Ufuk University Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department of English Language Teaching

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN GROUPWORK INTERACTION IN A TASK-BASED AND COOPERATIVE CLASSROOM

Radhwan Hassan

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2013

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN GROUPWORK INTERACTION
IN A TASK-BASED AND COOPERATIVE CLASSROOM

Radhwan Hassan

Ufuk University Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department of English Language Teaching

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2013

KABUL VE ONAY

Radhwan Hassan tarafından hazırlanan "Görev Tabanlı ve İşbirlikçi Sınıfta Grup Çalışması Etkileşiminin Söylem Çözümlemesi" başlıklı bu çalışma, 15.02.2013 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

[İ m z a]

Prof. Dr. Ahmet KOCAMAN (Başkan)

[İ m z a]

Prof. Dr. Gülsev PAKKAN (Danışman)

[İ m z a]

Doç. Dr. Paşa Tevfik CEPHE

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

Prof. Dr. Mehmet TOMANBAY

Enstitü Müdürü

BİLDİRİM

Hazırladığım tezin/raporun tamamen kendi çalışmam olduğunu ve her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi taahhüt eder, tezimin/raporumun kağıt ve elektronik kopyalarının Ufuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü arşivlerinde aşağıda belirttiğim koşullarda saklanmasına izin verdiğimi onaylarım:

☐   Tezimin/Raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

☐   Tezim/Raporum sadece Ufuk Üniversitesi yerleşkelerinden erişime açılabilir.

☐   Tezimin/Raporumun …… yıl süreyle erişime açılmasını istemiyorum. Bu sürenin sonunda uzatma için başvuruda bulunmadığım takdirde, tezimin/raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

15.02.2013

[İmza]

_____

Radhwan Hassan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

Hassan, Radhwan. Discourse Analysis in Group Work Interaction in a Task-Based and Cooperative Classroom, Master's Thesis, Ankara, 2013.

This study aimed to investigate and analyze foreign language students' in-class interaction and whether cooperative group works have an effect on the spoken discourse of students in terms of the use of follow-up moves and adjacency pairs in conversations before and after the cooperative group work activity. It is a descriptive qualitative discourse analysis study and the participants were 24 preparatory school students in the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences at Gazi University. The class, who were in elementary level, was observed for three hours and the dialogues of students were recorded during the pair and group work activities. These dialogues were transcribed and the data were analyzed comparing the first and second recording of students' utterances with regard to the discourse analysis conventions of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). The findings of the study showed that cooperative group works did have an effect on the spoken discourse of students in a way that made their dialogues more natural, more real-life like and more correct. In addition, the cooperative group work affected students' use of follow-up moves and adjacency pairs in a positive way as they really increased the number of follow-up moves and some pairs improved the use of adjacency pairs in their second dialogues.

Key words

Spoken Discourse Analysis, English Language Teaching, Classroom Interaction, Cooperative Group Work.

ÖZET

Hassan, Radhwan. Görev Tabanlı ve İşbirlikçi Sınıfta Grup Çalışması Etkileşiminin Söylem Çözümlemesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2013.

Bu çalışmanın amacı yabancı dil öğrencilerinin sınıf içi etkileşimini ve işbirlikçi grup çalışmalarının öğrencilerin sözlü söylemleri üzerinde grup çalışmasından önce ve sonraki diyaloglarında kullandıkları devamlılık sırası ve bitişik sözceler açısından etkisi olup olmadığını araştırmak ve çözümlemektir. Araştırma deseni betimsel nitel söylem çözümlemesi olarak belirlenmiştir ve katılımcılar Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi'nden 24 hazırlık sınıfı öğrencidir. Başlangıç seviyesindeki öğrenciler üç ders saati boyunca gözlemlenmiş ve ikili çalışma ve grup çalışmasındaki diyalogları kaydedilmiştir. Bu diyaloglar çözümlenmiş ve öğrencilerin birinci ve ikinci diyalogları Sinclair and Coulthard'ın (1975) söylem çözümlemesi kurallarına göre karşılaştırılarak çözümlenmiştir. Çalışmanın bulgularına göre, işbirlikçi grup çalışmaları ile birlikte öğrencilerin diyalogları daha doğal, daha doğru ve gerçek hayata benzer bir hale gelmiştir. Bununla birlikte, öğrenciler ikinci diyaloglarında daha fazla sayıda devamlılık sırası kullandığı ve bazı çiftler bitişik sözce kullanımlarını da geliştirdiği için, işbirlikçi grup çalışmalarının öğrencilerin devamlılık sırası ve bitişik sözce kullanımları üzerinde olumlu bir etki gösterdiği sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler

Sözlü Söylem Analizi, İngiliz Dili Öğretimi, Sınıf Etkileşimi, İşbirlikçi Grup Çalışması.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

In today's world, knowing a foreign language is very important for people to communicate with foreigners and to follow the recent developments all over the world. In this respect, English has become the leading language, a lingua franca, being the most popular language among countries. A lingua franca can be defined as a language widely adopted for communication between two speakers whose native languages are different from each other's and where one or both speakers are using it as a "second language" (Harmer, 2004). The increase in the importance of knowing a foreign language has led educators to review the approaches used in teaching foreign languages, as knowing how to communicate in that language has gained significance instead of knowing the grammatical rules of a language.

The shift in foreign language teaching approaches has resulted in more communicative and cooperative teaching methods and materials to be used in foreign language classrooms with smaller groups of language learners. The advantages of such classes have been shown in many research studies. Salmon (1988) expresses that in an affirming and encouraging small group, learners feel free to talk in provisional, exploratory ways and they speak tentatively, trying out their ideas on each other (as cited in Nunan, 1993) and this makes them feel freer to communicate and cooperate in the target language.

Many research studies have been conducted to investigate the contributions of communicative and cooperative approaches to language learning of students and among them, discourse analytic studies have gained popularity in the last years. Analyzing discourse, which refers to the stretches of language perceived to be meaningful, unified and purposive (Cook, 1989), can show educators the relationships between language and context as well as how the interaction occurs, namely, how it starts, continues and ends in meaningful relationships among groups of language learners. Furthermore, the interaction provided through cooperative activities is of great concern to many educators as the recent approaches in language teaching claim that they are vital in improving language abilities of learners.

In this respect, this study tries to focus on the interactive process seen among groups of foreign language students in a communicative and cooperative learning environment as well as their spoken discourse, the relationship between language and context and whether cooperative activities have an influence on the interaction process and spoken discourse of students.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The field of language teaching has undergone a great change during the last years as language learning is considered more important in today's world, as a result of which a lot of new methods and approaches have been introduced to the field of language teaching. With the help of these, students are expected to communicate more effectively, which was almost impossible with the old approaches applied at primary and high schools in Turkey. According to Birdal (2008), students were ignored in

foreign language content for many years in our country, only grammatical structures were taught and communicative aspect of the language was disregarded. Therefore, students had much difficulty in especially speaking skill as they just learned the structure of the language, without a chance to practice. However, real success in language learning comes only when learners can communicate in the target language in and out of the classroom (Davies and Pearse, 2002). Unfortunately, for many years in Turkey, mechanical exercises far from the usage of daily language have been used in foreign language classes and additionally, the same techniques is used in homework assignments and exams (Paker, 2006). Furthermore, a teacher centered approach has been adopted and language teaching has been far from real life which has made it impossible for students to learn the target language by using it in a communicative and cooperative learning environment and thus language teaching has mostly failed (Tanış, 2007). When students start high school, language learning is almost completely ignored as most students focus on the university entrance exam they take at the end of high school. Due to all of the aforementioned reasons, it can be said that spoken interaction is a big problem for Turkish learners and although they spend many years to learn a foreign language, it can still be a big problem for them to communicate in the target language.

In order to solve the problem of communicating effectively in the target language in foreign language classrooms, communicative and cooperative approaches have been adopted to language learning all over the world. Communicative language teaching could now be said to be the dominant paradigm in English teaching worldwide, at least in its theoretical representation in official curriculum documents (Hayes, 2008). Furthermore, cooperative language learning is gaining broad acceptance in a multitude

of language learning classrooms, principally because of its contributions to improving productivity and achievement and providing more opportunities for communication (Zhang, 2010a). Cooperative language learning brings pair or group work into mind as students have to work with each other for an activity to be cooperative and through pair and group work, students can find many opportunities to interact with each other in language classrooms. When it is thought that most of the classes tend to be crowded in Turkey, the importance of group work can be seen clearly. In their study, Long and Porter (1985) found out that in a 50 minute lesson with 30 students, if the students talked only to the teacher, they would have 30 seconds of talking time in each lesson. They mentioned that this equals only one hour per student in each year. However, it cannot be enough for a student to improve his/her competence in communicating or interacting with others; therefore, group work is very important in a communicative and cooperative language classroom to improve students' interacting abilities. Furthermore, in their study, Long and his colleagues (1976) found that the students produced not only a greater quantity but also a greater variety of speech in group work than in teacher-centered activities (as cited in Lightbown & Spada, 2006).

The fact that learners produce more discourse in group work through communicative and cooperative tasks is significant for this study as the purpose is to investigate language utterances in foreign language classrooms, analyze their interaction and if group work has any effects on the interactive process in the classroom. Within this scope, the use of adjacency pairs and follow-up moves are examined in the dialogues developed by students through pair and group works. Accordingly, adjacency pairs are pairs of utterances such as greeting-greeting and apology-acceptance

(McCarthy, 1991) and follow-up moves can be called an act of politeness (McCarthy, 1991) such as "Oh, really?" or "Nice!". These are important as they add naturalness and fluency to discourse.

In light of the aforementioned problem statement and purpose, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. Do cooperative group works have any effect on the spoken discourse of students?

2. How does group work interaction affect students' use of follow-up moves and adjacency pairs?

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore the language used in foreign language classrooms from a discourse analytic perspective. The language that will be key data for this study will not be that taken from random activities. Instead, it is to be the language used by students and the instructors while interacting in group work activities in communicative and cooperative foreign language classrooms. The communicative and cooperative learning environment is believed to have an effect on the interactive process among students and the instructors as well as upon the group work activities, as interaction stems from the nature of communication and cooperation among all people, not just students and teachers in a classroom setting. The group work activities are also examined to see whether they have any effects on the spoken discourse used during the interactions in the foreign language classrooms. Therefore, spoken discourse analysis is conducted in this research study, as this type of analysis aims to describe not just the

function of individual utterances, but how these utterances combine to form larger discourse units (Ellis, 1985).

It is now believed by many people that learning a foreign language is nearly impossible without a learning environment that requires learners to interact with each other in a communicative continuum. Therefore, investigating the natural process learners undergo in such learning environments is of great importance to many researchers. Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate and analyze students' interaction, the moves and adjacency pairs in those conversations, whether cooperative works have an effect on the use of moves and adjacency pairs as well as the interactive learning environment in the classroom.

1.4. Limitations

The most important limitation of this study is that the study group consists of 24 students in a school of foreign languages at a state university in Ankara. The students are all Turkish and their ages range between 18 and 20. They are learning English as a foreign language in a Turkish context. Furthermore, there may be some individual differences among them in terms of their backgrounds, characteristics or knowledge of the target language. Due to this limited study group, the results of this study cannot be generalized to a larger population.

1.5.Definitions of Terms

EFL: According to Crystal (1995, p.108), EFL means 'English seen in the context of countries where it is not the mother tongue and has no special status, such as Japan, France, Egypt, and Brazil'.

Interaction: Thomas (1991) defines interaction as "a process of mutual accommodation, with the addresser acting upon the addressee to cause a reaction, which in turn informs an action performed by the previous addressee, now turned addresser, upon the new addressee, which causes a reaction in the same way, and so on".

Communicative Language Teaching: Lightbown and Spada (2006, p. 196) define CLT as follows: "CLT is based on the premise that successful language learning involves not only knowledge of the structures and forms of a language but also the functions and purposes that a language serves in different communicative settings. This approach to teaching emphasizes the communication of meaning in interaction rather than the practice and manipulation of grammatical forms in isolation".

Cooperative Language Learning: Cooperative learning is the instructional use of small groups so students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec; 2002, p.5).

Discourse Analysis: Discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used (McCarthy, 2000).

Adjacency Pairs: Adjacency pairs are pairs of utterances such as greeting-greeting and apology-acceptance (McCarthy, 1991)

Follow-up Moves: Follow-up moves can be called an act of politeness (McCarthy, 1991) such as "Oh, really?" or "Nice!".

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

Cazden (2001) mentions that in traditional classrooms, the most significant imbalance is in the control of the right to speak because teachers have the natural right to speak at any time and to any person in the classroom; they can speak to their students anywhere in the classroom and in any tone of voice. However, in modern classrooms where communicative and cooperative language learning methods are applied, the roles of students and teachers have dramatically changed and interaction among students through communicative and cooperative activities has gained great importance.

The emergence of the concept of communicative competence brought a shift to more communicative oriented language teaching. Following this transition, language is now viewed as a means to communicate thoughts, as well as to accomplish a variety of life related tasks. As a result, drills that tend to treat language as fragmental, decontextualized units are now largely rejected in L2 pedagogy (Taguchi, 2007). Authentic materials, real life like activities and learning environments as well as fluency in communication are now seen as much more important components of language learning process. These all become more meaningful in an interactive language learning environment. Allwright (2000) states that classroom interaction in the target language can be accepted as not only offering language practice, or just learning opportunities, but as actually forming the language development process in itself.

Accordingly, Jule (2004) states that language learning students are in need of the following conditions to learn the target language in classroom:

1. A comfortable, low-stress environment

2. Language that is purposeful and used for real learning tasks

3. Activities that allow for a range of language functions

4. Comprehensible teacher talk, including meaningful questioning techniques and one on one time

5. Teacher talk that is challenging and meaningful

6. Language activities that are structured to be able to use the language being modeled.

7. Opportunities to work with peers in problem solving and collaborative learning situations.

8. One's first language and culture clearly acknowledged by the teacher.

All the aforementioned features remind one the communicative and cooperative learning approaches which are desired in modern classrooms in order to improve students' language competency in the best way possible.

2.2. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Like in all over the world, for many decades the predominant method of language instruction was the grammar-translation method that is rooted in the teaching of the nineteenth century and was widely used for the first half (in some parts of the world even longer) of the last century to teach modern foreign languages (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). However, it was criticized by many educators in that it did not lead language learners to use what they learned in real-life contexts as it focused mainly on

grammatical instruction. Therefore, there has been a shift towards a more communicative approach in language teaching and this approach is called communicative language teaching (CLT). It is based on the theory that the primary function of language use is communication. Its primary goal is for learners to develop communicative competence (Hymes, 1971). Communicative competence is defined as the ability to interpret and enact appropriate social behaviors, and it requires the active involvement of the learner in the production of the target language (Canale & Swain, 1980). According to Lightbown and Spada (2006), CLT claims that successful language learning is not only about knowledge of the structures of a language but also the functions that a language serves in various communicative settings. This approach underlies the communication of meaning in interaction instead of the practice of grammatical structures in isolation. Nunan (1991) defines five features of CLT as:

1. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.

2. The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.

3. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language but also on the Learning Management process.

4. An enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.

5. An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities outside the classroom.

Widdowson (1978) points out that an overemphasis on grammar would lead to prevent the learners from developing their communicative competence. In grammar-translation classes teachers' detailed explanations and exercises of grammar might be a

waste of time. In these classes there is little chance for students to communicate with language. In contrast, teachers in communicative classrooms will find themselves talking less and listening more becoming active facilitators of their students' learning (Larsen-Freeman, 1986) and so students can find much more opportunities to participate in their own learning and improve their ability to use the language. According to Snow (1996), students learn effectively about language when they take part actively in the communication with language rather than only passively accepting what the teacher said. Thomas (1991) explains the relationship between interaction and communication where he finds cooperation as the key concept to promote both terms. Accordingly, he states that there will be no communication when there is no interaction and if there is a conflict in the interaction, communication breaks down; therefore, communication takes place effectively and learning occurs when both sides get involved in the interaction in a cooperative way.

Many aspects of language learning can take place only through natural processes, which operate when a person is involved using the language for communication and the learners' ultimate goal is to communicate with others (Littlewood, 1981). This communicative environment can help learners adapt to the real world in an easier way because, as Richards & Rodgers (2001) states that learning activities are determined according to how well they involve the learner in authentic and meaningful use of language instead of mechanical practice of language structures. Cathcart (1989) shares a similar opinion as he mentions that function-based language models are unnatural and improper for communicative language teaching as are more

traditional texts since the notions or functions are introduced using the same unnatural texts.

Howatt (1984, p. 279) makes a distinction between strong and weak versions of communicative language teaching. Accordingly, he says;

> "There is, in a sense, a 'strong' version of the communicative approach and a 'weak' version. The weak version which has become more or less standard practice in the last ten years, stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for communicative purposes and, characteristically, attempts to integrate such activities into a wider program of language teaching... The 'strong' version of communicative teaching, on the other hand, advances the claim that language is acquired through communication, so that it is not merely a question of activating an existing but inert knowledge of the language, but of stimulating the development of the language system itself. If the former could be described as 'learning to use' English, the latter entails 'using English to learn it.'"

According to Martinez (2002), CLT has several advantages. For example, by using authentic material, students are exposed to real discourse, as in videos of interview with famous people where intermediate students listen for general idea. Authentic materials keep students informed about what is happening in the world and as language change is reflected in the materials, students and teachers can keep abreast of such changes. Moreover, reading texts are ideal to teach/practice mini-skills such as scanning, e.g. students are given a news article and asked to look for specific information. Teachers can also have students practice some skills of listening, e.g., students listen to news reports and they are asked to identify the names of countries, famous people, etc. Lastly, different authentic materials such as books, articles, newspapers, and so on contain a wide variety of text types, and language styles not easily found in conventional teaching materials.

Many studies in the literature prove the benefits of communicative language teaching on learners' use of language, their interest in learning foreign languages and also developing learner autonomy. Therefore, this approach can be defined as an advantageous and favorable one for language learners.

2.3. Cooperative Language Learning (CLL)

The importance of collaboration in small-group work and methods for facilitating effective group work, specifically through group problem-solving tasks, is a prominent research topic in the field of education (Webb, 1989). Cooperative learning is an approach to teaching that makes maximum use of cooperative activities involving pairs and small groups of learners in the classroom (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p.192). In other words, it is the instructional use of small groups so students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning (Johnson, Johnson & Holubec; 2002).

Research indicates that cooperative learning produces higher achievement, more positive relationships among students, and healthier psychological adjustment than do competitive or individualistic experiences (Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1991). People operating in a cooperative learning activity attain higher achievement level than those who function under more competitive and individualistic learning structures. Therefore, findings in cooperative learning research show cooperation has positive effects on the relationships among students, self-esteem, long-term retention, or depth of understanding of course material, etc. It has been tested as one of most effective and constructive teaching strategies (Zhang, 2010b). McGroarty (1989) talks about six learning advantages for the students of English as a second language in cooperative learning classes which are:

1) the increased frequency and variety of second language practice through different types of interaction,
2) the possibility for development or use of language in ways that support cognitive development and increased language skills,
3) opportunity to integrate language with content-based instruction,
4) opportunity to include a greater variety of curricular materials,
5) freedom for teachers to master new professional skills,
6) opportunity for students to act as resources for each other, thus assuming a more active role in their learning (as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p.192).

Cooperative language learning allows learners a lot more chances to produce language in a functional fashion. In traditional classrooms, discourse is usually initiated by the teacher in an artificial setting, but cooperative learning can be used to create a real-life social setting in which language can be normally used. In accomplishing the group task, cooperative groups can be helpful to students in developing their social abilities (Zhang, 2010b). For Johnson and Johnson (1984), there are some components for group learning to be truly cooperatively. Accordingly, the most important element is positive interdependence. Positive interdependence is successful when group members think that they are linked to each other in a way that one cannot succeed unless everyone succeeds. The second component is accountability. Group accountability exists when the group is clear about its goals and able to measure its progress in achieving them and the individual efforts of each of its members. Furthermore, the third essential component is promotive interaction, which exists when students share resources and help, support, encourage, and praise each other's efforts to learn. The fourth component is teaching students the required interpersonal and small group skills. Students have to engage simultaneously in task work and in teamwork. Students should be taught the social skills for high quality cooperation. Lastly, group processing which exists when group members discuss how well they are achieving their goals and maintaining effective working relationships is an important component of cooperative

group activities. According to Harmer (2004), group work is more dynamic in comparison with pair work as there are more people to react with or against in a group and so there is a greater potentiality of discussion.

Teachers need to be careful in sustaining cooperative language learning approach through ensuring interaction among the members of the class. Accordingly, Borich (2004) puts forward that teachers need to take the following components into consideration while organizing cooperative learning activities:

1. Teacher – student interaction as it promotes independent thinking.

2. Student-student interaction as it promotes the active participation and interdependence of all members of the class.

3. Task specialization as it creates an activity structure whose end product depends on the sharing, cooperation and cooperation of individuals within groups.

4. Role expectations and responsibilities as they facilitate the work of the group to promote communication and sharing among group members.

Furthermore, the literature makes some suggestions to implement cooperative learning activities successfully in a learning environment. Accordingly, Foyle and Lyman (1988) identify the basic steps involved in successful implementation of cooperative learning activities (as cited in Lyman & Foyle, 1988):

1. The content to be taught is identified, and criteria for mastery are determined by the teacher.

2. The most useful cooperative learning technique is identified, and the group size is determined by the teacher.

3. Students are assigned to groups.

4. The classroom is arranged to facilitate group interaction.

5. Group processes are taught or reviewed as needed to assure that the groups run smoothly.

6. The teacher develops expectations for group learning and makes sure students understand the purpose of the learning that will take place. A time line for activities is made clear to students.

7. The teacher presents initial material as appropriate, using whatever techniques she or he chooses.

8. The teacher monitors student interaction in the groups, and provides assistance and clarification as needed. The teacher reviews group skills and facilitates problem-solving when necessary.

9. Student outcomes are evaluated. Students must individually demonstrate mastery of important skills or concepts of the learning. Evaluation is based on observations of student performance or oral responses to questions; paper and pencil need not be used.

10. Groups are rewarded for success. Verbal praise by the teacher, or recognition in the class newsletter or on the bulletin board can be used to reward high-achieving groups.

Cooperative language learning shares some characteristics with communicative language teaching. They both give high light to the interaction and communication between students and students and teachers, take teachers' role as guider, facilitator, and negotiator, and stress the autonomy and centricity of the students in classroom. They

both consider healthy relationships with other classmates are more conductive to learning, and respect the integrity of learners, allowing for personal growth and responsibility, etc. The communicative function of language can also find its way in cooperative language learning (Zhang, 2010b). Therefore, using both approaches in a classroom setting may be helpful in strengthening learners' foreign language competence.

2.4. Interaction in Language Classrooms

Both communicative and cooperative language learning approaches require foreign language learners and teachers to interact as much as possible in the classroom so that learners can use the language in a better way in the real world. Interaction is the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings or ideas between two or more people, resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other (Brown, 2001, p.165). Effective language learning depends on structuring social interaction to maximize the needs of communication in the target language (Jia, 2003).

Ellis (2004) stated that "interactionists view language learning as an outcome of participating in discourse, in particular face-to-face interaction" (p. 78). Furthermore, it is believed that interaction is the central part of communication in an era of communicative language teaching (Brown, H.D. 1994)". Hall and Verplaetse (2000) state that the role of interaction in language learning is really important because it is in their interactions with one another that teachers and students work together to create the intellectual and practical activities shaping the form and the content of the target language in addition to the processes and outcomes of individual development.

Additionally, as suggested by Choudhury (2005), some control on a teacher's part is actually an important element of successfully carrying out interactive techniques. Teacher-directed and dominated classrooms cannot, by their nature, be interactive. It is mandatory for a teacher to take the role of a controller and a facilitator rather than of an authoritarian. The results of research studies on interaction in classroom show that the following features increase students' active participation in interaction in the classroom (Kumpulainen & Wray, 2002, p.142):

> A complex and open learning situation,
> Students initiating meaning-making,
> Opportunities to approach and conceptualize the task with different problem-solving strategies,
> Opportunities to use a range of semiotic tools, including informal and formal language.

These features show that a flexible learning environment with active students who willingly seek to solve problems through using language is important to create an interactive learning atmosphere.

One of the most important keys to create an interactive language classroom is the initiation of interaction by the teacher. However non-directive the teaching style is, the teacher should provide the stimuli for continued interaction. These stimuli are important in the initial stage of a classroom lesson as well as throughout the lesson. Without such guidance, classroom interaction may indeed be communicative, but students can easily get distracted and move away from the class objectives (Choudhury, 2005). However, teachers need to be flexible through a set of techniques they can use in line with the circumstances and keep interaction central-interaction between teacher and student, student and teacher, student and student, student and writers of texts, and student and the community speaking the target language (Rivers, 1983). Moreover, a

really interactive learning environment in a classroom requires the teacher to give a full role to the student in developing and carrying through activities, to accept students' all kinds of opinions, and be tolerant of mistakes done by the students while trying to communicate (Rivers, 1983).

In order to improve interaction in the classroom, the results of research studies suggest the following movement in teaching-learning process (Gorman, 1969, p. 40; as cited in Zengin, 2008):

Table I: Movement in Teaching-Learning Process

Movement from	Movement Toward
teacher domination	teacher as special member of group
teacher as sole leader	group-centered shared leadership
extrinsic control in hands	intrinsic control in hands of individuals of teacher (including teacher)
active membership of teacher	active membership of total group plus two or three verbal students
stress on subject with exclusion	stress on both cognitive *and* affective of personal social needs elements
almost total dependence on teacher as planner, initiator and evaluator	student self direction and independence
formal recitation by small percentage	spontaneous participation by all of students
selective inattention by students	careful listening with feedback checks
an aggregate of non-cohesive individuals	a cohesive group of interacting individuals
student learning with the intent of test passing and grade getting	student learning to satisfy personal needs to know and to grow

This table suggests that teachers should be facilitators rather than leaders, students should participate in the learning process through group and student centered methods,

they should be independent, they should interact with each other and the teacher and students should satisfy their personal needs.

In interaction, students can use all they possess of the language- all they have learned or casually absorbed- in real life exchanges where expressing their real meaning is important to them (Rivers, 2000, p.4). Therefore, it is really important to create an interactive learning environment in the foreign language classrooms so that students have enough opportunities to practice what they have learned in real-life like contexts learning how to communicate with others.

2.5. Spoken Discourse Analysis

Speaking in language classrooms can provide researchers for valuable data as to what happens under what context. Therefore, language classrooms can be seen as discourse communities (Hall & Verplaetse, 2000). McCarthy (1991, p. 118) says, "Spoken language is a vast subject, and little is known in hard statistical terms of the distribution of different types of the speech in people's everyday lives." Spoken language is immediate and hard to control. According to Cook (1989, p.115),

> "Spoken language, as has often been pointed out, happens in time, and must therefore be produced and processed 'on line'. There is no going back and changing or restructuring our words as there is on writing ; there is often no time to pause and think, and while we are talking or listening, we cannot stand back and view the discourse in spatial or diagrammatic terms as we did."

In fact, as Burns, et al. (1996, p. 49) assert,

> "Spoken and written language draw on the same systems of language, but they do so in different ways because they have evolved over time to fulfill different socio cultural functions. It may be helpful to think of a language continuum with very spoken texts, such as casual conversation, at one end and very written texts, such as novels, at the other."

Therefore, studying spoken language may yield useful data as to how discourse is formed and continued among groups of learners in any learning environment.

Speech is less richly organized and contains less tightly packed information, i.e., spoken language typically contains little subordination. In addition, whereas interactive markers, planning "fillers" and other hesitation phenomena never occur in written language, they do very frequently in spoken language. Moreover, spoken language tends to be filled with generalized vocabulary and repetitions of the same syntactic forms. Written language, on the other hand, usually contains well-chosen words and well-organized structures. These characteristics of spoken discourse, in contrast with written discourse, are carefully investigated and well described in many languages (Chodchoey, 1988).

Z. Harris (1951, 1952) was the first linguist to use the term *discourse analysis* and he was a formalist: he viewed discourse as the next level in a hierarchy of morphemes, clauses and sentences. This view has been criticized due to the results shown by researchers like Chafe (1980, 1987, 1992), who rightfully argued that the units used by people in their speech cannot always be categorized as sentences (as cited in Alba-Juez, 2009). According to Johnstone (2002), discourse analysis is a research method that can be (and is being) used by scholars with a variety of academic and non-academic affiliations, coming from a variety of disciplines, to answer a variety of questions. Emerging from many disciplines such as linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology and sociology, discourse analysis is an attempt to study how language is

used in various situations. It is chiefly concerned with the study of the relationship between language and context in which it is used (Dahal, 2010).

Discourse analysts study language in use: written texts of all kinds, and spoken data, from conversation to highly institutionalized forms of talk (McCarthy, 2000, p. 5). Through spoken discourse analysis, a variety of features and functions, which may not be explicit to everyone, are summarized to explain how people communicate effectively with these hidden rules (Zhang, 2010a). Discourse analysts do not focus on language as an abstract system as they all tend to be interested in what happens when people use language, depending on what they have said, heard or seen before, as well as in how they do things with language, like expressing feelings, entertaining others, exchanging information, and so on. This is the main reason why the discipline has been called "*Discourse Analysis*" rather than "language analysis". The matters explored by most discourse analysts, being sufficient to demonstrate that researchers in discourse analysis are certainly concerned with the study of language in use, are as follows (Alba-Juez, 2009):

1. Turn-taking in telephone conversations

2. The language of humor

3. Power relationships in doctor/patient interviews

4. Dialogue in chat rooms

5. The discourse of the archives, records or files of psychoanalysts

6. The conversation at a dinner table

7. The scripts of a given television program

8. The discourse of politicians

9. The study of racism through the use of discourse

10. How power relations and sexism are manifested in the conversation between men and women

11. The characteristics of persuasive discourse

12. Openings and closings in different types of conversations

13. The structure of narrative

14. Representations of black/white people (or any race) in the written media (magazines, newspapers, etc.)

15. The strategies used by speakers/writers in order to fulfill a given discourse function

16. The use of irony or metaphor for certain communicative aims

17. The use of linguistic politeness

18. The discourse of E-mail messages

19. Legal discourse used in trials

20. How people create social categories like "boy" or "immigrant" or "lady" as they talk to, about, or among each other

21. And a long *etcetera*…

As the aforementioned list suggests, discourse analysis is also concerned with *language use in social contexts*, and in particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers (Slembrouck, 2005). In this research study, the focus is on spoken discourse analysis, which will be used to gather data in a naturally set cooperative work among groups of students in a communicative foreign language class. A language learner is not a captive learner pushed in the correct order of a dialogue; conversely, s/he is put in a

conversation like the ones outside the classroom. Their verbal functions are not restricted, because of which they can initiate, response or follow-up (Tezcan, 2006).

According to Burns, et al. (1996), through working closely with spoken data, it can be possible to:

1. see the importance of context in teaching spoken language

2. become more aware of discourse structures, structural features, intonation and grammatical patterns and discourse strategies

3. increase our knowledge of how the prosodic features of spoken discourse (i.e. intonation, stress, rhythm and articulation) contribute to meaning

4. increase our knowledge of the differences between spoken and written discourse

5. raise our awareness of the significance of interpersonal roles and relationships in spoken interactions

6. raise our awareness of how speakers jointly achieve social goals

7. think creatively about different ways we can use texts with learners.

The aforementioned advantages of studying spoken discourse add depth to the discourse analysis studies conducted in literature because it is not only easy to conduct such studies but such studies also contribute greatly to the literature in terms of increasing our knowledge of what happens while students are interacting during communicative and cooperative tasks in real language classrooms.

2.5.1. Turn-taking

As known by everybody, conversations progress through turns taken by the speakers as it is impossible to communicate effectively when everyone speaks at the same time, without waiting for each other to speak. Therefore, turn-taking is an important issue in conversations. Turn-taking practices organize the allocation of opportunities to participate in conversation and the turn-constructional forms such participation take. Understanding turn-taking for conversation and other forms of talk-in-interaction is key to understanding human conduct, because most actions carried out through talking are shaped by the organization of that talk into speaking turns: it shapes how speakers compose their contributions, it shapes where they position those contribution in the ongoing interaction, and it shapes when they get to participate (Lerner, 2004).

Turn-taking refers to 'the roles of speaker and listener change' collaboratively with remarkably little overlapping and few silences (Coulthard, 1994:59). Burns, et al. (1996, p. 18) mentions that "turn taking is concerned with when and how speakers take turns in spoken conversation, and can be aligned to types of conversation or different features of conversation". For example:

- "Overlaps in conversation mark instances of disagreement, urgency, annoyance, or a high degree of competition for a turn.
- Little competition for turns marks interactions which are more cooperatively negotiated.
- Pauses between turns may indicate that a speaker is searching for the correct response or is signaling that an unanticipated response is likely.
- Longer turns signal their endings by such things as pauses, laughter or fillers such as anyhow or so." (p.18)

Other features of how turns are given and gained in English may also prompt specific awareness training where necessary; these include body language such as inhalation and head movement as a turn-seeking signal, eye contact, gesticulation, etc. , as well as linguistic phenomena such as a drop in pitch or use of grammatical tags (McCarthy, 2000). Duncan (1972) proposed that, in every interaction, there are signals that speakers and hearers send to each other in order to indicate their state with regard to the turn. Turn yielding signals include: Intonation (rising or falling pitch); drawl; body motion (termination of hand gesture, relaxation of a tensed hand position); "socio-centric sequences" (fixed expressions such as *or something, you know, but uh*); paralanguage (drops in pitch or loudness); syntax (complete grammatical unit) (as cited in Taboada, 2006).

There is a set of rules that govern the turn-taking system, which is independent of various social contexts (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974); (a) when the current speaker selects the next speaker, the next speaker has the right and, at the same time, is obliged to take the next turn; (b) if the current speaker does not select the next speaker, any one of the participants has the right to become the next speaker. This could be regarded as self-selection; and (c) if neither the current speaker selects the next speaker nor any of the participants become the next speaker, the current speaker may resume his/her turn (as cited in Kato, 2000). This shows that the organization of turn-taking provides "an intrinsic motivation for listening." As any given listener might be selected to speak next, s/he must cope with responding to the previous utterances (Pöhaker, 1998).

Additionally, in relation to the skill of turn taking, Richards (1990, p. 67-68) points out three strategies:

1. Strategies for taking a turn. These involve ways of entering into a conversation or taking over the role of speaker, and include:
- Using interjection to signal a request for a turn such as 'Mmhmm', 'Yeah', and rising intonation
- Using facial or other gestures to indicate a wish to take a turn.
- Accept a turn offered by another speaker by responding to a question or by providing the second part of an adjacency pair.
- Completing or adding to something said by the speaker.
2. Strategies for holding a turn. These involve indicating that one has more to say, for example, through intonation or by using expressions to suggest continuity, such as 'first', 'another thing', 'then'.
3. Strategies for relinquishing the turn. These are devices used to bring the other person(s) into the conversation, and include:
- Using adjacency pairs
- Using phonological signals
- Pausing to provide an opportunity for someone to take up the turn.

Because of all these aforementioned features, turn-taking underlies the interactive nature of spoken discourse among speakers, who are foreign language students at a school of foreign languages in this study.

2.5.2. Adjacency pairs

Adjacency pairs can be described as automatic sequences consisting of a first part and a second part. These parts are produced by different speakers. Having uttered the first part, the speaker immediately expects his/her conversational partner to produce a second part of the same pair. The most widely used adjacency pairs indicate thanking-response, request-acceptance, apology-minimization, and question-answer sequences (Pöhaker, 1998).

According to Burns, et al. (1996, p. 18),

"the patterns which occur in conversation when the utterance of one speaker is likely to be followed by a particular kind of response. The response can be either a preferred response or a dispreferred response. A dispreferred response is typically accompanied by a justification or an explanation".

The diagram below shows this relationship:

Table II: The Relationship among Utterance, Preferred and Dispreferred responses

Utterance	Preferred response	Dispreferred response
Offer	Acceptance	Refusal
Greeting	Greeting	No response
Request	Fulfillment of request	Refusal to fulfill request

The aforementioned "pairs of utterances are ordered, i.e., there is a recognizable difference between first parts and second parts of the pair; and in which given first pair parts require particular second parts" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p.39). Burns, et al. (1996, p. 19) gives an example of adjacency pairs in spoken discourse in the following extract:

A = Agent
C = Customer
A: Do you want me to hold you some seats?
C: … No… I'm just finding out the price. I'm not sure whether I can go yet.

Burns, et al. (1996, p. 19) describe this interaction as an adjacency pair in which:

- the customer is asked a question and makes a response
- the question appears to be perceived as a challenge by the customer and she pauses before replying, indicating a dispreferred response
- the dispreferred response is accompanied by:
  – a justification, *I'm just finding out the price*
  – an explanation, *I'm not sure whether I can go yet.*

This example seems to be nice in explaining adjacency pairs in terms of their functions in conversations and conducting discourse analysis studies. They are used for opening

and closing conversations and are very important during conversations both for operating the turn-taking system by enabling a speaker to select next action and next speaker, and also for enabling the next speaker to avoid both gap and overlap (Coulthard, 1994).

2.5.3. Transactions and exchanges

According to McCarthy (2000), transactions in conversations are about openings and closings and the teacher can isolate, present and exemplify a set of useful transaction markers such as right, now, so, okay, and so on, for example by drawing attention to how s/he uses markers to divide a lesson.

Exchange consists of a question, an answer and a comment, and so it is tree part exchange. Each of the parts are given the name 'move' by Sinclair and Coulthard (McCarthy, 2000). They call the first move in an exchange an opening move, the second an answering move and the third a follow-up move.

McCarthy (2000, p. 123) states;

"it is worth looking at some common follow-up moves in eliciting exchanges in everyday talk. While speakers outside classrooms do not usually behave like teachers and evaluate the quality of one another's utterances (in terms of correctness, fluency etc.), they often evaluate (or at least react to) its content; and afterwards, he gives an example to compare what can sometimes happen in the classroom (5.6) with what is likely to happen in the real world (5.7)":

(5.6)   Teacher: Now Maria, you ask Fumiko.
Maria: What did you do at the weekend?
Fumiko: I went to Wales.
Teacher: Good, now Fumiko, you ask Marco, … (etc.)

(5.7)   Maria: What did you do at the weekend?
Fumiko: I went to Wales.

Maria: Oh, really? Where did you go?

Accordingly, "follow-up moves of the latter kind might include: how nice, that's interesting, oh dear, how awful, lucky you, oh no, I see, did you, right. These evaluations can also occur in the responding move in informing exchanges." (McCarthy, 2000, p. 123).

2.5.4. Moves and acts

Explaining exchange and the types of moves, Hatch (1992, p. 97) says the following and gives examples for the types of moves:

"Each exchange, however, is not made up of single utterances but of more elaborate moves. There are five types of moves: framing moves, focusing moves, opening moves, answering moves and follow-up moves. Framing moves indicate that one stage of the lesson is ended and another is about to begin (e.g., right, ok, well or a stressed silence). Focusing moves tell the students what is going to happen or what has happened.
Framing: Right
        (silent stress)
        Now,
Focusing: what we have just done, what h we've just done is we've decided
        how to outline our arguments.
Opening moves get students to participate in the teaching exchange. These are often followed by an answering move.
Opening: There were differences in who interrupted the most.
        Do you know who did the most interruptions?
        I'm sure you do.
        Vanessa?
Answering: The-the men did. At least in meetings.
The answering move is then given a follow-up:
Follow-up: The men did.
        That's another important finding."

According to Stenstrom (1994), a move is "the verbal action which carries the conversation forward". In effect, the move is a unit which has a function relating to the progression of the conversation (in contrast to the act, which has a function relating to the speaker's communicative intention). A move consists of one or more acts, so, for

example, a speaker who is seeking information would make an [Initiate] move which could take the form of a question act (Harrison, 1998).

Stenstrom (1994) differentiates between three different kinds of acts - primary acts, secondary acts and complementary acts. A primary act is the only obligatory act in a move. A secondary act accompanies primary acts by adding emphasis or further information to the primary act, for example emphasizer, expand, justify, meta-content, precursor and preface. Complementary acts accompany primary and secondary acts. They are mainly interactional and are low in informational content, eg: 'well', 'em', 'you know', etc.

All in all, spoken discourse consists of many components like transactions, exchanges, moves, acts and turn-takings, about which brief information has been given above. As the focus of this study is spoken discourse analysis, these components are important in explaining what has been observed in a communicative foreign language class where cooperative group works are conducted.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The method chapter will first present the overall research design with some explanation and definition of the design. Following the research design, it will explain the participants of the study as well as the research field. Then it will discuss data collection instruments, which is followed by the data collection procedure and data analysis procedures.

3.1. Research Design

This study is mainly based on spoken discourse analysis for the examination of classroom interaction in a foreign language classroom. It is a descriptive qualitative discourse analysis study; therefore, it does not aim to make generalizations to larger populations. Instead, it aims to gather deeper data based on the study of a small group of foreign language students and get a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of in-class interaction through the use of cooperative group works. Indeed, the value of a qualitative study may depend on its lack of generalizability in the sense of being representative of a larger population; it may provide an account of a setting or population that is illuminating as an extreme case or "ideal type" (Maxwell, 2008). The goal of discourse analysis is dealing with linguistic issues such as sentence cohesion, turn taking, the relationship between utterances, and how speakers use 'speech moves' and 'speech acts' in their discourse (Richards and Schmidt, 2002). The analysis of spoken discourse in this study described how a social phenomenon, namely the

classroom interaction, was established and maintained in the foreign language classrooms with specific references to what the teachers and students did and how they spoke in their interactive group works.

3.2. Participants of the Study

The study includes 24 participants, all of whom are the preparatory school students of the same class in the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences at Gazi University. They are at elementary level. The preparatory school students at the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences at Gazi University start from beginner level and finish school at intermediate level. Students who reach a GPA of 75 points are excused from taking the final exam. Grammar and vocabulary are assessed in quizzes while students are also assessed on presentations, portfolios and extensive reading tasks. Midterms are based on four skills, which shows that speaking is an important skill in the curriculum of the school as this skill is assessed in every midterm during the year. The students are all from the departments of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences; however, the syllabus is the same for all students in the faculties and school of foreign languages.

The students' ages in this study vary between 18 and 20. Among these participants, 9 students are 18, 10 students are 19 and 5 students are 20 years old. Moreover, 11 of the students are male while 13 students are female. Furthermore, 11 participants graduated from regular high schools, 10 participants graduated from Anatolian high schools and 3 participants graduated from science high schools. The

class of these participants was chosen through convenient sampling method, as the instructor of this class allowed the researcher to conduct the observations whenever possible. The background information of the participants is summarized in Table 3 below:

Table III: Background Information of the Participants

Categories		Number of students
Age	18 years old	9
	19 years old	10
	20 years old	5
Gender	Female	13
	Male	11
Graduate of	General public high school	11
	Anatolian public high school	10
	Science public high school	3

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

The main data collection method for this study is observation and recording the utterances of students during group work activities. As the data are obtained through transcribing the dialogues of the students, no observation form is prepared. Instead, the researcher has a list of interesting topics for speaking so that the students can choose the topics about which they want to perform their dialogues (Table 4). If students are

introduced to topics that interest them, they're more likely to be motivated (Jones, 2007). These topics have been gathered by the researcher examining the topics used by common course books to teach Simple Past Tense in English. After the students choose the topics that interest them, four mostly selected topics are determined by the researcher. The Past Simple Tense is the main grammar structure in the dialogues. The percentage of the topics are presented below:

Table IV: Percentage of the Topics Selected for Pair and Group Work

Topic	Percentage (%)
Your last holiday	24
The best day of your life	22
Your last birthday	20
The worst day of your life	15
The most horrible event of your life	8
An accident you had	6
The funniest event of your life	4
The best present you got	1

As it can be seen in the table above, 24% of the students chose the topic "your last holiday", 22% of the students chose "the best day of your life", 20% chose "your last birthday", 15% chose "the worst day of your life", 8% chose "the most horrible event of your life", 6% chose "an accident you had", 4% chose "the funniest event of your life" and 1% chose "the present you got" as a topic for the pair and group work activities. Accordingly, the four mostly selected topics were determined as "your last

holiday", "the best day of your life", "your last birthday" and "the worst day of your life".

This study is based on and encourages cooperative group work activities. Jensen (1998) states that new meaning comes through social interaction and so the connection between students is important. Therefore, cooperative learning and collaboration should be encouraged. To promote interaction among the students in a communicative environment, cooperative pair and group work are used in this study. The pair work requires two students to come together to produce a dialogue in one of the topics they choose. They discuss the topic and decide what to talk about. They take down notes so that they can feel better while they are producing their dialogues in front of their classmates. The group work requires six students, namely three pairs, to come together and help each other to develop their dialogues through cooperation. The notes students take during pair work activity help them at this point as their group mates can see and remember their dialogues and try to help better them. During the pair and group work, the teacher acts as a facilitator and helps the students find their way. Therefore, the researcher mainly observes the study of students with the help of the teacher and whether they improve their discourse or not during the group work that come after the pair work.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

The researcher, getting the necessary permission from the teacher of the class, observed and recorded the discourse of students during the pair and group works which

lasted three class hours including the pair work and group work activities as well as the performance of the students. Before the observation started, the researcher went to the research field and checked the layout of the classroom and if it was convenient or not for pair and group works. Luckily, the layout was U-shape where students could study in pairs and get together as group when necessary. A few days before the observation, the students were given the list of interesting speaking topics and each student selected the best option for him/her to study in a pair and group work. Then the researcher found out the mostly selected four topics in order to conduct a controlled study. Moreover, the researcher made a very short questionnaire to understand whether students wanted to select their own pairs or be selected by the teacher. Accordingly, 32% of the students wanted to select their own pairs while 68% wanted the teacher to put them into pairs. This might show the close relationships among the students as a class.

On the day of the observation, the focus subject was Simple Past Tense in the classroom. This is why the researcher chose Simple Past Tense as the main grammar structure in the dialogues. The students were previously taught the subject so they were ready to practice the structure through active participation in the pair and group work activity. The teacher began the lesson with some warm up questions where she asked students about their last weekend, what they did, who they were with, etc and following this activity, students were ready to practice the subject. The students were first informed by the teacher about the pair and group work they would do and they were told their utterances would be recorded during these activities so as to ensure the ethical aspect of the study. Following the warm-up and informing session, which was just before the pair work, the teacher asked the students what a natural real-life dialogue

included. The students, through brainstorming, mentioned that a natural real-life dialogue would consist of question-answers, reaction to what was said by the other part, greetings, exclamations, astonishment, leave-taking expressions, acknowledgment, refusals, etc, all of which refer to the use of adjacency pairs and follow-up moves. All of these were written on the board by the teacher and she did not clean them during pair or group work activity. After this brainstorming, the teacher wanted the students to produce the dialogues in pair and group work activity as natural and real-life like as possible, taking what she wrote on the board into consideration.

When the grades of the students in this classroom were examined by the researcher, it was seen that the students got more or less similar grades, from which it can be concluded that the level of students was the same. Therefore, the teacher selected them randomly and formed the pairs. After this, there were 12 pairs of students, all of whom made 24 students. Then each pair sat at a desk to start working. The first recording began when students started producing their own dialogues in a topic they selected out of the four mostly selected speaking topics. The teacher led them take notes so that they would feel more relaxed in front of their friends. Then, the pairs gathered in groups of 6, which made 4 groups including 3 pairs of students. The teacher wanted the students to study on each other's dialogues and give feedback to each other in order to improve the dialogues in light of the questions "Does the dialogue sound natural? Is it like real-life dialogues?", which were mainly about the use of adjacency pairs and follow-up moves. Through asking these questions, the students started the cooperative group work. As all pairs had taken notes about their dialogues during the pair work, the groups did not have difficulty in remembering and going through the dialogues. The

notes on the board also seemed to help them a lot as the students were observed to look at the board frequently. All the groups included 3 pairs; therefore, they were observed to study on each other's dialogues in turns. They gave feedback to each other, made some changes in their dialogues and worked collaboratively on their dialogues in order to make them more natural and real-life like. The cooperative group work seemed to involve students more into the activity, with a well-defined aim in their minds, as they studied eagerly to improve each other's dialogues in a relaxed, enjoyable and friendly atmosphere. They were observed to be enjoying more compared to the pair work activity. The second recording consisted of the dialogues of students, with their pairs, performed after the cooperative group work activity. The observation finished here.

3.5. Data Analysis

This study is based on the analysis of the use of follow-up moves and adjacency pairs in students' spoken discourse and whether there is a difference in the use of these in students' dialogues performed after the pair and group work activity. Accordingly, adjacency pairs are usually in the form of question-answer but there are others such as greeting-greeting; congratulations-thanks; apology-acceptance; information-acknowledgement and leave taking-leave taking. Follow-up moves in conversations, according to Warren (2006), "are made with the expectation that the other participant(s) will not disagree, and that the effect will be to consolidate the mutual understanding between those involved". The example for this is as follows (Warren, 2006), where "right" can be seen as the follow-up move:

A: Shall I put the kettle on?

B: That'd be lovely.

A: Right.

Accordingly, recording the spoken discourse of students during pair and group work, the researcher analyzed the transcribed data through comparing the use of follow-up moves and adjacency pairs in the dialogues produced by students before and after the cooperative group work activities. The findings were written presenting both dialogues so that the difference could be seen clearly. As a result of this, the effect of cooperative group work interaction on the dialogues produced by students was studied by the researcher. During the data analysis process, the researcher tried to answer the following research questions:

1.   Do cooperative group works have any effect on the spoken discourse of students?

2. How does group work interaction affect students' use of follow-up moves and adjacency pairs?

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The findings of this study are based on the recordings of students' dialogues before and after cooperative group work. Therefore, the data were analyzed comparing the first and second recording of students' utterances with regard to the discourse analysis conventions of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975).

4.1. The Analysis of the Pairs' Dialogues

In this part, the first and second recording of students' dialogues are presented and analyzed with regard to the research questions. In the tables below, "answering" part refers to the use of adjacency pairs while "follow-up move" refers to the use of follow-up moves in the dialogues.

4.1.1. The Dialogues of the First Pair

This pair chose "Your Last Holiday" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

First Recording						
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
1	Z: Hello Uğur.		U: Hello Zeynep.			
2	Z: How are you?		U: Fine, and you?			
3			Z: I'm (…) I'm so tired.			

Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
4	U: Why?		Z: I came from holiday. It was (.) wonderful.			
5	U: Where did go?					
6	L: We can't hear.					
7	T: Ş::::t! (to class) Uğur, repeat your question.					
8	U: Where did you go?		Z: I went (…) I went to Çanakkale. I visit Asos, Behramkale and Küçükkuyu.		U: Oooh!	
9			Z: I swam and ate food. I, ı:::h, (..) slept.			
10	U: Who (.) you go with?		Z: (…)			
11	T: Yes, who did you =		Z: I went with friends.			
12	U: Was it good?		Z: Yes, good!			
13	T: Good, thank you!					

Second Recording						
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act

1	Z: Hello.		U: Hello Zeynep.		
2	Z: How are you?		U: Fine, thanks. And you?		
3			Z: I'm tired.		
4	U: Why?		Z: I came from holiday.	U: Really?	
5	Z: Yes. I went to Çanakkale to visit Asos, Behramkale and Küçükkuyu.			U: Oooh!	
6	U: Where did =		T: Where? Or what?		
7	U: What (..) What did you do?		Z: We swam, ate fish and saw good place.	U: Nice nice!	
8	Z: ((smiling)) Did you go to Çanakkale?		U: No, I didn't. I want =	Z: Really?	
9	U: Sleep now. You (…) ı:::h (..) are tired.		Z: Yes, I want to sleep. See you!		
10			U: See you!		
11	T: [Thanks a lot] thanks!				

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used only one follow-up move. It is seen in line 8 and U used it to express a feeling of amazement. Although there seem to be other suitable expressions after which follow-up moves can be used, the pair

preferred using only one follow-up move. As for the use of adjacency pairs, it is seen that the pair gave suitable answers to each other's questions and greetings. Moreover, in order to maintain classroom order, T interrupted the pair in line 7 after a student from the class mentioned they couldn't hear well. When the pair hesitated to continue the dialogue in line 10, T tried to help them tell the right use of Simple Past Tense, which seemed to help Z give an answer to U's question. The first dialogue finished suddenly as the pair did not use any leave-taking expressions.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used four follow-up moves, which can be interpreted as a great improvement. The follow-up moves seen in lines 4, 5, 7 and 8 are all to express amazement and liking and three of them were used by U. It may be because Z talked about her last holiday and U was mainly the one who asked questions and reacted to the answers. The use of adjacency pairs is good as in the first transcription but in the second one, the pair also used leave-taking expression in lines 9 and 10. T tried to help U in line 6 which made the dialogue continue.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work had a positive effect on the frequency of follow-up moves as the number increased from one to four, making the dialogue sound more natural and real-life like. Although there is no change in the use of adjacency pairs, the pair added a leave-taking expression in the second dialogue, making the dialogue finish in a more natural way.

4.1.2. The Dialogues of the Second Pair

This pair chose "The Best Day of Your Life" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

	First Recording					
Line	**Opening**	**Act**	**Answering**	**Act**	**Follow-up Move**	**Act**
1	S: Good morning Ali.		A: Good morning.			
2	S: Yesterday was the best day in my life.		A: Why? (…) What did happen? Ay söyleyemedim.			
3	T: What happened?		S: I saw Murat Boz. He's my favorite pop star.		A: Oh, nice!	
4	S: I:::h, he accepted talk to me and we (.) drank a cup of =					
5	T: Tea?		S: Tea.			
6	A: Where did you see him?		S: I saw him on the concert hall.		T: I saw him at the =	
7			S: I saw him =. I saw him at the (..) concert hall.			
8	A: Did he like you?		S: Yes, he liked me.			
9	A: Did you (..) I:::h, did you get his phone		S: Yes, I did!		A: Really?	

	number?				
10	S: I can't give it. Don't beg!		A: I'm not (…) begging.		
11	S: Tell about the best day of your life.		A: It was last August. I (.) passed the university entrance exam.		
12	T: [Ş::::t!] (to class)				
13	S: How did you feel?		A: I felt so happy!		
14	S: Hah, did your parents feel happy?		A: Yes, they were so so so so happy.	S: Good!	
15	T: Thanks.				

Second Recording					
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
1	S: Good morning.		A: Good morning. You are happy. What's (.) matter?		
2			S: Yesterday was the best day of my (…) my life.		A: Really?
3	S: Yes, I saw Murat Boz at the concert hall. I:::h, he was very handsome!				A: Oh, nice!

4	S: I wanted to talk him. He accepted it. (…) It was wonderful!		A: Where did you talk?		
5	T: A bit slowly, please.				
6	A: Okay. Where did you talk?		S: We talked at the backstage. There were musicians.		A: O::::::h! How nice!
7	A: What did you talk?		S: We talked about (.) music. Pop is my favorite music.		
8	A: Did he like you?		S: Yes, (…) he liked me. He gave me flowers.		A: Really? I can't believe!
9	A: Did you (..) get his phone number?		S: Yes, I got! I can't give it to you. Are you (.) begging?		
10			A: I'm not! (angrily)		
11	S: What is the best day of your life?		A: It was last August. I passed the university exam.		S: Oh!
12	S: How did you feel?		A: I felt happy		

		because I (.) won the medicine faculty!			
13	S: Were your parents happy?	A: Yes, they were!		S: Good.	
14	S: We finished.	T: O::h, okay! Thank you.			

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used three follow-up moves, which can be considered as a good start. The follow-up moves are in lines 3, 9 and 14. Two of the follow-up moves were used by A while one was used by S. S was the one who talked about the best day of her life, while A was the one who questioned and listened to S's utterances; however, S also asked A the best day of his life. This made S use a follow-up move in reaction to A's utterances. As for the use of adjacency pairs, it is seen that the pair gave suitable answers to each other's questions and greetings. T is seen correcting S in line 6 and S corrected his mistake in line 7. In line 12, T tried to silence the class to create a peaceful atmosphere, which seemed to work as the class was much more quiet and attentive to the performance.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used six follow-up moves, which is a great improvement and contribution to the natural flow of the dialogue. The follow-up moves are seen in lines 2, 3, 6, 8, 12 and 15, and they are to express amazement and liking. In the second transcription, the number of follow-up moves used by S is two, while the number used by A is four. The use of adjacency pairs is good again as the pair tried to answer each other's greeting and questions. The pair used no

leave-taking expression in the second dialogue as in the first one. In the second dialogue, the pair seemed a bit more anxious and so they spoke quickly. Therefore, T warned them to slow down in line 5. This made the dialogue more understandable and sound natural.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work had a positive effect on the frequency of follow-up moves as the number increased from three to six, thus making the dialogue sound more natural and real-life like. However, there is no change in the use of adjacency pairs in both dialogues.

4.1.3. The Dialogues of the Third Pair

This pair chose "Your Last Birthday" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

First Recording						
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
1	H: Jale, it is my birthday today!		J: Happy birthday Halil!			
2	J: What's your plans today?		H: I'm (…) I'm meeting my friends at (.) restaurant.			
3	J: I can't forget my last birthday.				H: Really?	
4	H: Why? What did you do?		J: My parents forget my holiday (…) I			

Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
			thought. I:::h, they didn't.			
5	H: What happened?		J: They bought a motorbike. It is very good!			
6	H: Did you have license?		J: I hadn't got.			
7	T: Ş:::t! (to class) No, I didn't.		J: No, I didn't.		H: O:::h!	
8	H: What did you do?		J: I gave it to my big brother but it's mine.			
9	T: Ş::::t! (to class)					
10			J: It's (.) mine.			
11	H: I want a car but it's very expensive.		J: You must = I:::::h (…)			
12	H: Hadi.		J: You must save.			
13	T: You must save money.		J: You must save money.			
14	H: I must go. Good bye.		J: Good bye.			

Second Recording						
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
1	H: Jale, it's my		J: Happy birthday			

	birthday today!		Halil!		51
2	J: What your plans (.) are today?		H: I meet my friends at a restaurant.		J: Nice!
3	J: I:::h, I can't forget my last birthday.		H: Why? (…) Was it funny?		
4			J: Yes, it was. My parents - bought me:: a motorbike.		H: Oh, God!
5	H: Did you have (..) motor license?		J: No.		
6	H: What did you do?		J: I:::::, I lent it to my brother but it's mine.		H: Good idea!
7	H: I have license (..) but I don't have car.		J: Save money.		
8	H: I don't have money.				J: What a pity!
9	H: I want to have part-time job.		J: Work at McDonalds.		
10	H: I must go now. Good bye.		J: Good bye.		
11	T: OK. Good. Sit down.				

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used two follow-up moves and both were to express amazement. The follow-up moves are in lines 3 and 7, both used by H in reaction to J's utterances. In the first transcription, the pair was a bit nervous and the class was noisy. The pair's anxiety might have led the class to disorder. Therefore, T tried to maintain classroom order in lines 7 and 9. Moreover, T tried to help J in line 13. The pair's anxiety can be seen in lines 11, 12 and 13; yet, T's help seems to help them relax. As for the use of adjacency pairs, it is seen that the pair gave suitable answers to each other's questions and leave-takings.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used four follow-up moves as a good improvement and this seems to make the dialogue more natural. The follow-up moves are seen in lines 2, 4, 6 and 8, which are to express amazement, liking and pity. There is no interruption by T in the second dialogue as the class was much more attentive and the pair was much more relaxed and self confident. The adequate question-answering and leave-taking – leave-taking expressions shows the correct use of adjacency pairs.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work had a positive effect on the frequency of follow-up moves as the number increased from two to four, thus making the dialogue sound more natural and real-life like. The use of adjacency pairs was good in both dialogues and there is no change in the use of adjacency pairs.

4.1.4. The Dialogues of the Fourth Pair

This pair chose "The Worst Day of Your Life" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

First Recording						
Line	**Opening**	**Act**	**Answering**	**Act**	**Follow-up Move**	**Act**
1	B: It's the worst day of my life!		F: What happened?			
2	B: I got a bad mark in (.) English exam.		F: Did you (.) study for it?			
3			B: Yes, ı::::h, but I failed the exam.			
4	F: Why?					
5			B: Because I was ill.			
6			F: Get well soon.			
7	B: I told teacher, she (…) she didn't (.) believe.				F: What a pity!	
8	B: I am very unhappy!		F: Don't! You (…), you get high marks next exam.			
9	B: Thank you.		F: (…)			
10	B: Take care. See you.		F: Take care. See you.			

	Second Recording					
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
1	B: Oh, it's the worst day of my life!		F: What happened?			
2			B: I got bad mark in (.) English exam.		F: What a pity!	
3	F: Did you study?		B: Of course. But I:::: didn't understand (…) some subject.			
4	F: Why didn't you (..) ask me?		B: I don't know.			
5	B: I was ill also.		F: I:::h, get well soon.			
6	B: And I'm – I told the teacher but she didn't believe.					
7	T: Ş:::t! (to class)					
8	B: I'm very unhappy!		F: Don't worry, you, ı::h, you can get high (.) mark next time.		B: Yeah!	
9	B: Thank you (.) Fatih.		F: You're welcome.			
10	B: Take care. See you.		F: See you. Take care.			

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used just one follow-up move to express pity. The follow-up move is seen in line 5 and it is used by F. This pair can be thought to have produced a shorter dialogue in comparison with other pairs. There is no interruption by T as the dialogue was relatively fluent and the class was silent. As for the use of adjacency pairs, there is no use of greeting-greeting by the pairs in the beginning of the dialogue but the pair gave answers to each other's questions. In line 9, F did not answer B's thanking and there was a short silence. In line 10, it is seen that B and F answered each other's leave-taking expressions.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used just two follow-up moves. The follow-up moves are seen in lines 2 and 8, which are to express pity and approval. The moves were used by F and B. It is interesting to note that F did not use the follow-up move he used in the first transcription in reaction to B's same sentence in line 6. Different from the first transcription, T tried to silence the class in line 7, as the class seemed distracted. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's questions and unlike the first dialogue, F answered B's thanking in line 9 as well as answering B's leave-taking.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work did not have much effect on the pair's use of follow-up moves. The pair gave answers to each other's questions in both dialogues but there was an improvement in the use of adjacency pairs as they answered each other's thanking in the second transcription, which helped the dialogue sound more natural and real-life like.

4.1.5. The Dialogues of the Fifth Pair

This pair chose "Your Last Holiday" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

First Recording						
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
1	E: Hi.		B: (…)			
2	E: I:::h, how are you?		B: Fine. (…) You?			
3			E: Fine, thanks. I think my last holiday.			
4	B: How it was?		E: Great! I was in Kaş.		B: Really?	
5	B: Who did you (.) with?		E: I::: was with parents. Kaş is great.			
6	B: I didn't go to:: it. Is it large?		E: No. Small.			
7	B: What did you do?		E: I swam, ate meals. I (…), ı:::h, I:: went to bazaar.			
8	B: What (.) did (.) buy?		E: I bought mug, magnet.			
9	E: Where did you go		B: I was in Ankara.		E: O:::h!	

Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
	last holiday?					57
10	E: What did you do in Ankara?		B: I went to museum. I (…) meet with friends. I =			
11	T: I = ?		B: uyumak			
12	T: Sleep. I slept.		B: I slept.			
13	E: I like holidays.		B: Me too.			
14	E: Okay. I go now. Bye.		B: Okay. Bye.			

Second Recording						
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
1	E: Hi.		B: Hi.			
2	E: How are you?		B: Fine, thanks. And you?			
3			E: Fine, thanks. Thank you.			
4	E: (…) I::: doing homework for last holiday.		B: I hate (.) homeworks. How was, ı:::h, how your last holiday?			
4	E: Great. I went to Kaş.				B: Really?	
5	B: Who (.) you go		E: I went with			

	with?		parents. We (.) stayed in hotel. It is great!		
6	B: I didn't go. Is it (…) large?		E: No:::.		
7	B: What you did in Kaş?		E: I swam, ate fish, (…) danced at disco. I::: went to (.) bazaar.	B: Really?	
8			E: Yeah!		
9	B: ((smiling)) Did you buy something?		E: Yes, of course.		
10	B: What?		E: Mugs and magnets.	E: Good!	
11	E: Where did (.) you go (…) last holiday?		B: I didn't go (.) holiday. I:::h, I was in Ankara.		
12	E: What did you do in Ankara?		B: I met with friends. I (.) museum (…) I went museum.		
13	E: Did you, ı:::h, (.) swim?		B: No. There (…) isn't sea in Ankara.	E: What a pity!	
14	E: Burcu, I must go now! Bye.		B: Bye.		
15	T: Thank you! Good!				

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used two follow-up moves to express liking and pity. The follow-up moves can be seen in lines 4 and 9, one used by B and one by E. The short use of follow-up moves made the first dialogue relatively monotonous as the dialogue continued in a question-answer fashion. When B could not complete the sentence in line 10, T interrupted the dialogue. In line 11, it is seen that B asked for the English translation of "uyumak" and T helped B in line 12. As for the use of adjacency pairs, it is seen that B did not answer E's greeting in line 1. In other lines, questions were answered by the pair and in line 14, it is seen that B and E answered each other's leave-taking.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used four follow-up moves. The follow-up moves are seen in lines 4, 7, 10 and 13, which are to express liking, pity and amazement. The moves were used by E and B, two used by E and two by B. In the second transcription, T was not involved in the dialogue as the pair did not ask for help. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's questions and leave-taking expression and unlike the first dialogue, B answered E's thanking in line 1.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work was really helpful in the frequency of follow-up moves, thus making the dialogue sound more natural and real-life like. The use of adjacency pairs was good in both dialogues but there was an improvement in the use of adjacency pairs as they answered each other's greeting in the second transcription.

4.1.6. The Dialogues of the Sixth Pair

This pair chose "Your Last Birthday" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
	First Recording					
1	V: Good morning.		H: Good morning.			
2	V: How are you?		H: Fine, thanks. (.) And you?			
3			V: Fine.			
4	H: How was your =		V: (…)			
5	H: How was your, ı:::h, last birthday?		V: It was bad.			
6	H: Why?		V: Because I::: separated my girlfriend.		H: O:::h!	
7	H: What (.) happened?		V: We fighted (…) and she shouted.			
8	H: Did she =		V: I:::h, (…)			
9	H: Did she buy present?		V: Yes. She (.) bought a (.) shirt. I don't (.) like it. We fight::ed.			
10	T: We fought.		V: We fought.		H: O:::h!	
11	T: Ş::::t! (to class)					

| 12 | V: I:::h, I hate birthdays. Do you like? | | H: Yes, I like. (…) I make birthday party every year. | | | |
| 13 | V: OK. See you. | | H: OK. | | | |

Second Recording						
Line	**Opening**	**Act**	**Answering**	**Act**	**Follow-up Move**	**Act**
1	V: Good morning.		H: Good morning.			
2	V: How are you?		H: Fine, thanks. And you?			
3			V: Fine.			
4	H: How was (.) your last birthday?		V: (…) Unfortunately, it was bad.		H: Really?	
5	H: Why?		V: Because I separated wit::h my girlfriend.		H: O:::h!	
6	H: Why? What happened?		V: We fought. (…) She shouted and, ı:::h, and (.) I cried.			
7	H: Did she buy present?		V: Yes. She (.) bought a shirt. I (.) didn't like it. And we fought.			
8	V: I::: hate birthdays.		H: Yes. I make			

	Do you like them?		birthday (…) make party every year.			
9	V: OK. See you.		H: See you.			

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used two follow-up moves to express pity. The follow-up moves can be seen in lines 6 and 10, both used by H. This pair was a bit nervous during the dialogue so there was some hesitance. When V made the same mistake in the Simple Past form of the verb "fight" in lines 7 and 9, T interrupted the dialogue and corrected this mistake in line 10. The anxiety of this pair caused disorder in the class; therefore, T tried to silence them in line 11. To make the dialogue more fluent, there could have been more follow-up moves; however, the pair used just two. As for the use of adjacency pairs, although the pair tried to answer each other's questions and greetings, it is seen that H did not answer V's leave-taking in line 13.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used two follow-up moves, the same number used in the first dialogue. The follow-up moves are seen in lines 4 and 5, which are to express pity and astonishment. The moves were used by H, as in the first transcription. More follow-up moves could have made the dialogue better and more natural; however, the pair used just two follow-up moves as in the first dialogue. In the second transcription, T was not involved in the dialogue. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's questions and unlike the first transcription, V answered H's leave-taking expression in line 9.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work did not increase the number of follow-up moves. The use of adjacency pairs was good in both dialogues but there was an improvement in the use of adjacency pairs after the cooperative group work as V answered H's leave-taking in the second transcription, making the dialogue sound more natural and real-life like.

4.1.7. The Dialogues of the Seventh Pair

This pair chose "The Best Day of Your Life" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

	First Recording					
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
1	C: Hello.		D: Hello. How are you:::?			
2			C: Fine, you?			
3			D: Fine.			
4	C: You are happy.		D: Yes.			
5	C: Why?		D: It's the best day of life.			
6	C: Why? What (…) happened?		D: I became (.) darling with Eda.			
7	C: How did happened?		D: We went dinner yesterday. I:::h, I:::, I asked her. She said yes.		C: Nice!	

63

8	C: Where did you (.) go?		D: We were at cinema. We =			
9	T: We =		D: We watched love film.			
10	C: I like (.) watch love films (…) too. Favorite film is Titanic.		D: I like Titanic, too.			
11	C: Were, (…) was Eda happy yesterday?		D: Yes, happy. She cried.			
12	C: But why?		D: Because (.) she was very very happy.		C: Oh!	
13	C: Mom is calling. I go. Bye.		D: Bye.			

Second Recording						
Line	**Opening**	**Act**	**Answering**	**Act**	**Follow-up Move**	**Act**
1	C: Hello.		D: Hello Ceren. How are you:::?			
2			C: Fine. And you?			
3			D: Fine.			
4	C: You are (.) happy.		D: Yes.		C: O:::h!	
5	C: Why?		D: Because, because (.) it's the			

			best day of my life.		65
6	C: Why? What (…) happen?		D: Eda is girlfriend now!		C: Really?	
7	C: How did it happen?		D: I:::h, we (…) went to dinner yesterday and I:: asked her. She (.) said yes.		C: Nice!	
8	C: Where did (.) you go?		D: We::: went to Ankamall Cinema. We watch (…) a love film.			
9	C: I like love films. Titanic, ı:::h, Titanic is (.) my favorite film.		D: I like Titanic, too.			
10	C: I think Eda (…) was happy. Was she happy?		D: Yes. She cried.			
11	C: Why?		D: (…)			
12	C: Why?		D: Because she was very very happy.		C: O:::::h!	
13	C: She's very good. You are lucky.		D: Thank you.			
14	C: Mom calling. I (.) must go. Goodbye.		D: Bye.			

15	T: Thanks.					

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used two follow-up moves to express liking. The follow-up moves can be seen in lines 7 and 12, both of which were used by C. As D could not complete the sentence in line 8, T helped her complete the sentence in line 9, without telling the right answer. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's questions, greetings and leave-taking expressions, so there was not a problem in the flow of the dialogue with regard to the use of adjacency pairs.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used four follow-up moves, which can be considered a great improvement compared with the first dialogue. The follow-up moves are seen in lines 4, 6, 7 and 12, which are to express amazement and liking. All of the follow-up moves were used by C, as in the first transcription and this might be because D talked about the best day of his life and C was the one asking questions and reacting to D's utterances. In the second transcription, T was not involved in the dialogue. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's questions, greetings and leave-taking expressions as in the first dialogue, so there was not a problem in the flow of the dialogue.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work had a positive effect on the frequency of the follow-up moves, making the dialogue sound more natural and real-life like. The use of adjacency pairs was good in both dialogues and there was not an unanswered utterance; therefore, the cooperative group work did not have any effect on the use of them.

4.1.8. The Dialogues of the Eighth Pair

This pair chose "The Worst Day of Your Life" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

	First Recording					
Line	**Opening**	**Act**	**Answering**	**Act**	**Follow-up Move**	**Act**
1	A: Hello! What happened? You are (.) bad.		D: Oh, it's a bad day.			
2	A: What happened?		D: I had an interview. But =			
3	A: I:::h, (…) yes?		D: But I failed.			
4	A: Why?		D: I woke up late. I:::, I missed the bus. (…) It was so bad.			
5	A: What you did?		D: I ran (.) but the bus escaped.		A: O:::h!	
6	T: Ş::::t! (to class)					
7	A: And?		D: I::::h, I fell down. My trousers (.) become dirty.		A: Oh, God!	
8	D: Also I wore different shoes. (…) I saw (.) there.		A: Two different shoes? You are unlucky.			

9	D: I was, ɪ:::h, late to interview. And (.) I failed.		A: I:::h, don't worry. You can find good job.		D: O::h! Yeah!	
10	D: Anyway. I go now.		A: Why?			
11	D: It's dinner time. Take care. Bye.		A: Take care. Bye.			

Second Recording						
Line	**Opening**	**Act**	**Answering**	**Act**	**Follow-up Move**	**Act**
1	A: Hello! What happened? (…) You are bad?		D: Yes. It's bad day.		A: Really?	
2	A: What happened?		D: I had (.) interview. But I failed.			
3	A: Why?		D: I:::h, I woke up late. I:::: missed the bus. It was (.) very bad.		A: What a pity!	
4	A: What did you do?		D: I ran but (.), ɪ:::h, the bus went.		A: O::::h!	
5	A: Then what happened?		D: I fell down. (…) My trousers become dirty. (…)		A: Oh, God!	

		There was mud on face.			
6	D: And I wore different shoes.	A: You are (.) unlucky man!			
7	D: Also::: I was late (…) so::: (.) I failed.	A: Don't worry. You, you (.) can find good job.	D: Oh! Yeah::!		
8	D: OK. I must go now.	A: Why?			
9	D: It's dinner time. Bye!	A: Take care. Bye.			
10	T: OK. Thanks.				

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used three follow-up moves to express pity and approval. The follow-up moves can be seen in lines 5, 7 and 9, two used by A and one used by D. This pair can be called successful in using follow-up moves looking at the number of moves and this made the dialogue sound natural and fluent even after the pair work. Despite the fluency of the dialogue, the class was a bit noisy; therefore, T tried to silence them in line 6. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's questions and leave-taking expressions; however, D did not answer A's greeting in line 1.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used five follow-up moves, which can be considered a good improvement although the first dialogue was also good in terms of the frequency of follow-up moves. The follow-up moves are seen in lines 1,

3, 4, 5 and 7, which are to express astonishment, pity and approval. Four of the follow-up moves were used by A and one was used by D. In the second transcription, T was not involved in the dialogue and did not have to silence the class as the class was silent and attentive to the performance. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's questions and leave-taking expressions; however, as in the first dialogue, D did not answer A's greeting in line 1.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work had a positive effect on the frequency of the follow-up moves, as the number of them increased from three to five and this made the dialogue sound more natural and real-life like. However, it did not have an effect on the use of adjacency pairs as the pair answered each other's questions and leave-taking in both dialogues but not the greeting in line 1.

4.1.9. The Dialogues of the Ninth Pair

This pair chose "The Worst Day of Your Life" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

First Recording						
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
1	H: Tell me. What is worst day (.) of your life?		Ş: Yes. I:::h, last year. I don't forget.			
2	H: What happened? (…) Tell me.		Ş: I was (.) lost in Italy.		H: Really?	

3	H: How?		Ş: We went with (…) my friend. We got off (.) bus in:: wrong station.		
4	H: What did you do?		Ş: We don't know Italian. We didn't, ı:::h, (.) knew English. We (…) wanted to:: the police.		
5	H: Could you find it?		Ş: Yes, yes. But (…) we don't know Italian. We, we (.) drew a picture. The place we went.	H: Nice!	
6	H: Did they (…), ı:::h, (…) understood?				
7	T: Understand. Did they understand?		H: Yes. Did they understand?		
8			Ş: Yes. They sent us.	H: Good!	
9	H: It wasn't a bad day. You:: lucky.		Ş: No, bad. We were (.) afraid (.) very much.		
10	H: Hmm:::: OK. You are right.		Ş: Yes.		

| 11 | H: See you. | | Ş: See you. | | | |

Second Recording						
Line	**Opening**	**Act**	**Answering**	**Act**	**Follow-up Move**	**Act**
1	H: Hi Şebnem. Can you tell (…) worst day of your life?		Ş: Hi:::! Yes. It is (.) last year. I (.) I can't forget.			
2	H: Why? (.) What happened?		Ş: I was lost in Italy.		H: Really?	
3	H: Which city?		Ş: Rome.			
4	H: How?		Ş: We went there with (.) friend. But (…) we don't know Italy. We:::, we got (.) the bus in wrong station.		H: O::h!	
5	H: What did you do?		Ş: We don't know Italian. I:::h, we (.) don't know English. We went to police.			
6	H: You (..) speak with police? Italian?		Ş: No, no, no::::. We drew a picture. They (.) understood (.) the place.		H: Nice!	

7	H: Did they understand?		Ş: Yes, they did. They sent us (…) to place.		H: Good!	
8	H: It wasn't a bad day. I:: think. I:::h, you lucky.		Ş: It was bad. We= Because= We were very afraid.			
9	H: Yes. Right.		Ş: Yes.			
10	H: See you.		Ş: See you.			

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used three follow-up moves to express liking and astonishment. The follow-up moves can be seen in lines 2, 5 and 8, all of which were used by H. This pair can be called successful in using follow-up moves looking at the number of moves and this made the dialogue sound natural. T had to interrupt the dialogue in line 7, as H had great difficulty in making a Simple Past Tense question using the right form of "understand" although T tried not to interrupt the dialogues with regard to the use of verb forms. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's questions and leave-taking expressions; however, they did not use a greeting and made a sudden start to the dialogue, which made it sound artificial.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used four follow-up moves, which can be considered good but not a big improvement compared to the first dialogue. The follow-up moves are seen in lines 2, 4, 6 and 7, which are to express astonishment, liking and pity. All of the follow-up moves were used by H, which was due to the fact that Ş talked about the worst day of her life and H was the one who

listened and reacted to Ş's utterances. In the second transcription, T was not involved in the dialogue and did not have to silence the class as the class was attentive to the performance and the pair did not have a serious difficulty. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's greetings, questions and leave-taking expressions; and additionally, it must be noted that the pair greeted each other in the second dialogue, which might be considered an improvement after the cooperative group work.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work had a positive effect on the frequency of the follow-up moves, as the number of them increased from three to four adding to the naturalness of the dialogue. Furthermore, the use of adjacency pairs was similar except for the addition of greeting at the beginning of the second dialogue and this can be accepted as an improvement for this pair.

4.1.10. The Dialogues of the Tenth Pair

This pair chose "Your Last Holiday" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

First Recording						
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
1	B: Good evening.		D: Good evening.			
2	B: My holiday ended. It was, it was (…) very nice.					
3	D: Ho::w (.) it was?		B: Very good.			

4	D: What did you do?		B: I went to Marmaris.		75
5	D: I:::h, where (.) did stay?		B: In a tent.		D: Very good!
6	D: But (.) why tent? Hotel is also good.		B: Yes. I love nature. (…) It is nice.		
7	D: Is it cheap?		B: It is cheap. I stayed (.) in tent. I swam (.) in sea.		
8	D: Was there =		B: I:::h, (…) yes?		
9	D: Was there (.) swimming pool?		B: No:::::::.		D: O::::::h, bad!
10	B: But the sea (…) was beautiful.		D: I see.		
11	D: Thank you for this information. I can (.) stay in tent, too.		B: OK. I:::h, you don't regret.		
12			D: I think so!		
13	D: Good bye.		B. Good bye.		

Second Recording					
Line	**Opening**	**Act**	**Answering**	**Act**	**Follow-up Move**	**Act**
1	B: Good evening.		D: Hi. Good evening.		

2	D: Hey, you are (.) unhappy. What's the matter?		B: My holiday ended. It was (.) great!		D: O::h, bad!
3	D: Summer holiday?		B: Yes.		
4	D: I:::h, unuttum.		B: (…)		
5	T: OK. Calm down. No problem. (B whispers the answer)				
6	D: Ho:::w (.) was it?		B: It was nice.		
7	D: What did you do?		B: I went to Marmaris.		
8	D: Where did stay?		B: I, ı:::h, stay in a tent.		D: Very good!
9	D: But (…) why you stayed in a tent? Hotel is good also.		B: Yes but nature I love. (…) Nature is good.		
10	D: Was it cheap?		B: You swim in sea and no money (.) of course.		
11	D: Was there a swimming pool?		B: No.		D: Oh, bad!
12	B: The sea was beautiful.		D: I understand.		
13	D: Thank you (.) very much. I too can stay in a tent.				B: Good!

14	D: Good bye.	B. Good bye.			

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used two follow-up moves to express liking and pity. The follow-up moves can be seen in lines 5 and 9, and they were used by D. Although this pair had difficulty in continuing the dialogue in some parts, T was not involved in the dialogue as the pair could deal with these difficulties on their own. Owing to the limited use of follow-up moves and question-answer fashion of the first dialogue, it sounded a bit unnatural. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's greeting, questions and leave-taking expressions.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used four follow-up moves, which can be considered a good improvement as the frequency of follow-up moves increased from two to four. The follow-up moves are seen in lines 2, 8, 11 and 13, which are to express liking and pity. Three of the follow-up moves were used by D while one was used by B. Different from the first transcription, B answered D's desire to stay in a tent using a follow-up move in the second transcription. The pair was nervous; therefore, T tried to calm them down in line 5 when D forgot what to say in line 4. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's greetings, questions and leave-taking expressions, which showed that there was not a problem in the flow of the dialogue in terms of the use of adjacency pairs.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work had a good effect on the frequency of the follow-up moves, making the dialogue sound more natural and real-life like. However, the use of adjacency pairs was the same in both

transcriptions, from which it can be interpreted that the cooperative group work did not have a positive or negative effect on the use of adjacency pairs.

4.1.11. The Dialogues of the Eleventh Pair

This pair chose "Your Last Holiday" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
			First Recording			
1	Y: Hello. How are you?		E: Hello. Fine, thanks and you?			
2			Y: Fine. Thank you.			
3	Y: How was your last holiday?		E: It was bad.			
4	T: Slowly, please. We can't follow you. Calm down.		Y: OK.			
5	Y: How was your last holiday?		E: It was bad.			
6	Y: Why?		E: It is a lo:::::ng story.			
7	Y: Tell me.		E: We had, we had (.) free five days. We went to:: (.)			

78

Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act
			Bodrum. I:::h, in beginning it was good. Then (…) rain started.			
8	Y: What did you do?		E: We waited. It didn't (.) stop. So we went Kemer. The::: weather became bad (.) in there.			
9	Y: Was it (.) in beginning (.) good?		E: Yes, it was. We was unlucky!			
10	Y: Did you = I:::h, did you =		E: Swim, yüzmek.			
11	Y: Hah, did you swim?		E: No. Water was cold. Because (.) weather is cold (…) was cold.		Y: What a pity!	
12	Y: I:::h, it was horrible (.) holiday!		E: Yes. I think so.			
13	Y: OK. See you.		E: See you Yasin.			
14	Y: Bye.		E: Bye.			

Second Recording						
Line	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up Move	Act

1	Y: Hello.		E: Hello.		
2	Y: How are you?		E: Fine, thanks and you?		
3			Y: Fine. Thank you.		
4	Y: You:: (…) came (.) from holiday. Yes?		E: Yes. True.		
5	Y: How was it?		E: It was very bad.	Y: O::h!	
6	Y: Why?		E: It is (.) a long story. Have you (.) time?		
7	Y: Of course. Tell me.		E: We had free five days. We wanted (.) go holiday.		
8	Y: Where did you go?		E: We went to Bodrum. Weather was (…) very good. Then, ı:::h, then (.) rain started.	Y: Oh!	
9	Y: What did you do?		E: We waited (.) but it didn't stopped. So::: we went to Kemer.		
10	Y: How was the weather?		E: It was sunny (…) in beginning. But (.) it rained.		
11	Y: Did you swim?		E: No:::. Water was	Y: What a pity!	

	((sadly))		cold. Because (.) weather cold.		
12	Y: It was horrible!		E: I think so. We were unlucky.		
13	Y: Yes. I must go. I::h, see you.		E: See you.		
14	Y: Bye.		E: Bye.		

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used just one follow-up move to express pity. The follow-up move can be seen in line 9. This pair started the dialogue in a hurry and uttered the first lines so rapidly that T had to warn them to slow down and calm down in line 4. Although the pair tried to slow down afterwards, they were still quick in some parts and this might have caused them to get confused in producing some parts of the dialogue. In line 10, it is seen that E helped Y find the English word for "yüzmek". Because of the use of only one follow-up move and question-answer fashion of the first dialogue, it sounded a bit unnatural. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's greeting, questions and leave-taking expressions in the first transcription.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used three follow-up moves, which can be considered a good improvement as the frequency of follow-up moves increased from one to three. The follow-up moves are seen in lines 5, 8 and 11, which are to express astonishment and pity. Y's follow-up move in line 5 was pertinent in contributing to the dialogue in terms of naturalness. Compared to the first dialogue, the pair was more relaxed after the cooperative group work; therefore, T did not have to

warn them to slow down as she did in the first dialogue. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's greetings, questions and leave-taking expressions, which showed that there was not a problem in the flow of the second dialogue in terms of the use of adjacency pairs like the first dialogue.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work had a good effect on the frequency of the follow-up moves as the number increased from one to three, which made the dialogue sound more natural and real-life like. However, the use of adjacency pairs was the same in both transcriptions, from which it can be interpreted that the cooperative group work did not have a positive or negative effect on the use of adjacency pairs.

4.1.12. The Dialogues of the Twelfth Pair

This pair chose "Your Last Birthday" as a speaking topic and produced a dialogue in this topic.

First Recording						
Line	**Opening**	**Act**	**Answering**	**Act**	**Follow-up Move**	**Act**
1	D: I like birthday. Do you (.) like?		R: Yes. I give party (.) every birthday.		D: Really?	
2	D: How was, ı:::h, how was (.) last party?		R: Great!			
3	D: Let's speak.		R: OK. Party was			

		in our garden. We danced (…) and we ate (.) cake.			
4	D: How many (.) people?	R: 30.			
5	D: You::: got many presents?	R: Yes. Shirts, books, CDs, a ticket.			
6	D: Ticket? What is it? I:::h, hah okay.	R: (…)			
7	D: Yes? (…) What is it?	R: I:::h, theater ticket.			
8	D: Do you like theater?	R: Yes, I do.	D: Oh!		
9	D: Who did buy it?	R: Girlfriend.			
10	L: Who bought =				
11	T: Ş:::t! (to class) Go on, please.				
12	D: Did you:: (…) go there?	R. Yes. We went. It was very good play.			
13	D: You had great birthday.	R: Yes. Last birthday (…) it was was great.			
14	D: OK. See you tomorrow. Bye.	R: See you. Bye.			

Second Recording						
Line	**Opening**	**Act**	**Answering**	**Act**	**Follow-up Move**	**Act**
1	D: I like birthdays. (…) Do you like?		R: Yes. I give party every birthday.		D: Really?	
2	D: How wa::s (.) your last party?		R: Great!			
3	D: Let's speak about it.		R: OK. The party was in our garden. We danced (…) we ate cake.			
4	D: How many people?		R: 30 people.			
5	D: Did you, ı:::h, you got presents?		R: Yes. CDs, shirts, books, and ı:::h ticket.			
6	D: Ticket? What?		R: Theater.			
7	D: Hmm… Do you like theater?		R: Yes, (…) I do.		D: Oh!	
8	D: Who:: bought?		R: My girlfriend.			
9	D: Did you watch?		R. Yes. Yes. It wa::s (..), ı::h, good play.			
10	D: Your birthday, it was great.		R: Yes, great!			
11	D: OK. See you tomorrow. Bye.		R: See you. Bye.			

In the first transcription of this pair, the students used two follow-up moves to express amazement. The follow-up moves can be seen in lines 1 and 8, both used by D, which might be because R was the one, who talked about her last birthday while D was the one, who listened to her utterances and reacted to them. This pair started the dialogue in a different way as they did not greet each other and made a sudden start saying they liked birthdays. This made the dialogue sound a bit unnatural and artificial. In line 10, one of the students in the class got involved in the dialogue and corrected a mistake, maybe because of the frequent hesitation of the pair, after which T tried to silence the class in line 11. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's questions and leave-taking expressions in the first transcription.

In the second transcription of this pair, the students used two follow-up moves, which is the same number and the same follow-up moves used in the first dialogue. The follow-up moves are seen in lines 1 and 7, which are to express amazement. The pair started the dialogue in the same way as in the first one, which can be interpreted as a sudden start again. Different from the first dialogue, T was not involved in the second dialogue. As for the use of adjacency pairs, the pair answered each other's questions and leave-taking expressions, which showed that there was not a problem in the flow of the second dialogue in terms of the use of adjacency pairs.

For this pair, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work did not have any effect on the frequency of the follow-up moves. Additionally, the use of adjacency pairs was the same in both transcriptions, from which it can be interpreted that the

cooperative group work did not have a positive or negative effect on the use of adjacency pairs.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will first present the conclusion of the study based on the research questions. Following the conclusion, the recommendations will be presented regarding further studies to be conducted in this area.

5.1. Conclusion

This study aimed to examine the effect of cooperative group work on students' interaction process and their use of follow-up moves and adjacency pairs. Accordingly, the study tried to answer the following two research questions:

1. Do cooperative group works have any effect on the spoken discourse of students?
2. How does group work interaction affect students' use of follow-up moves and adjacency pairs?

In order to answer these research questions, the students' dialogues were recorded and transcribed first before the cooperative group work activity. Then, the students did the cooperative group work activity and the dialogues were recorded and transcribed again so as to see the effect of cooperative group work on the use of follow-up moves and adjacency pairs.

Examining the first dialogues of the students in Table 5, it can be seen that the pairs used 24 in total. There is not even one pair who did not use any follow-up moves, which can be interpreted as a positive aspect in students' dialogues produced after the pair work. This might be because of the brainstorming exercise students did before the pair work where the teacher asked them what a real-life dialogue includes. However, when the pairs' first dialogues are examined, it can be seen that in some parts, most students did not use any follow-up moves where anyone would use in a real-life dialogue. Therefore, the first dialogues did not sound as natural and real-life like as they should have been.

Table V: Change in the Use of Follow-up Moves and Adjacency Pairs

Pairs	Follow-up moves used in the first dialogue	Follow-up moves used in the second dialogue	Change in the use of follow-up moves	Change in the use of adjacency pairs
1	1	4	↑	-
2	3	6	↑	-
3	2	4	↑	-
4	1	2	↑	↑
5	2	4	↑	↑
6	2	2	-	↑
7	2	4	↑	-
8	3	5	↑	-
9	3	4	↑	↑
10	2	4	↑	-

11	1	3	↑	-
12	2	2	-	-
Total	24	44	↑	-

Examining the second dialogues of the students in Table 5 above, it can be seen that the pairs used 44 follow-up moves in total, which can be interpreted as a great improvement when compared to the number of follow-up moves the pairs used in their first dialogues. Furthermore, out of the 12 pairs, 10 pairs increased the number of follow-up moves they used, while 2 pairs used the same number of follow-up moves in the first and second dialogues. There is no decrease in the number of follow-up moves in any pairs. Moreover, when the second dialogues are examined, it can be seen that the pairs used the follow-up moves in more suitable places and made their dialogues more natural and real-life like. It can be interpreted that the question the teacher asked before the group work about the naturalness of the first dialogues guided the students in a good way as they knew their aim and how they would help each other develop the dialogues. They also seemed to be enjoying the group work activity and they were observed to be eager and excited to better each other's dialogues.

The use of adjacency pairs did not improve as much as the use of follow-up moves as it can be seen in Table 1. Out of the 12 pairs, only 4 pairs could improve the use of adjacency pairs. This might be because the pairs already used correct adjacency pairs in their first dialogues. They answered each other's questions, greetings, leave-taking expressions and etc. except for a few utterances. Therefore, it can be concluded that students were already good at using the adjacency pairs; however, 4 pairs

improved the use of them which can still show the positive effect of the cooperative group work activity on the use of adjacency pairs.

All in all, looking at the first research question, it can be concluded that cooperative group works did have an effect on the spoken discourse of students in a way that made their dialogues more natural, more real-life like and more correct. In addition, as an answer to the second research question, the cooperative group work affected students' use of follow-up moves and adjacency pairs in a positive way as they really increased the number of follow-up moves and some pairs improved the use of adjacency pairs in their second dialogues. To sum up, it can be concluded that the cooperative group work had a positive effect on students' spoken discourse and increased the use of the follow-up moves and adjacency pairs; therefore, helped students make their dialogues sound more natural and real-life like.

5.2. Recommendations

This observational study investigated the effect of cooperative group work on students' spoken discourse and their use of follow-up moves and adjacency pairs in a university setting with 24 elementary level students. To deepen the findings of the study, such an observational study can be enriched with students' views regarding the effects of the cooperative group work and how they felt during the activity. Moreover, it can be conducted with different age groups and different levels of students in different school settings to see the effect of these on the process.

REFERENCES

Alba-Juez, L. (2009). *Perspectives on Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Allwright, D. (2000). *Interaction and Negotiation in the Language Classroom: Their Role in Learner Development*. Retrieved from http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/groups/crile/docs/crile50allrigh.pdf.

Birdal, A. (2008). *Yabancı Dil Öğretiminde "Gereksinim Çözümlemesi" Uygulamasının Gerekliliği*. http://www.ingilish.com/gereksinim-cozumlemesi.htm.

Borich, G. D. (2004) (5th edition). *Effective Teaching Methods*. New Jersey: Pearson, Merrill Prentice Hall.

Brown, D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by Principles*. Prentice Hall. New Jersey.

Burns, A., Joyce, H. & Gollin, S. (1996). *"I See What You Mean" Using Spoken Discourse in The Classroom: A Handbook For Teachers*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics,*1, 1-47.

Cathcart, R. (1989). Authentic Discourse and the Survival English Curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 1: 105–126.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Chodchoey, S. (1988). *Spoken and Written Discourse in Thai: The Difference*. http://sealang.net/sala/archives/pdf4/chodchoey1988spoken.pdf

Choudhury, S. (2005). Interaction in Second Language Classrooms. *BRAC University Journal*. Vol. II, No. 1, pp. 77-82.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coulthard, M. (1994). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis.* London: Longman.

Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Çelebi, M. D. (2006). Türkiye'de Anadili Eğitimi ve Yabancı Dil Öğretimi. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi.* Sayı: 21.

Dahal, B. (2010). Analysis of Spoken Discourse Pattern in Nepali ELT Classes. *Journal of NELTA*. Vol. 15 No. 1-2.

Davies, P. & Pearse, E. (2002). *Success in English Teaching*. Shangai Foreign Language Education Press.

Duncan, S. (1972) Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 23: 283-292.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2004). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hall, J. K. & Verplaetse, L. S. (2000). *Second and Foreign Language Learning through Classroom Interaction.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Harmer, J. (2004). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman.

Harrison, S. (1998). E-*mail Discussions as Conversation: Moves and Acts in a Sample From a Listserv Discussion. Linguistik* [online].

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and Language Education*. Cambridge University Press.

Hayes, D. (2008). *Non-native English-speaking Teachers, Context and English Language Teaching*. Elsevier Ltd.

Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (1998) *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hymes, D. (1971). *On Communicative Competenc*e. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jensen, E. (1998). *Teaching with the Brain in Mind*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Jia, G. (2003). *Psychology of Foreign Language Education* (2nd edition). Nanning: Guangxi Education Press.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R.T. (1984). *Circles of Learning*. Washington, DC: Assoc. Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Holubec, E. (2002). *Circles of Learning: Cooperation in the Classroom.* Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T. & Smith, K. (1991). *Active Learning: Cooperation in the College Classroom.* Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishers.

Jule, A. (2004). *Gender, Participation and Silence in the Language Classroom*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kato, F. (2000). *Discourse Approach to Turn-Taking from the Perspective of Tone Choice between Speakers*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Birmingham.

Kumpulainen, K. & Wray, D. (2002). *Classroom Interaction and Social Learning*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lerner, G. H. (2004). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages are Learned* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Littlewood, W. (1981), *Communicative Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M & Porter, P. (1985). Group Work, Interlanguage Talk and Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-212.

Lyman, L. & Foyle, H. C. (1988). Cooperative Learning Strategies and Children. *ERIC Digest.*

Martinez, A. G. (2002). *Authentic Materials: An Overview Karen's Linguistics Issues*. http://www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/authenticmaterials.html.

Maxwell, J. A. (2008). *Designing A Qualitative Study*. 07-Bickman-45636:07-Bickman-45636. http://www.corwin.com/upm-data/23772_Ch7.pdf .

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M. (2000). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGroarty, M. (1989). The benefits of cooperative learning arrangements in second language instruction. *NABE Journal*, 13(2) (winter), p. 127-143.

Nunan, D. (1993). *Collaborative Language Learning and Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.

Paker, T. (2006). *Çal Bölgesindeki Okullarda İngilizce Öğretiminin Sorunları ve Çözüm Önerileri*. Çal Sempozyumu. tpaker.pamukkale.edu.tr/.../Çal%20Sempozyumu.

Pöhaker, K. (1998). *Turn-taking and Gambits in Intercultural Communication*. Diplomarbeit, Graz.

Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (1990). *The Language Teaching Matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Pearson Education.

Rivers, W. M. (1983) Communicating naturally in a second language, Cambridge, Cambridge Language Teaching Library.

Rivers, W. M. (2000). *Interactive Language Teaching*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. M. & R. M. Coulthard (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils*. London: OUP.

Slembrouck, S. (2005). Discourse, Critique and Ethnography: Class-oriented Coding in Accounts of Child Protection. *Language Sciences* 27:619–650.

Snow, D. (1996). *More Than A Native Speaker*. Alexandra, Virginia: TESOT, Inc.

Stenstrom, A. B. (1994). *An Introduction to Spoken Interaction*. London.

Taboada, M. (2006). *Spontaneous and Non-Spontaneous Turn-Taking*. International Pragmatics Association.

Taguchi, N. (2007). Chunk Learning and the Development of Spoken Discourse in a Japanese as a Foreign Language Classroom. *Language Teaching Research.*

Tanış, E. (2007). *Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil Öğretimi*. http://www.ingilizceogretmeni.com/portal/index.php?option=com_contentvetask=viewveid=115veItemid=74.

Tezcan, N. B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis of the Students' Groupwork Interaction in a Task-Based Cooperation Continuum*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Muğla University.

Thomas, A.M. (1991). *Classroom Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Webb, N. M. (1989). Peer Interaction and Learning in Small Groups. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13, 21–39.

Widdowson, HG, (1978), *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zengin, E. (2008). *A Study on the Nature and Frequency of the Interaction and the Factors Affecting Interaction in Language Classrooms*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. METU.

Zhang, Y. (2010a). *An Analysis of Spoken Discourse between Two Native Speakers*. Review of European Studies. Vol. 2, No. 2.

Zhang, Y. (2010b). Cooperative Language Learning and Foreign Language Learning and Teaching. *ISSN 1798-4769 Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 81-83.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Transcription Conventions

The following transcription symbols of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) were used in this study:

T	Teacher
L	Unidendified learner
=	An equals sign indicates an incomplete utterance.
-	A hyphen after a word or part of a word shows a cut-off or selfinterruption.
(.)	A pause is indicated by one or more periods in round brackets.
:	Colons following a letter indicate the sound extension of a word.
[ ]	Square brackets indicate simultaneous speech.
?	A question mark indicates a question.
( )	Utterances that cannot be transcribed are put inside empty single round brackets.
(( ))	Contextual information presented.