science teaching), they reported repetition and rephrasing as practices to interrupt EWT (Barnette et al., 1995; Bonnster, 1988; Rowe, 1972). Wasik and Hindman (2018) also mentioned rephrasing as one way to limit EWT, but they also suggested that teachers sometimes did not wait for 3-5 seconds and gave the answer themselves, which was also observed by Rowe (1972). Considering these findings, it can be suggested here that the findings of this study are is in line with the literature regarding rephrasing, repetition and providing candidate responses, and it was indeed found that rephrasing and repetition were the most common practices. However, the current study also detected and reported cueing and changing the topic as teachers' practices that interrupted EWT.

As for the pedagogic implications of this study, Extract 2 have demonstrated how avoiding EWT blocks students from responding, and how it narrows down the response types. Tobin (1986) and Walsh (2006) suggested that students can take extended turns without being interrupted if they are provided with a sufficient amount of silence via EWT. In an ELT setting, Yatağanbaba and Yıldırım (2016) also had a similar conclusion, and they suggested that teachers missed chances of further student contribution by use of interruptions. Yaqubi and Rokni (2012) and Walsh (2002) also found that teacher's limited wait-time use led to the closing of the space for interaction. Therefore, it can be suggested that teacher's interruption of EWT is a non-desirable discourse move as it decreases the quantity and quality of students' contribution, which means minimizing language learning prospects as well. Self-selections are also missed if the teacher interrupts frequently as seen in Extracts 1 and 2 above. To exemplify, PT2 does not let them take the turn and keeps interrupting them again and again, and accordingly, the whole class responds with a single word response. The students' response is severally limited, and they cannot elaborate on their responses as would be expected in classroom context mode (Walsh, 2011). The students could give an answer, but PT2 keeps

breaking the EWT and interrupting students' thinking time in which they might prepare some responses.

Finally, the observations in Extract 1 and 2 are in line with Honea (1982) in that inexperienced teachers may get nervous fearing that the students will not respond. This is also similar to Gooding et al.'s (1984) study which concluded that it was difficult for novice teachers to wait for 3 or more seconds if they had not been trained on this. Being PTs in the 3rd year, the participants of this study were also inexperienced and in fact, this was the first time they were teaching formally. Being under stress due to being new in teaching, they might have expected the exchanges between the teacher and students to be very smooth, and thus they may have thought that they were doing proactive work via different practices to avoid a potential non-response case. This could be because they interpreted late responses from students as a case of students' failure or non-understanding. As a result, they intervened and interrupted the EWT via various practices most of which were demonstrated in the extracts above.

CONCLUSION

The goal of this study was to analyze PTs' practices by which they interrupted EWT. In comparison to the studies in the literature that focused on the effects of EWT on students' interaction, this study focused on the ways PTs broke the EWT specifically. Through a conversation analytical perspective, five micro teaching sessions by four pre-service English teachers were analyzed. The phenomenon was considered as an action, and relevant details were also taken into consideration rather than solely focusing on the question types the participants used. The analysis showed that the PTs in this study interrupted the EWT via rephrasing, (partial) repetitions, providing candidate answers, cues and changing the topic/activity. The findings of this study are in line with some of the previous studies. However, this study has contributed to the literature by specifically focusing on sketching the ways in which PTs interrupted EWT. This study has demonstrated teachers' practices of breaking the EWT specifically and provided the instances of how they do it as an action. These instances may be incorporated into PT training programs to increase their awareness as especially some of them were observed to occur frequently even in a data of five micro teachings. Consequently, it may be argued here that the practices found in this study can be used to increase PTs' awareness about classroom interaction and the use of EWT. They could be trained on these potentially detrimental ways, and they might be asked to avoid doing these practices as they were argued to decrease interaction and students' contribution in classroom context and material modes.

However, it should also be reminded here that, from a CA perspective, local management is very significant, and these practices may not be detrimental in some other contexts (e.g. depending on different modes of the lesson (Walsh, 2016). See Ingram and Elliott (2016) for some details as well.)

As mentioned in the Methodology part, this is a qualitative and small scale study, and it focused on only pre-service English teachers' micro teachings. In the future, more data can be analyzed, and different contexts can be checked to see whether the findings of this study are generalizable or whether there are some variations. In this way, a broader understanding of the phenomenon may be achieved. Finally, considering the lack of studies on this issue in the literature, future studies focusing on the qualitative aspects of PTs' and teachers' practices of interrupting EWT will be a significant contribution.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, M., Shakir, A., & Arshad, A. (2020). A Conversation Analysis of teacher talk and learners' involvement in a Pakistani ESL classroom. *Pakistan Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation, 8*(1), 20-42.

Alavi, M., Pourhaji, M., & Yaghoubi, B. (2016). Teacher wait-time and learner initiation: A single case analysis. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, *8*(18), 1-18.

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.

Atar, C. (2020). The Implementation of awareness raising for pre-service teachers' management of classroom interaction with a focus on extended wait-time. *Rumelide Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, (Ö8)*, 831-848. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.827633.

Barnette, J., Orletsky, S., Sattes, B., & Walsh, J. (1995, April 18-22). *Wait-time: Effective and trainable* [Conference presentation]. The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, United States.

Beyerbach, B. A. (1988, April). *Comparing researchers', teachers', and students' perspectives on a line of research attempting to implement wait time in classrooms* [Conference presentation]. The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, United States.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. Maidenhead: Open University Press

Blosser, P. E. (2000). *How to ask the right questions.* Arlington, VA: National Science Teacher Association.

Bonnstetter, R. J. (1988). Research & teaching: Active learning often starts with a question. *Journal of College Science Teaching, 18*(2), 95-97.

Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and classroom context. *English Language Teaching Journal, 25*, 179-187.

Doerr, S. T. (1984). *The effect of wait time and Piagetian levels of teacher questions in middle school science classrooms [*Unpublished master's thesis]. State University of New York.

Donald, S. (2010). Learning how to speak: Reticence in the ESL classroom. *ARECLS, 7*, 41-58.

Duell, O. K. (1994). Extended wait time and university student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 31*, 397–414.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/Foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a 'reconceptualised' SLA. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*, 800-819.

Fowler, T. W. (1975). An investigation of the teacher behavior of wait-time during an inquiry science lesson. *ERIC Number*, ED108872.

Gooding, C. T., Swift, P. R., & Swift, J. N. (1983, April). *An analysis of classroom discussion based on teacher success in observing wait time* [Conference presentation]. Annual Conference of New England Educational Research Organization, Rockport, ME.

Gooding, T., Swift, J. N., & Swift, P. R. (1984). Development and field testing of a wait time feedback device for monitoring and improving classroom interaction. *ERIC Number*, ED241482.

Honea, M. J. (1982). Wait time as an instructional variable: An influence on teacher and student. *Clearinghouse, 56*(4), 167-70.

Ingram, J. & Elliott, V. (2016). A critical analysis of the role of wait time in classroom interactions and the effects on student and teacher interactional behaviours. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 46*(1), 37–53, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2015.1009365.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Eds.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kamdideh, Z., & Barhesteh, H. (2019). The Effect of Extended Wait-Time on Promoting Iranian EFL Learners' Willingness to Communicate. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(3), 183-200. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12312a

Li, L. (2011). Obstacles and opportunities for developing thinking through interaction in language classrooms. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 6*(3), 146-158.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2011). *An introduction to conversation analysis* (Second Edition). Continuum International Publishing group.

Myhill, D. (2006). Talk, talk, talk: Teaching and learning in whole class discourse. *Research Papers in Education, 21,* 19–41.

Nunan, D. (1991) *Language teaching methodology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall

Rowe, M. B. (1972). Wait-time and rewards as instructional variables: Their influence on language, logic and fate control. *ERIC*, ED 061 103.

Rowe, M. B. (1974). Wait time and reward: as instructional variables, their influence on language, logic and fate control: Part one-wait time. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 11*(2), 81-94.

Rowe, M. B. (1986). Wait time: Slowing down may be a way of speeding up! *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 43-50.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turntaking for conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696–735.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction. A primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A Conversation analysis perspective.* Malden: Blackwell.

Stahl, R. J. (1994). Using "think-time" and "wait-time" skillfully in the classroom. *ERIC*, ED370885.

Süt, A. M. (2020). Wait-time in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) Context: A Conversation Analytic perspective. *Language Teaching and Educational Research (LATER), 3*(1), 149-162.

Swift, J. N., & Gooding, T. (1983). Interaction of wait time feedback and questioning instruction on middle school science teaching. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *20*(8), 721-73

Tobin, K. G. (1985, April). *Wait time in science: Necessary but not sufficient* [Conference presentation]. The annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, French Lick, IN.

Tsui, A. B. M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the Language Classroom* (pp.145-167). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsui, A. (2001). Classroom interaction. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 126-131). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

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

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

Walsh, S., & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 23*(2), 247-66.

Wangru, C. (2016). The research on strategies of college English teachers classroom questioning. *International Education Studies, 9*(8), 144-158.

Wasi'ah, N. (2016). A study of teacher talk in classroom interaction at an Islamic Senior High School. *OKARA Journal of Languages and Literature, 1*(1), 29-43.

Wasik, B. & Hindman, A. (2018). Why wait? The importance of wait time in developing young students' language and vocabulary skills. *The Reading Teacher, 0*(0), 1-10. DOI: 10.1002/trtr.1730

Yaqubi, B., & Rokni, M. P. (2012). Teachers' limited wait-time practice and learners' participation opportunities in EFL classroom interaction. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, *10*, 127-61.

Yatağanbaba, E., & Yıldırım, R. (2016). Teacher interruptions and limited wait time in EFL young learner classrooms. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 232*, 689–695.

Yıldırım, A., Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (7. edition), Ankara: Seçkin Yay.

APPENDIX

Appendix I. Jeffersonian (2004) Transcription Conventions

Transcription Conventions

A full discussion of CA transcription notation is available in Atkinson and Heritage (1984). Punctuation marks are used to capture characteristics of speech delivery, **not** to mark grammatical units.

[	indicates the point of overlap onset
]	indicates the point of overlap termination
=	a) turn continues below, at the next identical symbol b) if inserted at the end of one speaker's turn and at the beginning of the next speaker's adjacent turn, it indicates that there is no gap at all between the two turns
(3.2)	an interval between utterances (3 seconds and 2 tenths in this case)
(.)	a very short untimed pause
word	underlining indicates speaker emphasis
e:r the:::	indicates lengthening of the preceding sound
-	a single dash indicates an abrupt cut-off
?	rising intonation, not necessarily a question
!	an animated or emphatic tone
,	a comma indicates low-rising intonation, suggesting continuation
.	a full stop (period) indicates falling (final) intonation
CAPITALS	especially loud sounds relative to surrounding talk
° °	utterances between degree signs are noticeably quieter than surrounding talk
↑ ↓	indicate marked shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance following the arrow
> <	indicate that the talk they surround is produced more quickly than neighbouring talk
( )	a stretch of unclear or unintelligible speech.

1

(guess)	indicates transcriber doubt about a word
.hh	speaker in-breath
hh	speaker out-breath
→	arrows in the left margin pick out features of especial interest

Additional symbols

(T shows picture)	non-verbal actions or editor's comments
ja ((tr: yes))	non-English words are italicised, and are followed by an English translation in double brackets.
[gibee]	in the case of inaccurate pronunciation of an English word, an approximation of the sound is given in square brackets
[æ]	phonetic transcriptions of sounds are given in square brackets
< . >	indicate that the talk they surround is produced slowly and deliberately (typical of teachers modelling forms)
X_____	the gaze of the speaker is marked above an utterance and that of the addressee below it. A line indicates that the party marked is gazing towards the other; absence indicates lack of gaze. Dots mark the transition from nongaze to gaze and the point where the gaze reaches the other is marked by X
T:	teacher
L:	unidentified learner
L1:	identified learner
LL:	several or all learners simultaneously

2