HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Department of Foreign Language Education

English Language Teaching Program

ASSUMING LEARNER BEHAVIOR AS AN INTERACTIONAL RESOURCE IN L2 TESTING AND EVALUATION CLASSROOM INTERACTION IN A TEACHER EDUCATION CONTEXT

Reyyan Zülal YÖNEY

Master's Thesis

Ankara, (2021)

With leadership, research, innovation, high quality education and change,

To the leading edge... Toward being the best...

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Department of Foreign Language Education

English Language Teaching Program

ASSUMING LEARNER BEHAVIOR AS AN INTERACTIONAL RESOURCE IN L2 TESTING AND EVALUATION CLASSROOM INTERACTION IN A TEACHER EDUCATION CONTEXT

ÖĞRETMEN EĞİTİMİ BAĞLAMINDA YABANCI DİLDE ÖLÇME VE DEĞERLENDİRME SINIF-İÇİ ETKİLEŞİMİNDE BİR ETKİLEŞİMSEL KAYNAK OLARAK ÖĞRENCİ DAVRANIŞI VARSAYIMI

Reyyan Zülal YÖNEY

Master's Thesis

Ankara, (2021)

Acceptance and Approval

To the Graduate School of Educational Sciences,

This thesis / dissertation, prepared by **REYYAN ZÜLAL YÖNEY** and entitled "Title of the Thesis" has been approved as a thesis for the Degree of **Master** in the **Program of English Language Teaching** in the **Department of Foreign Language Education** by the members of the Examining Committee.

Chair	Prof. Dr. Çiler HATİPOĞLU	Signature
Member (Supervisor)	Assist. Prof. Dr. Nilüfer CAN DAŞKIN	Signature
Member	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ufuk BALAMAN	Signature

This is to certify that this thesis/dissertation has been approved by the aforementioned examining committee members on 23/06/2021 in accordance with the relevant articles of the Rules and Regulations of Hacettepe University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, and was accepted as a **Master's Thesis** in the **Program of English Language Teaching** by the Board of Directors of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences from ...../...../........

Prof. Dr. Selahattin GELBAL
Director of Graduate School of Educational Sciences

Abstract

This study uncovers an unexplored phenomenon of "Assuming Learner Behavior" (ALB) emerging within the context of testing and evaluation course in an English Language Teaching (ELT) program by using Conversation Analysis (CA). It involves the analysis of video-recorded classroom interaction (12 hours) of fourth year ELT students and an ELT professor in a university in Ankara, Turkey. Using CA, this study has investigated how the phenomenon of ALB emerges in the classroom interaction of pre-service teachers during feedback and presentation sessions in the testing and evaluation course. Moreover, this study has explored the interactional functions of ALB in different sequential positions and how pre-service teachers' orient to the different aspects of test items by means of ALBs. In addition, the analysis has indicated that ALB creates learning opportunities for pre-service teachers in developing their testing and evaluation knowledge and skills. In light of these findings, this study provides insights into classroom interaction in a higher education context in general and has implications for L2 teacher education, classroom learning of pre-service teachers, and the development of testing and evaluation knowledge and skills.

Keywords: classroom interaction, assuming learner behavior, English language teaching, testing and evaluation, L2 teacher education, conversation analysis

Öz

Bu çalışma, İngilizce Öğretmenliği programı ölçme ve değerlendirme dersi bağlamında, daha önce araştırılmamış olan "Öğrenci Davranışı Varsayımı" (ÖDV) olgusunu Konuşma Analizi (KÇ) kullanarak ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda Türkiye'nin Ankara ilinde bulunan bir devlet üniversitesinin İngilizce Öğretmenliği ölçme ve değerlendirme dersini almakta olan son sınıf öğrencileri ile dersi vermekte olan profesörün sınıf etkileşiminin (12 saat) video kayıtlarının analizi yapılmıştır. KÇ yöntemi ile bu çalışmada ÖDV olgusunun, ölçme ve değerlendirme dersinde geri dönüt ve sunum oturumları sırasında öğretmen adaylarının sınıf etkileşiminde nasıl ortaya çıktığı araştırılmıştır. Buna ek olarak, bu çalışma, ÖDV'nin farklı dizisel pozisyonlardaki etkileşimsel işlevlerini ve öğretmen adaylarının ÖDV'ler aracılığıyla test ögelerinin farklı boyutlarına nasıl yöneldiklerini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Ayrıca, analizler sonucunda ÖDV'nin öğretmen adayları için ölçme ve değerlendirme bilgi ve becerilerini geliştirmeleri açısından öğrenme fırsatları oluşturduğu gözlenmiştir. Bu bulguların ışığında, bu çalışma, bir yükseköğretim kurumu bağlamında sınıf etkileşiminin anlaşılmasına katkı sağlamakta ve öğretmen eğitimi, öğretmen adaylarının sınıfiçi öğrenmesi ile ölçme ve değerlendirme bilgi ve becerilerinin geliştirilmesi için uygulamalar sunmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: sınıf söylemi, öğrenci davranışını varsayma, İngilizce öğretmenliği, ölçme ve değerlendirme, öğretmen eğitimi, konuşma çözümlemesi

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Symbols and Abbreviations

ALB: Assuming Learner Behavior/Assumption on Learner Behavior

CA: Conversation Analysis

CA-SLA: Conversation Analysis for Second Language Acquisition

CIC: Classroom Interactional Competence

ELT: English Language Teaching

ELTE: English Language Testing and Evaluation (in other settings, ELTE is also used to refer to English Language Teacher Education; however, in this study, it is used to refer to English Language Testing and Evaluation)

FPP: First Pair Part

L2: Second/Foreign Language

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

SPP: Second Pair Part

TCU: Turn Constructional Unit

TRP: Transition Relevance Place

Chapter 1
Introduction

This chapter presents the statement of the problem, the aim and significance of the study and research questions. Assumptions and limitations related to the study are also explained and definitions of relevant terminology are provided.

Statement of the Problem

The importance of interaction in teacher education has been emphasized in interaction studies with the impact of social perspectives in teacher education (Johnson, 2009). Interaction studies involving dialogic reflection and feedback practices has gained prominence in the literature in recent years. But these predominantly concentrate on post-observation feedback sessions, and teachers' beliefs and understanding in relation to their own teaching. Studies involving classroom interaction in teacher education are quite few in the related literature. Studies on classroom interaction in teacher education are significant in order to present and understand the classroom interactional competence (CIC) (Walsh, 2011) of pre-service teachers and shed light on the learning of teachers since interaction is at the center of both teaching and learning (Walsh, 2011).

Social interaction proves to be crucial in teacher education since "[t]eacher learning and the activities of teaching are understood as growing out of participation in the social practices in classrooms" (Johnson, 2009, p. 13) from a sociocultural perspective. Along with their experiences as students and teachers, L2 teachers' knowledge base is shaped by the undergraduate courses they take during teacher education (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Graves, 2009). While this is the case, interaction studies investigating prospective teachers' learning processes in classroom interaction are quite limited in the literature. Knowing that courses pre-service teachers receive in teacher education plays such an important role in the development of their knowledge base, the investigation of classroom interaction in L2 teacher education is considered to be noteworthy for providing insights and implications with regards to teacher learning.

The interactional studies regarding teacher education existing in the literature predominantly involve dialogic reflection, reflective models, post-observation

conferences, and feedback practices, which focus on the practices of teachers regarding "how to teach?". On the other hand, studies regarding "how to test?" remains insufficient, even though testing and evaluation constitutes a vital part of teachers' "pedagogical content knowledge" (Shulman, 1987). With assessment being "one of the cornerstones of the educational process" (Hatipoğlu, 2015), an investigation of undergraduate testing and evaluation courses in L2 teacher education programs is needed to uncover how prospective L2 teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) on assessment develops in teacher education.

English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) courses entered the curricula of Turkish L2 teacher education programs in 1998 (Hatipoğlu, 2017). This course is usually offered in the fourth year of ELT programs in most Turkish universities with the course topics and syllabi generally being based on the coursebook chosen for the course or on the core concepts from the related literature (Şahin, 2019). While ELTE courses offered in different institutions have differing learning objectives, most ELTE courses share the objectives of defining and using fundamental concepts and principles of language testing and assessment, analyzing and differentiating between test types, and constructing tests for assessing language areas and language skills for different age and proficiency level students (Şahin, 2019, p. 160).

In most cases, studies on L2 teachers' testing and evaluation skills in Turkey have investigated the assessment literacy of pre-service and in-service teachers and their beliefs, needs, and attitudes regarding assessment. Studies investigating the assessment literacy of L2 teachers in Turkey generally had the conclusion that pre-service and in-service teachers had low language assessment literacy and needed to receive further training. Most studies on the English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) courses offered in Turkey also came to the conclusion that ELT teachers required more training on testing and evaluation. While these studies investigated ELTE courses and L2 teachers' assessment literacy and indicated issues with the knowledge base of teachers on testing and evaluation, what is actually happening in the ELTE classrooms remains neglected. For these reasons, it is concluded that studies exploring the interactional context of testing and evaluation courses in L2 teacher education programs where the assessment literacy of L2 teachers begin to develop are needed. Because examining the micro details

of classroom interaction within L2 testing and evaluation courses is essential for a better understanding of how the assessment literacy of L2 teachers develop in interaction.

Aim and Significance of the Study

This study aims to investigate classroom interaction in English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) course in an English Language Teaching (ELT) program in Turkey. The purpose of this investigation is to explore the micro details of classroom interaction of prospective L2 teachers to uncover how their testing and evaluation skills develop in and through interaction in the ELTE course in English language teacher education. The significance of the investigation carried out in this study is twofold.

First of all, investigating classroom interaction of pre-service teachers can provide important insights into teacher learning and teachers' classroom interactional competence (Walsh, 2011) as the undergraduate courses is one of the places that shape the knowledge base of L2 teachers (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Graves, 2009). Such research is needed in the related literature and this study is noteworthy in that it can enable to observe how pre-service teachers learn. Secondly, exploring classroom interaction in English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) courses is fundamental as testing and evaluation is a crucial element in teachers' "pedagogical content knowledge" (Shulman, 1987). Assessment is a cornerstone of the educational process (Hatipoğlu, 2015); however, most studies on teacher education focus on "how to teach?" while "how to test?" aspect needs more investigation. Studying the micro details of classroom interaction in ELTE courses in L2 teacher education programs is needed to uncover how prospective L2 teachers' assessment skills develop in teacher education. For the purpose of contributing to filling the gaps in the literature outlined here, this micro-analytic study of classroom interaction in the L2 testing and evaluation course context focused on interactional practices of pre-service teachers in interaction.

Prior research on interaction in teacher education utilized a variety of methodologies such as action research (e.g., Dinkelman, 2000), grounded theory (e.g., Rodman, 2010), interviews (e.g., Yuan, Mak, & Yang, 2020), Conversation Analysis (e.g., Li & Walsh, 2011, Duran, 2017), case study (e.g., Karakaş & Yükselir,

2020), linguistic ethnography (e.g., Copland, 2011) and others. Similarly, L2 testing and evaluation courses have been investigated through different methodologies, some of which are action research (e.g., Giraldo & Murcia, 2019), interviews (e.g., Lam, 2015); Büyükahıska, 2020), questionnaires (e.g., Jin, 2010; Hatipoğlu, 2015). While there are various methodologies adopted to investigate classroom interaction and L2 testing and evaluation courses, Conversation Analysis (CA) was determined as the research methodology for this study. Conversation Analysis has been used to investigate classroom interaction in a number of classroom contexts such as young learners (e.g., Watanabe, 2016; aus der Wieschen & Sert, 2018), primary education (e.g., Kardaş İşler, Balaman, & Şahin, 2019; Herder, Berenst, de Glopper, & Koole, 2020), secondary education (e.g., Sert & Walsh, 2013; Evnitskaya & Berger, 2017), and even higher education (e.g., Çimenli & Sert, 2017; Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2020) and adult-learner settings (e.g., Jacknick, 2011; Malabarba, 2019). An overview of these studies suggested that Conversation Analysis is advantageous when it comes to capturing, analyzing, and presenting the micro details of classroom interaction. Huth (2011) also highlighted the significance of CA studies of classroom interaction by stating that the application of CA to classroom contexts has served the purpose of providing a better understanding of the interactional practices taking place between the parties involved. Because of this reason, Conversation Analysis (CA) was adopted as the research methodology of the study in order to investigate the micro details of classroom interaction in this English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) course context in L2 teacher education.

The setting of this study was an English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) course classroom context in an English Language Teaching (ELT) program of a public university located in Ankara, Turkey. The class consisted of 23 fourth-year ELT students and a professor who instructed the course. The students took this testing and evaluation course during the summer school of the 2018-2019 academic year as part of their final year curriculum. The structure of testing and evaluation course followed a flipped classroom design (see Chapter 3 for further details of the course structure and the setting). First, the pre-service teachers received lectures on the theoretical basis of testing and evaluation while forming peer groups and prepared the first drafts of their exams as a group during lecture

weeks. Lecture weeks were followed by feedback sessions where each section of the exams prepared by the groups were discussed. The assigned feedback-providing groups orally provided their feedback while other groups and the professor also gave feedback if and when they wanted to.

Prior to each feedback session, the feedback-providing groups were required to submit their written feedback for the related sections to the Google Drive file of the course. After each session, the test-maker groups were required to submit the revised versions of the exam sections on which they had received feedback. Throughout the lecture weeks and feedback session weeks, the pre-service teachers were required to complete the reading tasks at home prior to coming to class. After these, a presentation session was held where pre-service teachers self-evaluated their exams and the progress they made. The recorded data used in this study involved the feedback and presentation sessions only. Eight classes were recorded during the summer school in total. The data collected from five of these classes are the subject of this study.

The close examination of classroom interaction revealed a number of phenomena occurring in classroom interaction in this ELTE course classroom context. This study focused on "Assuming Learner Behavior" (ALB) which is a recurrent phenomenon in pre-service teachers' classroom interaction. This phenomenon consistently occurs in pre-service teacher turns during feedback and presentation sessions of test construction process. The reason for deciding on the phenomenon of ALB was that, during unmotivated looking sessions, it was perceived as a practice that offered affordances for improvements in items and tests constructed by pre-service teachers.

ALB stands for utterances that involve assumptions on how the students that take the exams would react to the questions and the exams. These assumptions should imply one of the following aspects of student reaction to be accepted as an instance of ALB: The assumption should refer to (1) what the students would possibly think, (2) feel, and/or (3) do upon encountering the test item(s) or the test section(s). Apart from these, assumptions may refer to (4) the epistemic status of the students who will take the exams regarding the knowledge they possibly possess at the time of encountering the test item(s) or the test section(s). If a pre-service teacher's turn displays one or more of these qualities while referring to how

students would possibly react to the tests prepared, that instance was tagged as an ALB.

In order to illustrate ALB, a part of Extract 5 from Chapter 4 is provided here. The extract takes place during the seventh recorded session of summer school and it is dedicated to the feedback on the writing sections of the exams prepared by the groups. The sequence in this extract involves group five receiving feedback on a question in the writing section of their exam. Nes (a member of group two) is a feedback provider and Yus is a test writer (a member of group five). Tea is a short form representing "teacher" in the transcripts. Tea and Nes provide feedback to the question and Yus responds to these feedbacks. The question discussed in the extract is a writing question which requires the students to write why people visit the places listed in the question. The places that group five included in their question are library, hospital, and bank. The instructions of the question ask the students to write one or two sentences about why people go to these places. Prior to the sequence below, the teacher problematizes the fact that the instructions provided by group five in the focal question does not comply with the expected answer from the students. Yus responds to this by expressing that they will write the instructions again, which receives acknowledgment from the teacher. Following this, Nes raises her hand (Sahlström, 2002) and self-selects at the same time and extends on the problem that the teacher initiated by pointing out another possible outcome of the lack of appropriate instructions.

Extract 5: For fun (R7-P1)

```
38    NES: →      $◦they can◦ even %say that we go for fun@%
                  $raises hand, gestures---> line 40  --->@
      tea                        %-----looks at NES------%
39               (0.3)
40    TEA:       +↑exactly$+ £(0.2) so would you accept that↑£
                     --->$
                  +----3----+ £--------looks at group 5-------£
                  3: nods and gestures with left hand
```

In line 38, it is observed that Nes employs an ALB by referring to the students who would take this exam by using the third person plural pronoun "they" and by providing a possible student response which may be noncompliant for the question

(°they can° even say that we go for fun). This provides extension to the teacher's earlier problematization of the ambiguous instructions by demonstrating another outcome with an assumption on the students' possible response. In line 40, the teacher responds with a compliance token and a nod. Then, she orients to group five by directing her gaze towards them and by asking whether this is an acceptable response for them. This short excerpt from Extract 5 presents an example of how an ALB may be formed by pre-service teachers.

Research Questions

The research questions of this study were formulated following data collection and unmotivated looking sessions. The reason for formulating research questions after these procedures is that Conversation Analysis does not draw from any exogenous theory when analyzing data. Therefore, the research questions were formulated after the collection of data and the unmotivated looking sessions. The research questions this study aims to answer are as follows:

1. How does the use of ALBs emerge in the sequential unfolding of interaction?
2. What functions do instances of assuming learner behavior (ALB) perform in interaction?
3. Which aspects of test items do pre-service teachers orient to in ALBs?
4. How do ALBs provide learning opportunities for pre-service teachers in terms of their testing abilities?

Assumptions

It is assumed that the professor and the pre-service teachers involved in this study are assumed to act naturally in spite of the presence of the cameras recording them. Another assumption regarding this study is that Conversation Analysis is considered to be an appropriate research method to examine classroom interaction.

Limitations

One limitation of this study is that the scope is limited to the students who took the testing and evaluation course during the summer school of 2018-2019

academic year in a public university in Ankara. Another limitation is related to the technical problems related to recording devices during data collection. Data could be collected with two camera angles (or rarely with one camera angle) instead of three in some parts of the recording sessions. This hindered the researcher from observing some participants during interaction as they were not visible to the angle of the camera operating in those parts of the sessions.

Definitions

Assuming Learner Behavior: Utterances that involve assumptions on how the students that take the exams would react to the questions and the exams. These assumptions may involve references to what the students would think, feel, and/or do upon encountering the test item(s) or the test section(s). Additionally, the utterances that involve assumptions may refer to the epistemic status of the students at the time of encountering the test item(s) or the test section(s).

Testing and Evaluation Course: A course offered as compulsory in undergraduate teacher education programs in Turkey. The course curriculum generally involves the teaching of principles and practices related to the testing and evaluation of learners.

Pre-Service Teacher: Pre-service teacher can be defined as an undergraduate student who is being trained to become a teacher. Within the context of this study, the term pre-service teacher refers to the undergraduate students being trained to become English teachers in an English Language Teaching (ELT) program.

Test/Exam: A tool adopted to measure development in learners. In Haladyna's (2004) words, a test is "a measuring device intended to describe numerically the degree or amount of learning under uniform, standardized conditions" (p. 4).

Language Testing/Language Assessment: Measuring learners' proficiency, progress, or achievement through employing various instruments, such as tests. Language testing is also used interchangeably with language assessment. O'Loughlin (2006) states that assessment is "an increasingly important domain of language teachers' expertise as the professional demands on them to accurately

assess their students increases and as the theory and practice of assessment continues to mature" (pp. 71-72). Joughin (2009) remarks that the central functions of assessment are "*supporting the process of learning; judging students' achievement* in relation to course requirements; and *maintaining the standards of the profession or discipline* for which students are being prepared" (pp. 1-2, emphasis in original).

Chapter 2
Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter aims to present a review of literature. The first section will review classroom interaction. In the first section, interaction studies conducted in teacher education are discussed. The second section will present a review of studies conducted on L2 testing and evaluation in teacher education.

Interaction in Teacher Education

Interaction is a crucial component of studies related to classrooms across various contexts. However, interaction is also a significant aspect of teacher education at the same time. Interaction in teacher education has attracted attention as a field of research in recent years. With the rise of social perspectives, interaction in teacher education has received attention and gained importance within literature. A variety of subcategories emerge when the related literature is reviewed for studies of interaction in teacher education.

Teacher cognition is one aspect that has been investigated in interaction studies in teacher education through the influence of social perspectives. Li (2020) describes the concept of cognition as "cognition-in-interaction" which is "developed in and through social interaction" (p. 4, emphasis in original). From a sociocultural perspective, the social activities that teachers take part in is where teacher cognition is originated and shaped (Johnson, 2009). In Kagan's (1990) words, "[t]eacher cognition is defined as pre- or inservice teachers' self-reflections; beliefs and knowledge about teaching, students, and content; and awareness of problem-solving strategies endemic to classroom teaching" (p. 419). In line with these definitions, it can be concluded that interaction studies in teacher education that investigate teachers' reflections, beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions are a part of research on teacher cognition.

Teachers' beliefs and perceptions in relation to teaching is one aspect of teacher cognition that has been investigated. These studies looked into teachers' beliefs regarding specific topics such as subject matter (e.g., Andrews, 2003) or broader concepts such as their own teaching (e.g., Li, 2012) through different

methods including questionnaires and interviews. Such research involving teachers' beliefs on subject matter or their teaching skills has been carried out in Turkish context through similar methods as well (Saraç Süzer, 2007; Cabaroğlu, 2012; Çapan, 2014). These studies generally produced results specific to the context in which they were carried out.

More recently, studies investigating the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices has become quite popular in an attempt to understand teacher cognition and its relation to classroom practices in international (Johnson, 1992; Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver, & Thwaite, 2001; Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004; Li, 2013; Farrell & Ives, 2015; Gaitas & Alves Martins, 2015;) as well as Turkish contexts (Erkmen, 2014; Çalışır Gerem & Yangın Ekşi, 2019; Serdar Tülüce, 2019). Some of these studies demonstrated a decent congruence between teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. Some others interestingly reported discrepancy between beliefs and actual practices of teachers. This indicates that teachers' stated beliefs about teaching does not always correspond to what they do in the classroom.

Apart from perceptions, beliefs, and their relation to classroom practice, studies on dialogic reflection practices of teachers form one aspect of research on interaction, and on teacher cognition, in teacher education that has received attention from researchers. This has involved both pre-service and in-service teacher education research through using a variety of methodologies. Some of these studies benefited from Conversation Analysis (Lazaraton & Ishihara, 2005; Li & Walsh, 2011) when investigating reflective practices of teachers, which shed light on the self-reflection of teachers (Lazaraton & Ishihara, 2005) and the connection between the beliefs and practices of teachers (Li & Walsh, 2011) in relation to their own teaching. Action research (Dinkelman, 2000), structured reflection questions and grounded theory (Rodman, 2010), group interviews and reflective journals (Cherrington & Loveridge, 2014), and interviews and videoed reflections (Yuan, Mak, & Yang, 2020) has also been adopted for the investigation of reflective practices of pre-service and in-service teachers, which again presented results regarding teachers' understanding of their own teaching. Specific to the context of Turkey, reflective practices of teachers have been investigated through different methodologies such as reflective essays and interviews (Demirbulak, 2012) and through case study (Karakaş & Yükselir, 2020). The studies conducted in this

11

context focused on the understanding of teaching while one of these (Demirbulak, 2012) also indicated that reflective practices of pre-service teachers can be promoted during teacher education apart from teaching practices.

Along with studies on reflective practices of in-service and pre-service teachers in recent years, teacher education models entailing the reflective practice of teachers have emerged within the field. Walsh (2001) introduced a set of L2 classroom modes to help promote quality teacher talk (QTT) in classroom interaction. The SETT (Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk) framework (Walsh, 2006) also entails the identification of the L2 classroom modes (Walsh, 2003, 2013) to enable the development of awareness and understanding of classroom interaction in teachers. Other frameworks developed for reflective practices are CA-modified action research (Hale, Nanni, & Hooper, 2018) and SWEAR framework (Waring, 2020, as cited in Sert, 2019) for in-service teachers. For the context of Turkey, Sert (2010, 2012) highlighted that the current foreign language teacher education in Turkey does not enable pre-service teachers to develop their classroom interactional competence and proposed the IMDAT model (Sert, 2015, 2019) for reflective teacher education which is comprised of five steps and entails the introduction of classroom interactional competence (CIC) (Walsh, 2011) followed by teaching, reflection, and feedback sessions.

Interaction has been investigated in teacher education with a focus on post-observation sessions and feedback sessions of supervisors as well. While investigating post-observation sessions, a variety of methodologies have been adopted such as Conversation Analysis (Waring, 2013; Waring, 2017; Harris, 2013; Kim & Silver, 2016), heuristic outlook (Gwyn-Paquette & Tochon, 2002), case study (Hyland & Lo, 2006), and linguistic ethnography (Copland, 2011). Some of these involved pre-service teachers such as Gwyn-Paquette & Tochon's (2002) study, which concluded that receiving feedback helped the pre-service teachers to reflect on their teaching process and that this enabled them to become more comfortable with using cooperative learning on their own. Some others involved in-service teachers such as Kim & Silver's (2016) longitudinal study which showed how trainee and mentor practices facilitated reflection and allowed for reflective thinking in interaction.

Other than reflective practices, reflective models and post-observation sessions, peer feedback studies form another aspect of interaction studies within teacher education. These studies involved peer assessment practices of both pre-service (Sluijsmans, Brand-Gruwel, van Merrienboer, & Bastiaens, 2003) and in-service teachers (de Lange & Wittek, 2018; Batlle & Seedhouse, 2020) in a variety of contexts through written and/or oral feedback. In the Turkish context, some studies (Demiraslan Çevik, Haşlaman, & Çelik, 2015; Demiraslan Çevik, 2015) investigated the effect of peer feedback in online learning environments involving groups of graduate students and/or undergraduate students while others (Yüksel & Başaran, 2020) focused on the written peer feedback of pre-service teachers.

The review of literature in terms of interaction in teacher education showed that reflection and feedback practices have gained prominence. These studies mostly focused on the dialogic reflection and post-observation and peer feedback sessions in relation to L2 teachers. However, the review of interactional studies in relation to teacher education uncovered that classroom interaction studies involving teacher education remain insufficient within the literature. Classroom interaction studies prove to be important due to two reasons. Firstly, investigating classroom in teacher education enable showcasing and understanding the classroom interactional competence (CIC) (Walsh, 2011) of pre-service teachers. Secondly, classroom interaction can shed light on the learning of teachers as interaction is central to both teaching and learning (Walsh, 2011).

Concerning classroom interaction within teacher education, there are a number of exceptional studies which involve one particular classroom context of a course named "Guidance" in the faculty of education of a Turkish university where English was adopted as a medium of instruction for all departments (Duran, 2017; Duran & Sert, 2019; Duran, Kurhila, & Sert, 2019; Duran & Jacknick, 2020; Jacknick & Duran; 2021). These studies investigated classroom interaction in two classrooms involving senior year trainee teachers from various educational departments taking this course as part of their undergraduate programs. The participants included English Language Teaching students as well as students from other teacher education departments. Apart from this specific context investigated in these studies, pre-service teachers' classroom learning experiences remains a neglected area in the literature. As the context involved in the aforementioned studies is an

English as a medium of interaction (EMI) setting of an educational science course and the participants are enrolled in various teacher education departments, classroom interaction in L2 teacher education is still unattended. All in all, it can be concluded that studies on classroom learning of pre-service teachers, especially classroom interaction in L2 teacher education, is an unexplored field within the literature.

When all of the interactional studies reviewed in this chapter are considered, it is seen that interaction in teacher education has been investigated mostly with a focus on teachers' teaching abilities while their testing abilities are not adequately inquired in interactional studies. Some of the dialogic reflection studies actually focused on teachers' development and learning mainly focusing on "how to teach?" while "how to test?" is not sufficiently explored, even though testing forms a significant part of the pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) of teachers. In order to understand how the pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) of L2 teachers develop, it emerges as a need to conduct classroom interaction research on the undergraduate courses in L2 teacher education since these courses are the places where the basis of teachers' skills related to pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) develop. Investigating the micro details of classroom interaction in undergraduate courses can provide insights into how these skills develop and how teacher education programs may be improved to better suit the needs of pre-service teachers in relation to pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987).

L2 Testing and Evaluation in Teacher Education

Testing and assessment form a crucial element of L2 teacher education programs as well as in-service teacher practices. As testing is an important component of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987), studies investigating testing and evaluation comprises an essential part of research on teacher education. Studies on L2 testing and evaluation in L2 teacher education incorporate a spectrum of research foci. One such foci in L2 testing and evaluation is the assessment needs of teachers. Research on the assessment training needs of L2 teachers is one aspect of assessment studies that have been investigated in international (Hasselgreen, Carlsen & Helness, 2004; Fulcher, 2012; Tavassoli &

Farhady, 2018; Gan & Lam, 2020) as well as in Turkish contexts (Ölmezer-Öztürk & Aydın, 2019). Studies carried out in both contexts concluded that L2 teachers needed more training on assessment.

Beliefs and attitudes of L2 teachers have also been investigated in relation to assessment, revealing the divergent approaches of teachers in different cultural contexts (Davison, 2004) and the divergence or alignment between perceptions about assessment and assessment practices (Jannati, 2015; Chan, 2008). In the Turkish context, studies on the beliefs and attitudes of L2 teachers about assessment have been carried out in recent years (Yavuz Kırık, 2008; Kavaklı & Arslan, 2019; Ölmezer-Öztürk & Aydın, 2019). Interestingly, the majority of these studies suggested inadequate assessment knowledge and negative opinions regarding teachers' own assessment abilities. Others showed that teachers' beliefs and actual assessment practices differed from each other (Büyükkarcı, 2014; Gonen & Akbarov, 2015; İnan Karagül, Yüksel, & Altay, 2017; Öz & Atay, 2017). Teachers' preferences about assessment were also found to be affecting their actual assessment practices (Han & Kaya, 2014; Öz, 2014; Kirkgoz, Babanoglu, & Ağçam, 2017). While these studies employed introspective data to investigate teachers' experiences and attitudes, how teachers develop their testing and evaluation knowledge and skills in the actual classroom setting is still largely unknown.

The review of related literature uncovered that assessment literacy studies constitute a major part within L2 testing and evaluation research conducted in relation to pre-service teachers in teacher education programs (Xie & Tan, 2019) and in-service teachers (Guerin, 2010; Vogt & Tsagari, 2014; Hakim, 2015; Tsagari & Vogt, 2017; Fard & Tabatabaei, 2018; Xie & Tan, 2019; Xu, 2019; Sultana, 2019). These studies provide contributions to the understanding of assessment literacy and assessment skills of L2 teachers at various points in their carriers. Some of these studies reported teachers' confidence in their assessment literacy (Xie & Tan, 2019) while others suggested further training needs for assessment literacy of teachers (Guerin, 2010; Vogt & Tsagari, 2014; Hakim, 2015; Tsagari & Vogt, 2017; Fard & Tabatabaei, 2018; Xu, 2019; Sultana, 2019).

In the context of Turkey, assessment literacy of L2 teachers (Büyükkarcı, 2016; Mede & Atay, 2017; Ölmezer-Öztürk & Aydın, 2018, 2019; Valizadeh, 2019; Yeşilçınar & Kartal, 2019; Genç, Çalışkan, & Yüksel, 2020) and teacher candidates

(Kavaklı & Arslan, 2019) has attracted the attention of researchers investigating L2 teacher education in recent years. What these studies revealed was that both pre-service and in-service teachers needed to improve their assessment literacy levels regarding L2 assessment. One interesting finding of one of these studies (Yeşilçınar & Kartal, 2020) was that the assessor identity was not adopted by teachers, and this was attributed to a number of factors such as problems in teacher training. Unlike the above assessment literacy studies, Yastıbaş & Takkaç (2018) investigated the factors contributing to the development of L2 teachers' assessment literacy and revealed previous assessment experience, assessment training, and self-improvement to be factors improving the assessment literacy of L2 teachers in this context.

Two review studies that compare Turkish and foreign contexts on the assessment literacy of pre-service and in-service L2 teachers provided similar implications on the assessment literacy of teachers. Sevimel Sahin & Subasi (2019) carried out a systematic review study focusing on the language assessment literacy of both in-service and pre-service teachers in Turkey and in other EFL contexts and uncovered that both pre-service and in-service teachers had low language assessment literacy and suggested enhancing pre-service teacher education in terms of language assessment courses. Another conclusion of this study was that language assessment literacy studies in pre-service EFL contexts were significantly less than studies in in-service EFL contexts. Similarly, the review study of Pehlivan Şişman & Büyükkarcı (2019) regarding the language assessment literacy of EFL teachers in Turkey and in international contexts concluded that teachers had limited language assessment literacy and that assessment courses were considered to be inadequate in both settings.

One major component of assessment studies regarding L2 teacher education is L2 testing and evaluation courses. In recent years, L2 testing and evaluation courses has received more attention and became a research focus for researchers investigating L2 teacher education. These courses form a crucial component of L2 teacher education programs and have been studied in a variety of contexts through different methodologies.

In studies involving L2 testing and evaluation courses in international contexts different methods were involved such as interviews (Johnson, Becker, &

Olive, 1999; Lam, 2015), questionnaires (Brown & Bailey, 2008; Jin, 2010), narratives (Kleinsasser, 2005; O'Loughlin, 2006), descriptive-evaluative research (Mohammadi, Kiany, Samar, & Akbari, 2015), and action research (Giraldo & Murcia, 2019; Restrepo Bolivar, 2020). These provided insights into the status, content, and objectives of the courses; the assessment literacy of the pre-service teachers enrolled in them; and these teachers' progress. When studies involving English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) courses were reviewed, a number of studies stood out. Brown & Bailey's (2008) investigation of the status of language testing courses in various countries looked into several aspects of these courses through a questionnaire conducted with course instructors. The results of this investigation revealed that test critiquing and test analysis received the most coverage in terms of hands-on experiences in theses course. In relation to the general topics taught in these courses, Brown & Bailey (2008) showed that measuring the different skills, testing in relationship to curriculum, and classroom testing practices had higher rating means while item analysis topics, including item writing, were covered in the majority of the courses offered. Among these studies, Jin's (2010) investigation of foreign language teacher education within the context of language testing and evaluation courses in the context of Chinese universities indicated that the aspects of the courses such as classroom practice in test development and educational and psychological measurement were not prioritized. The findings of these studies indicate results quite varied among different teacher education contexts investigated.

In Turkey, English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) courses became a part of L2 teacher education programs' curricula in 1998 (Hatipoğlu, 2017) and the course is generally offered in the fourth year of ELT programs in the majority of Turkish universities while some of them offer this course at different terms (Şahin, 2019). Regarding the syllabi of the ELTE courses offered in Turkish universities, Şahin's (2019) study uncovered that ELTE course instructors frequently based the topics and the syllabi of the course on the main coursebooks they chose to utilize. The second most common way to structure course syllabi was found to be determining core concepts from the related literature (Şahin, 2019). Şahin's study also revealed twenty-four different learning objectives while all of the investigated ELTE courses shared the learning objectives of defining and using fundamental

concepts and principles of language testing and assessment, analyzing and differentiating between test types, and constructing tests for assessing language areas and language skills for different age and proficiency level students (Şahin, 2019, p. 160).

Within the context of Turkey, studies exclusively conducted on L2 testing and evaluation courses have investigated these courses through exploring the needs and views of pre-service teachers, and also course instructors in one case, with regards to the L2 testing and evaluation courses (Hatipoğlu, 2010, 2015; Şahin, 2019; Büyükahıska, 2020). Hatipoğlu's (2010) summative evaluation study on an ELTE course in a Turkish university utilized questionnaires and interviews to uncover the pre-service teachers' views on the course, which revealed pre-service teachers' demand for more practical topics related to testing to be included in the ELTE course. In another study, Hatipoğlu (2015) conducted needs analysis survey questionnaires along with focus group interviews with pre-service teachers. The study implied that receiving training on testing and evaluation through only one course during undergraduate education may not be sufficient to prepare the pre-service teachers for the requirements and challenges of testing and assessment in their prospective teaching careers. Besides, it was concluded that the pre-service teachers had limited knowledge about testing.

In a similar vein, Büyükahıska's (2020) investigation of English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) course through semi-structured interviews with ELT students in a Turkish university indicated that pre-service teachers expressed receiving only one ELTE course was not sufficient and felt the need for further training in assessment. Different from these studies, Şahin (2019) investigated ELTE courses in Turkey through a mixed methods research study involving pre-service L2 teachers enrolled in these courses and the instructors teaching them. Şahin's (2019) study concluded that testing and evaluation courses emphasize the theoretical aspect of testing more than the practical side of it. In contrast with Bailey & Brown's (2008) findings about item analysis practices in various countries' ELTE courses, Şahin (2019) indicated that practices like test analysis and item writing mostly could not be covered in ELTE courses in Turkey due to time constraints. All in all, it can be concluded from these studies that pre-service L2 teachers require further training in testing and assessment while ELTE courses offered in teacher

education programs in Turkey also need improvement to include more hands-on practice for pre-service teachers to develop their testing abilities.

In light of the findings of the studies by Bailey & Brown (2008) and Şahin, one other aspect of ELTE courses in Turkey that may require improvement is test/item analysis and test/item writing. It is essential for pre-service L2 teachers to graduate from teacher education programs prepared for the testing and assessment duties awaiting them in their careers as L2 teachers. One way of preparing them to these duties can be to include test analysis and test writing practices in teacher education. Using pre-made tests by publishers or by another external resource may not be appropriate for L2 teachers' own context or irrelevant for the needs of their students (Brown, 1996). This constitutes one reason for pre-service teachers to be equipped with the necessary skills to write their own tests as properly prepared tests may not always be at their disposal. When it comes to constructing valid tests, the importance of giving and receiving feedback interactionally regarding the improvement of validity of tests and test items has been emphasized within the field of L2 testing and evaluation. As Brown (1996) highlighted, having other colleagues examine the tests prepared by teachers can allow for problems to be noticed prior to administering tests. Interacting with colleagues in the process of constructing and reviewing test items can contribute to increasing the validity of tests.

An exceptional study by Can (2020) set an example of how interaction in item reviewing can contribute to test and item validity. In her study, she looked into EFL teachers' item reviewing interactions in workplace through adopting conversation analytic procedures with a focus on the structural organization of item reviewing and the interactional practices involved, revealing how mutual understanding took place and how decision-making was established. This study also illustrated how problems in test items were noticed and suggestions were provided for solution. Along with these, Can's (2020) study put forth the insufficiency of utilizing checklists for preparing tests and the significance of interaction with the parties involved with regards to the improvement of validity of tests as well as the needs of pre-service teachers in relation to this.

With respect to this significance of interaction in the process of test writing, this study in a sense looks into to what extent pre-service teachers obtain the testing skills required for their future work life as L2 teachers when environments that allow

them to develop tests in interaction are provided in the L2 testing and evaluation classroom. Understanding the processes involved in receiving feedback from peers for testing and evaluation practices of pre-service teachers in classroom interaction and the learning opportunities these processes create would reveal significant results for L2 pre-service teacher education.

The review of L2 testing and evaluation in teacher education indicated a research tendency on investigating the assessment literacy of in-service and pre-service teachers. While this is the case, the micro details of real practices in classroom contexts that constitute the basis of teachers' assessment literacy is not adequately investigated. This study focuses on an L2 testing and evaluation course context with the intention of exploring the micro details of practices of L2 pre-service teachers in the classroom so as to uncover how well pre-service teachers get prepared to construct tests, review test items in interaction, and give feedback to peers. Investigating the micro details of these practices in the L2 testing and evaluation course is important since performing such practices will be expected of them in their prospective careers as L2 teachers and the development of these skills is vital for their testing and assessment abilities.

Summary

The review of literature in this chapter has focused on two main branches of research. The first one focused on interaction in teacher education by reviewing interaction in teacher education settings with a focus on reflection and feedback practices. The second one involved L2 teacher education and testing studies.

The review of interaction in teacher education studies has demonstrated that interaction in teacher education has been investigated mostly with a focus on teachers' teaching abilities while their testing abilities are not adequately inquired in interactional studies. Teachers' development and learning was investigated mostly with a focus on "how to teach?" while "how to test?" has not been explored enough, even though testing is a crucial constituent of the pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) of teachers. In order to understand how the pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) of L2 teachers develop, research on classroom interaction in the undergraduate courses in L2 teacher education is needed as these courses are the places where the basis of teachers' skills related to pedagogical

content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) develop. An investigation of the micro details of classroom interaction in these courses can provide insights into how these skills develop and how teacher education programs may be improved to better suit the needs of pre-service teachers.

The review of L2 testing and evaluation in teacher education indicated a tendency on investigating the assessment literacy of in-service and pre-service teachers. On the other hand, the micro details of real practices in teacher education classroom contexts that constitute the basis of teachers' assessment literacy has not been investigated sufficiently. Investigating the micro details of these practices in the L2 testing and evaluation course is important since performing practices such as item reviewing, feedback giving, and test writing will be expected of them in their prospective careers as L2 teachers. The development of such skills is fundamental for their testing and assessment abilities. For these reasons, this study focuses on an L2 testing and evaluation course context for the purpose of exploring the micro details of classroom interaction of L2 pre-service teachers so as to uncover how well pre-service teachers get prepared to perform duties regarding testing and evaluation practices awaiting them in their prospective careers as L2 teachers.

<h1 align="center">Chapter 3</h1>
<h1 align="center">Methodology</h1>

Introduction

This chapter explains the research method adopted for this study, setting and participants, data collection process, and the processes involved in the analysis of the data. Information regarding the validity and reliability of the study as well as ethical considerations is also provided.

Conversation Analysis

This study adopted Conversation Analysis as the research method. Conversation analysis (CA) is the method of analysis established by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson in the 1960s (ten Have, 2007; Sidnell, 2010). This tradition emerged under the influence of Goffman & Garfinkel's within the field of sociology while it has been used within various fields of research, including applied linguistics (ten Have, 2007; Hoey & Kendrick, 2017). Within the field of applied linguistics, CA has found application area in SLA studies as CA-SLA, which utilize conversation analysis for the study of language learning (Markee & Kunitz, 2015). CA has been adopted in studies of language in use in order to bring evidence to learning from sequences of talk (Hellermann, 2013).

Sidnell (2010) describes CA as "a set of methods for working with audio and video recordings of talk and social interaction" (p. 20). In Hoey & Kendrick (2017) words, CA is "an inductive, micro-analytic, and predominantly qualitative method for studying human social interactions" (p. 1). Markee (2000) defines CA as "a form of [analysis of conversational data] that accounts for the sequential structure of talk-in-interaction in terms of interlocutors' real-time orientations to the preferential practices that underlie, for participants and consequently also for analysts, the conversational behaviors of turn-taking and repair in different speech exchange systems" (p. 21). In light of these definitions, it can be said that CA entails a thorough analysis of recorded talk-in-interaction paying close attention to practices of participants.

CA does not only focus on what is said in interaction but also on how it is said. Markee (2005) expresses that the aim of CA is to explain the orientations of

members in talk to the behavioral practices while co-constructing talk-in-interaction. Kasper & Wagner (2014) state that "CA's central interest is to describe and explain how participants achieve the organization of social action step by step in real time" (p. 173) CA diverges from other approaches for a variety of reasons, one of which is the fact that it works with naturally occurring data regarding talk-in-interaction (ten Have, 2007). The naturally-occurring data analyzed in CA may come from ordinary conversation or institutional talk (Markee, 2000).

CA considers interaction to inherently have an organization, that is, there exists orderliness in talk-in-interaction (ten Have, 2007). It concentrates on naturally occurring interaction, interactions happening in settings other than natural ones are not used or preferred in CA; it adopts an emic perspective and follows an inductive approach (ten Have, 2007). It has a stance against drawing from any exogenous theory when approaching interaction (Kasper & Wagner, 2011). This enables researchers to focus on what is present in the data rather than analyzing it with assumptions or beliefs in mind related to a theory. This is one of the strengths of CA as it allows for different analysts to discover something different within the same data (Sidnell, 2010).

As CA adopts an inductive approach and usually has a stance against exogenous theories, data collection is the initial step in CA. After the collection of data, usually the transcription of the data is next step in CA. Transcription in CA is a meticulous process as the focus is on how something is said rather than focusing only on what is being said (ten Have, 2007). Unmotivated looking in data sessions in order to notice interactional phenomenon or phenomena is the first step of analysis in CA (Kasper & Wagner, 2011). After a phenomenon is determined, a collection of instances is built and the phenomenon is explained in detail (Kasper & Wagner, 2014). The basic practices and terminology related to talk in the transcription and analysis processes of CA explained below.

Turn-taking is considered as an organization that constitutes great importance for talk-in-interaction and it is a form of sequential organization as it involves the order of speakers (Schegloff, 2007). Turns in interaction consists of turn constructional units. Schegloff (2007) refers to turn constructional units (TCUs) as the "building blocks out of which turns are fashioned" (p. 3). TCUs are mostly comprised of items such as words, phrases, clauses, or sentences that are used to

build complete utterances that constitute turns (Schegloff, 2007; Hoey & Kendrick, 2017). In between these turns, transition-relevance places occur. A transition-relevance place (TRP) is a point where a TCU is considered complete and where transition to another speaker is possible (Sidnell, 2010; Hoey & Kendrick, 2017). Though transition to another speaker is possible at a transition-relevance place at the completion of a TCU or a turn, this does not entail that a transition has to occur (Schegloff, 2007). Turn-taking, or turn allocation, occurs when the current speaker selects the next speaker or the next speaker self-selects (Liddicoat, 2007).

Sequence organization refers to a type of sequential organization by which actions performed through turns-at-talk are organized (Schegloff, 2007). Sequence organization consists of adjacency pairs. An adjacency pair refers to two turns or two actions formulated by different speakers in interaction and it is basic form of sequence organization (Hoey & Kendrick, 2017). The first of these two turns or actions is called first pair part (FPP) while the second turn produced by the other speaker is called second pair part (SPP). Although these two turns do not necessarily follow one after the other during interaction (Schegloff, 2007), the absence of a second pair part is noticed as missing since there is a "conditional relevance" between first and second pair parts (Sidnell, 2010).

Repair as used in CA refers to the practices of participants for resolving trouble in interaction. The troubles in interaction may result from misarticulations, wrong word usage, hearing problems, misunderstandings, or other reasons (Kitzinger, 2013). Kasper & Wagner (2014) state that even though the context and turn design assist interaction, understanding/intersubjectivity may still be disrupted and participants may utilize systematic procedures to repair these disruptions in understanding. Repairs can happen in four trajectories as self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair (Seedhouse, 2004a).

Another organizational process involved in conversation is preference organization. The term "preference" as it is used in CA does not imply the speakers' desires, but it hints at the relationship between sequence parts (Schegloff, 2007). Liddicoat (2007) expresses that "[t]he basic distinction made in preference organization is that in a particular context, certain actions may be avoided, or delayed in their production, while other actions are normally performed directly and

with little delay" (p. 111). Thus, preference refers to whether such actions in interaction are realized as they are expected or not. The actions and responses taking place as expected in interaction are called preferred action or preferred response while the opposites are referred to as dispreferred.

Setting, Participants and Data Collection

The setting of this study was an English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) course classroom context in an English Language Teaching (ELT) program in a public university located in Ankara, Turkey. The class consisted of 23 fourth-year ELT students and a professor who instructed the course. 17 of the ELT students that participated in this study were female while 6 were male. The students took this testing and evaluation course during the summer school of the 2018-2019 academic year as part of their final year curriculum. Even though testing and evaluation is an important part of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987), ELTE course did not become a part of Turkish L2 teacher education programs until 1998 (Hatipoğlu, 2017). Most Turkish universities usually offer this course in the fourth year of ELT programs and the course syllabi are generally based on a chosen coursebook or on the core concepts from the related literature (Şahin, 2019).

The course that this study involves took place during the summer school of the 2018-2019 academic year. An ELTE course during the fall term of this university lasts fourteen weeks and has three hours of instruction each week. However, the ELTE course during the summer term lasts six weeks, has seven hours of instruction each week, and takes place on Mondays (3 hours) and Tuesdays (4 hours) (see Table 1 for course outline). For this reason, the summer ELTE course is more intensive than a regular ELTE course. Unlike a traditional lecture-based design, the focal course in this study followed a flipped classroom design. In the first two and a half weeks of the course, pre-service teachers received lectures on teaching and testing, kinds of tests, stages of test development, test writing, validity, and reliability. They also formed peer groups of four to five people (See Table 2) for writing exams and prepared the first drafts of their exams as a group by the end of the second week.

Table 1

English Language Testing and Evaluation Course Outline

Weeks	Days	Topics	Tasks
Week 1	Monday	General introduction to the course Teaching and testing	Form working groups
	Tuesday	Kinds of tests and testing Stages of test development	Reading assigned resources
Week 2	Monday	Validity (Content, Criterion-related, Construct, Face)	-
	Tuesday	Writing Multiple Choice Questions	Submission of Group Tests by Friday
Week 3	Monday	Holiday (No class)	-
	Tuesday	Testing Grammar & Vocabulary Reliability	Submission of feedback on Test Specifications, Multiple choice questions and the sections related to Grammar and Vocabulary by Friday
Week 4	Monday	Testing Reading	Submission of the revised versions of the Grammar and Vocabulary Sections by Wednesday
	Tuesday	Testing Writing	Submission of feedback on the Reading and Writing Sections of the Exam by Friday
Week 5	Monday	Testing Listening & Speaking	Submission of the revised versions of the Reading and Writing Sections of the Exam by Wednesday
	Tuesday	Testing Speaking	Submission of feedback on the Listening and Speaking Sections of the Exam by Friday
Week 6	Monday	Evaluation of test items	Submission of the revised versions of the Listening and Speaking Sections of the Exam by Tuesday
	Tuesday	Review	-

The exams were supposed to be prepared for grades 5, 6, 7, or 8 and had to include 6 sections (Grammar, Vocabulary, Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking). Starting with the third week, the course followed a totally flipped classroom design. The pre-service teachers read the assigned readings at home,

prepared exams and came to class and provided feedback to the exams written by their peers. Each group received feedback from two other groups and were expected to correct their exams in line with the feedback they received. As the course has seven hours in two subsequent days each week, the pre-service teachers did not have as much time as in the fall term to prepare and/or respond to the feedback they received.

Table 2

Peer Groups and Their Members

Group Names	Group Members
Group 1	ECE, SAN, ZEY, ARI, SON
Group 2	MIR, NES, GIZ, MEL
Group 3	EGE, FIR, DER, LIN, BIR
Group 4	DEN, CEY, BER, SER
Group 5	YUS, MER, EDA, CAN, ALP

All of the groups were required to write critical evaluations related to the format, content, appropriateness of the exams prepared by their classmates and they were expected to support their comments with quotations and examples from suitable sources. In line with the feedback they receive, all of the groups were supposed to revise their exam sections and submit them to the Google Group of the course and the university system (METU CLASS). At the end of week six, the revised exams were reviewed in a presentation session where pre-service teachers self-evaluated their exams and the progress they made.

Table 3

The Duration of Recordings

Sessions	Session Type	Duration
Session 4	Feedback on grammar sections	184 minutes
Session 5	Feedback on grammar and vocabulary sections	128 minutes
Session 6	Feedback on reading sections	126 minutes

Session 7	Feedback on writing sections	122 minutes
Session 8	Presentation	168 minutes
Total		12 hourse (728 minutes)

The recorded data used in this study involved the feedback and presentation sessions only. Eight classes were recorded during the summer school in total. The data collected from five of these classes are the subject of this study. These sessions come from weeks three to six of the course and each session correspond to the relevant exam section day (feedback sessions) and the review day (presentation sessions) indicated in the course outline above. In total, 12 hours and 8 minutes of classroom interaction has been analyzed for this study (See Table 3). The data was collected with the help of three video-cameras. One camera was located at the back of the classroom while the two remaining cameras were positioned at the two corners in the front. This positioning was used for every classroom session recorded. Tripods were utilized in order to place the cameras.

Transcription, Building a Collection and Data Analysis

Following the collection of the data, unmotivated looking sessions were carried out and every course session was viewed multiple times in order to uncover patterns in interaction. It was noticed that there were repeated patterns in interaction in the course sessions where feedback giving practices were carried out. These course sessions correspond to the last five of the eight recorded sessions. Several patterns were identified in these five recorded sessions and ALB, one of these patterns identified, was determined as the research subject of this study. One particular aspect of pre-service teacher utterances made this phenomenon recognizable for the researcher. It was noticed that the pre-service teachers in their classroom interaction frequently referred to the students who would take these exams by explicitly uttering the word "students" or the third person plural pronoun "they". When these instances were closely viewed, it was noticed that they involved some assumption on how the students would react to the test items. This led to the decision to call these instances as "Assuming Learner Behavior" ALB. After this, a collection of instances of ALB was built by marking every sequence related to the

determined pattern in interaction (See Table 4). The marked ALB sequences were then transcribed in detail using the transcription conventions of Jefferson (2004) and Mondada (2018). After this, the collection of instances was analyzed for further sub-categorization based on the use and functions of different instances of ALB.

Table 4

Number of ALBs in Sessions

Sessions	Number of Instances
Session 4	26 instances
Session 5	8 instances
Session 6	8 instances
Session 7	18 instances
Session 8	15 instances
Total	75

Validity and Reliability

The transcripts are vital for determining the validity of the claims and observations made in transcript-based research (Jenks, 2011). It is important that the transcripts accurately represent talk and interaction. Transcripts included in CA studies makes the analysis process visible and provides for testing the validity of the researcher's claims and the analytical procedures conducted (Seedhouse, 2004b). Internal validity is related to whether the observations and the claims of a researcher correspond to each other (Bryman, 2012). In CA, internal validity is secured through developing an emic perspective that reflects the participants' point of view (Seedhouse, 2004b). External reliability is about whether the results of a study are generalizable (Bryman, 2012). Seedhouse (2004) expresses that "by explicating the organization of the micro-interaction in a particular social setting, CA studies may at the same time be providing some aspects of a generalizable description of the interactional organization of the setting" (p. 8). As CA is concerned with naturally-occurring interactions, this ensures ecological validity (Mazeland, 2006) since the data directly reflects real-world behavior. Reliability refers to whether the results of a study is consistent and repeatable (Bryman, 2012). In CA

studies, reliability is ensured by how data is presented in transcripts. As CA adopts an emic approach, the transcripts enable "an empirically reliable approximation" of the interaction between participants in talk (Mazeland, 2006). Seedhouse (2004b) highlights that including transcripts of data in studies contributes to the reliability; he also points out that, unlike CA, many other research methodologies do not present primary data in published studies.

Ethical Considerations

To ensure the anonymity of the participants, pseudonyms are given to each pre-service teacher and the professor instructing the course is referred to as the teacher or as "TEA" in transcripts and in analyses. Any third person mentioned during classroom interaction is also anonymized. Ethics Committee Approval for the data collected was granted from Middle East Technical University. Prior to the collection of the data, participants were informed on why and how the course was going to be recorded. Each participant was asked to fill in a consent form for the collection and use of the data.

Chapter 4
Data Analysis

Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of assuming learner behavior (ALB) instances chosen from the collection of instances of ALB. The data analysis is structured in a way that allows to analyze ALBs from feedback sessions first. The functions of these ALB instances also contributed to the order of the extract analyzed in this chapter. Following the analysis of the ALB instances from feedback sessions, instances from the presentation session are analyzed. The presentation session is different than the feedback sessions in that it involves the test writer groups' presentation of the final drafts of their exams and discussing the changes they did to the initial drafts of their exams. The extracts involved in this data analysis are taken from the fourth, sixth, seventh, and eighth recorded sessions of the summer school.

Seventy-five instances of ALB have been discovered through multiple unmotivated looking sessions. Twenty-two instances in fourteen different extracts are included in this analysis. Eleven of these are by feedback providers while Eleven are by test writers. Of the extracts included here, ten are from feedback sessions while four are from the presentation session at the end of the course where all the groups present the final version of their exams.

The ALBs in this chapter are analyzed in sub-headings in accordance with the emergence of ALBs during interaction. These sub-headings look into the use of ALB (1) in order to initiate the problem, (2) in response to the problem already indicated, (3) in order to oppose the feedback provided, (3.1) in counter arguments in response to the use of ALB by feedback providers, and (4) in order to recap the feedback received. In the transcriptions, an arrow ($\rightarrow$) is added next to the lines that involve instances of ALBs to guide the reader.

Use of ALB in order to Initiate the Problem

The extracts analyzed in this section demonstrate the use of ALBs when initiating the problem with focal test item. All instances of ALB in these extracts are provided by feedback provider group member. The first extract analyzed here is

taken from the fourth recorded session of the summer school which is the first feedback session. The session is dedicated to the grammar sections of the exams prepared by the groups. Each group gets feedback from two different groups while other groups can also provide feedback if they would like to add anything. In this extract, group one (ECE, SAN, ZEY, ARI, SON) receives feedback from group four (DEN, CEY, BER, SER) regarding the grammar section of the exam they prepared for fifth grade students. The focal item of discussion is the eighth question.

Extract 1: Between (R4-P1)

```
1     TEA:         … now (0.3) question (.) eight
2                  (3.3)
3     DEN:         hocam we can eliminate (.) er: all the
                   teacher
4                  options (.) from (0.4) between (0.3)
5                  [because (.) if-
6     TEA:         [ca- (0.5) >can i just< before that say that
7                  this question seven (1.4) is +question seven
                                          +walks to group 1--->
8                  (0.7) which: (0.4) mea::ns+ that you think
                                        --->+
9                  (1.0) it's a difficult question
                   (lines 10-23 are omitted)
24    TEA:         *okay now let's* go to (.) question (0.4)
                   *nods at DEN---*
25                 e- eight (0.8) okay
26                 ↑what does it ↑test
27                 (0.5)
28    DEN:         &er:: (0.7) it tests wh questions
      tea          &--->writes on her doc--->line 38
29                 *[a:nd (0.5)=
30    TEA:         *[uh huh
                   *slight nod--->
31    DEN:         =(the other)* next on between but (.)
                             --->*
32    →            er:: it (.) student [doesn't need to-
33    TEA:                             [so wh questions and
```

```
34                    prepositions=
35    DEN:            =yes=
36    CEY:            =°yeah° [>(unintelligible)< (.)=
37    TEA:                    [okay
38    CEY:            =er: difficult question&
                                       --->&
39                    (0.2)
40    TEA:            &okay* &$(1.6)[°so°-
41    DEN:      →                   [umm however the students (.)
                      --->*
      tea             &---1--&
                      1: looks at group 4 and nods
                              $looks at her doc and nods --->line 49
42                    may not know (.) who where when but umm
43                    still can answer because of the bet↑ween
44                    (0.3) it (0.2) it is written the library
45                    and the park %(0.6) [two places (.) then=
46    CEY:                                [°yeah°
      den                              %looks at TEA and gestures
                      with her hands--->
47    DEN:            =it can only be bet↑ween (.)% so (0.2) he
                                             --->%
48                    or she doesn't need to know who where when
49                    °or which°$
                          --->$
50    CEY:            you can just %*[look at=
51    TEA:                         %*[agree*
      tea                            *--2---*
      san                          %takes notes--->line 62
                      2: looks up and wags her index finger at DEN
52    CEY:            +=the right side and you can solve ↓(all)
      tea             +looks at her doc and takes notes--->line 56
53                    the [question
54    TEA:                [exactly just by (.) knowing that we
55                    have two different things (.) the library
56                    (.)↑and the park and (.)what (.) is+
                                             --->+
```

```
57                      +£↑right in the middle is between them+(0.2)£
        tea             +gestures with her hands, looks at CEY+
        cey              £looks at TEA then at doc while nodding----£
58                      er: [and-
59      CEY:                [it's directly c (0.2) there is °no
60                      other option°
61      TEA:            there is (.) there is no other option
62                      (.) okay (0.2) &what do you ↑think&%
                                       &points at group 5 &
                                                     --->%
```

At the beginning of the extract Tea nominates question eight as the focal point of discussion and, after a long pause of 3.3 seconds, Den is seen initiating a comment on the eighth question of the exam section. In lines 3 and 4, she initiates a problematization of the distractor options by using the inclusive "we" pronoun, which refers to either her group or the whole class. She remarks that options can be eliminated based on the inclusion of the word "between" in the correct option of the question. By expressing this, she performs rule policing (Sert & Balaman, 2018) as her statement implies that the options should not be easily eliminated and the correct option should not be reached by this elimination (Heaton, 1990).

Den's as-yet-incomplete account is interrupted by Tea in line 6 as she draws the focus to question seven, which was the previous item discussed in this section. Tea expresses that this question is determined to be the seventh question of this section by the test writers which indicates that they accept it as a difficult question. The elongated part (me::ans) when she refers to the test writers' marks her emphasis on this choice and challenges their choice. Tea walks towards group one and warns them about the order of the questions and asks them to reorder in line with the difficulty level of the questions so that they comply with this rule (Sert & Balaman, 2018). This discussion which continues in the subsequent lines is omitted from the transcript. After her problematization of the order of the questions, Tea once again shifts the focus to question eight in line 24 to 25 and allocates the next turn to Den by nodding at her (Kääntä, 2010). Following an intra-turn pause Tea asks what the question tests.

Den starts her comment with a hesitation marker in line 28 and explains what the question tests, wh- questions and prepositions of place, which is seen to overlap

with Tea's confirmation token in line 30 and receives a slight head nod. As Den changes the focus towards what is problematic about the question, she initiates an ALB by explicitly referring to the "student" in line 32. However, her initiation is interrupted by Tea in line 33. Tea employs a confirmatory repeat (Park, 2014) of Den's utterance about the grammar points tested by this question while reformulating the final part of it. Den provides an approval to this with a compliance token (`yes`) in line 35. Following Den's approval, Cey self-selects and provides a compliance token as well. He also makes a comment on the difficulty level of the question; however, his comment is not completely intelligible as part of it is uttered too fast to comprehend.

After Cey's comment, Tea signals group four to continue in line 40 with her statement (`okay`) accompanied by her nodding at them. After a pause she seems to attempt to move on with her turn. This time Den interrupts Tea with her hesitation marker and she implements the base sequence of problematizing in line 41. Although Den initiated her problematization using the first-person plural pronoun in line 3 with reference to her group or the participants in the class, this time she accounts for the problem with reference to "the students", which resembles the initiation she provided in line 32. She utilizes the contrastive marker "however" that signals an upcoming negative evaluation (Can, 2020) and then initiates problematization with an ALB. She expresses that the students can answer the question solely by focusing on the preposition "between", even if they do not know the wh- questions (`the students (.) may not know (.) who where when but umm still can answer because of the bet↑ween`). Her account for the problem is marked with hesitation markers and provides an example of ALB as she hypothesizes on how potential students may react to this question upon encountering it. From line 44 to 49, Den explains that including names of two places in the question stem leads to "between" as the only preposition of place possible among all the other options provided and that the students can figure out the answer even if they do not know the wh- question words given in the options, which are understood to be the alternatives provided for the other item the students are required to determine in order to complete the question. With her ALB, Den emphasizes her assumption that the students may be led to the correct answer because of the options even if they do not know the answer.

The ALB provided by Den has resemblance to the practice which Leyland (2021) called "invoking the reader". In Leyland's (2021) study, writing tutors providing advice to international students were found to be explicitly referring to the reader of the academic writing as a pedagogical tool during advice-giving sequences. In Leyland's (2021) study, the tutors invoked readers as the end-users of the written product being reviewed in interaction and this invoked party was a non-present category of people that were included in the process. Similar to this practice, Den explicitly refers to the students as the end-users of the test constructed when she provides an ALB in line 44; thus, she "invokes the learners" in her feedback through an assumption on possible learner behavior. Thus, she brings the non-present learners into the discussion by explicitly referring to them. Based on this ALB provided by Den, it can be inferred that the construction of the options directly exposes the correct option to complete the question and her explanation on the question stem and the options reveals that Den treats this as a problem with the item design.

While Den explains why between is the only preposition possible for the answer, Cey provides a confirmatory "yeah" in line 46 in an overlap. Immediately after the end of Den's turn, Cey provides an account of how this helps eliminate options (lines 50, 52, and 53) and emphasizes that the continuation of the question stem reveals the answer to be chosen. Overlapping with the beginning of Cey's turn, Tea shows that Den's account is a preferred contribution through an agreement token (`agree`) and wags her index finger at Den, signaling her agreement with the comment. Tea's agreement token accompanied by her embodied gestures marks Den's comment is an affiliative response which complies with the pedagogical focus. At the same time with Tea's agreement token, San, a member of group one who prepared the exam discussed, is seen taking notes on the notebook she is holding and she continues to do this until the end of the extract. In her follow-up turn in line 54, Tea provides an explicit positive assessment marker (`exactly`) (Waring, 2008) in a turn terminal overlap (Jefferson, 1984) at the completion point of Cey's turn and she gives an account of the problem with the options provided (`just by (.) knowing that we have two different things (.) the library (.)↑and the park and (.)what (.) is ↑right in the middle is between them`), which is in line with Den and Cey's comments. She provides a hesitation marker

after this comment and as she attempts to continue with her turn, Cey self-selects upon Tea's hesitation marker in line 59 and interrupts her comment to once again state that there is only one option possible, which mirrors Den's statement in line 6 where she has stated the options can be easily eliminated (Sert & Balaman, 2018). Tea provides a confirmatory repeat (Park, 2014) of Cey's comment in line 61 (`there is (.) there is no other option`) which indicates that she agrees with the comment. She then points at group five, the other group who is responsible to provide feedback on the grammar section of the exam prepared by group one, and asks them what they think of this question. Both Den's use of the inclusive "we" pronoun in line 3 (`we can eliminate`) and Tea's orientation to group five at the end of the sequence (line 62) signals that this is an instance of multilogue (Schwab, 2011) in which multi-party interaction takes place.

It is seen in this extract that Den's ALB regarding question eight of the focal exam section functions as problematizing the item design. Den is not only describing the problem in the item design but does so by providing account from the perspective of the students who are the potential test takers. So, assuming student behavior emerges as one interactional resource used when reviewing and problematizing test items. This also shows that these teacher trainees do not simply orient to the designed test items as a requirement of the ELTE (English Language Testing and Evaluation) course but as items that are to be potentially completed by the targeted students. This assumption and the design problem highlighted are supported by another group member. The fact that a member of the test writer group (San) takes notes during the discussion on this assumed learner behavior may also indicate that the problem is noticed by the test writer group as well. Moreover, Tea approves of the assumed learner behavior and expands on it to emphasize the problem with the question. She openly provides agreement tokens and nods her head to show approval in multiple places during the discussion.

The next extract also shows an example of how ALB is used when initiating problematization. Extract 2 below takes place during the sixth recorded session which is dedicated to the discussion of the reading sections of the exams prepared by each group. The focal discussion involved in Extract 2 is a part of the reading section of the exam prepared by group three (EGE, FIR, DER, LIN, BIR) and they receive feedback from group two (MIR, NES, GIZ, MEL) during the extract. Group

two member Mir provides feedback while a member of group four, Cey, also adds his comments occasionally. Lin, who is responsible for the questions prepared for the part discussed, responds to the feedback her group receives. Prior to the beginning of the extract, Tea asks for further comments and Mir bids for a turn by providing a pre-pre (Hocam bir şey söyleyebilir miyim/Teacher can I say something). This receives an affiliative response from Tea for Mir to continue in the next turn.

Extract 2(a): Fifty percent (R6-P2)

```
1     MIR:        °yes° (0.3) er:: (0.2) in the (.) first section
2                 they have (.) er five questions (0.2) >as it seems
3                 but< (0.3) all the (0.2) >you know< (.) options
4                 have (0.2) er: questions have five options that
5                 means [that they have (0.2) %twenty=
      cey                                    %nods ---> line 8
6     LIN:            +[yeah (0.3) a lot of questions+
                        +------------nods------------+
7     MIR:        =five
8     CEY:        yeah%
                  --->%
9     MIR:        questions=
10    LIN:         $[yeah        $
11    MIR:        =$[to: (.)    $ answer (.) and then (0.6) *er: (0.2) five
      lin           $nods at TEA$
      tea                                                  *nods--->
12                questions* (.) also (0.2) true false and=
                       --->*
13    LIN:        &+[yeah    &+
14    TEA:        &+[hmm hmm&+
      lin           +--nods--+
      tea         &--nods--&
15    MIR: →      =they have (.) er: (.) >you know< (0.4) er: (.) fifty
16                (0.7) $[fifty percent=
17    NES:              $[fifty percent
      tea              $nods--->
18    MIR:        =to: (0.2) find the correct$ answer and (0.3) for
                                        --->$
19                reading comprehension (0.2) >you know< (0.4) there
```

```
20      →              are (.) thirty (.) questions they can have (0.4) the
21                     half of the points by just +(0.6) s- er:
                                           +gestures with hand--->line 23
22      LIN:    *yeah
                *raises her hand ---> line 24
23      MIR: →  [saying+ true or false
                   --->+
24      TEA:    &[no no  & %0.3) but* (.) here%
                &gestures& %lifts up her paper%
                              --->*
25              (1.0)
26      CEY:    her biri bi soru ama
                but each of them is one question
27              (0.4)
28      TEA:    $hu::h (0.5) but then↑[(0.4) we should (0.2) (.) but we=
                $looks at the paper--->
29      MIR:                          [otuz soru var ama (.) öyle düşünün
                                       but consider it like thirty questions
30      TEA:    =should have a look at (.) the number of$ true and false
                                                 --->$
31              answers (0.2).hh +maybe the: (0.3) er: (0.3) options that
                                 +gestures ---> line 39
32              (0.2) er require not given↑ (0.5) the number of those=
33      LIN:    =%hmm hmm   %=
                 %slight nod%
34      TEA:    =options could be much bigger
35      LIN:    %hmm hmm%
                %-nods--%
36      TEA:    so >the students< (.) are not (.) able to guess true or
37              false=
38      LIN:    =%hmm hmm%=
                 %-nods--%
```

At the beginning of the extract, Mir initiates a comment on the number of questions in the test section and signals an upcoming opposition with the contrastive marker "but" (Can, 2020), which implements the base sequence of problematizing the number of questions in the reading section. Following the contrastive marker,

she explains that there are a lot more questions than is stated (most probably in the exam specifications) by group three since each option of the five questions also includes questions within. Overlapping with Mir's problematization, Lin is seen providing an acknowledgment token (`yeah`) and an anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1996) to Mir's turn-in-progress in line 6 (`a lot of questions`) and provides another confirmation token in line 10. Lin's statement on having a lot of questions displays her affiliation with Mir's stance (Hayashi, 2013) on the problematization initiated at the beginning of the sequence. Her feedback receives the compliance token "yeah" from Cey (group four) in line 8 as well. Mir continues with her comment in lines 11 and 12 to express that there are five additional true-false questions to answer which receives an acknowledgement token from Lin (`yeah`) and another acknowledgement token from Tea (`hmm hmm`) in lines 13 and 14 respectively. It is seen that Mir's feedback receives orientation and responses not only from Tea but also from other classroom members in this interaction (Schwab, 2011).

Starting in line 15, Mir states the students have a fifty percent chance to guess the correct option for these thirty questions and continues to express that the students can get half of the points in this section by writing true or false. Her statement involves micro pauses, elongated hesitation markers (`er:`) and hedges (`you know`) marking hesitation and Nes is seen employing an anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1996) in line 17 following a pause in Mir's account. This account-giving of Mir presents an ALB by alluding to the non-present students. She adopts the third person plural pronoun "they" and states that they have a fifty percent chance to guess the correct answers and get points. With her ALB, Mir assumes that the students may choose to "say" "true" and "false" randomly instead of answering each one of the thirty questions as they may get the answer correct with a fifty percent chance. By employing the verb "say", she refers to the answers that the students may "write", and in a way provides a "pre-enactment" (Leyland, 2016) of what the learners would do in the exam. She indicates that the number of the questions prompts the students to write answers by guessing the answer and get points even if they do not know the answers. By this means, the ALB provided by Mir invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners as she explicitly refers to the students, who are the non-present end-users of the test, by the use of the third person plural pronoun "they". Apart from invoking (Leyland, 2021) the learners, Mir's ALB also

problematizes the design of the questions and performs rule policing (Sert & Balaman, 2018) as she treats the possibility of students' guessing the correct answer to be stemming from the question type (true/false questions) chosen. Because of the nature of this type of question, they are prone to encourage guessing the answer (Heaton, 1990). She problematizes the use of a single type of question for an abundant number of questions. The rule policing that Mir's ALB carries out involves two different aspects of the test items prepared. She implies that both having too many reading comprehension questions and having true-false question type for these is problematic.

This comment of Mir receives another acknowledgment token from Lin in line 22. By providing acknowledgment tokens throughout Mir's account-giving, Lin provides claims of understanding by doing acknowledgment (Koole, 2010) for the problematization on the test items. While she provides an acknowledgment token in line 22, Lin also raises her hand to be allocated the next turn (Sahlström, 2002). However, this is not noticed by Tea as she expresses rejection against Mir's account-giving in line 24. Tea opposes Mir's problematization with polarity markers followed by the contrastive marker "but" and shows something on the exam paper to object (`no no % (0.3) but (.) here`). Upon her rejection, Cey self-selects and remarks that each option is in fact a question on its own. Tea responds to this with a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) (`hu::h`) in line 28. Overlapping with Tea's turn-in-progress, Mir continues with her account to state that there are in fact thirty questions while Tea continues to expresses that they should look into the ratio of the true, false and not given options as the correct answers. She employs the inclusive "we" pronoun, which includes either the feedback givers and test writers or the whole class, and she also produces the hedges "maybe" to downgrade Mir's assertion.

Extract 2(b): Fifty percent (R6-P2)

```
39   TEA:        =so (0.3) and then↑ (0.3) the number (.) of+ (.) maybe
                                          --->+
40               the false statements (.)&∘i- i didn't count them actually
                                        &looks at the paper--->line 45
41               i should have (0.5) one two three: (.) four five
42               (1.9)
```

```
43    MIR:        and (.) each [question is=
44    TEA:                     [s:ix
45    MIR:        =er two point↑ (0.3)& +as it says  +
      tea                           --->& +looks at MIR+
46    TEA:        >%uh huh%<=
                   %-nods-%
47    MIR:        =+and (0.3) so they are going to give (0.4) er: two
      tea          +looks at the paper--->
48                points only+ for true (0.3) &[options↑=
                          --->+
49    LIN:                                    &[(the)
                                              &raises her hand--->line 53


50    MIR:        =or false (0.5) they are not going to give (0.4)
51                er: (0.8) points to false (0.3) options I (.) I couldn't
52                un[der- (0.2) understand (it)
53    LIN:          [the thing is (.) that (.) here& (0.4) *when we are
                                              --->&        *--1--->
                  1: points at the exam paper
54                preparing the exam* (0.3) +i wasn't sure what counted as
                          --->*        +gestures with hand--->line 59
55                ↑one question=
56    TEA:        =$hm hm             $=
                   $raises her eyebrows$
57    LIN:        =or five questions (0.3) so (.) i: in advance (.) i
58                decided prepa- to prepare a lot of questions so i
59                wouldn't be >you know< BAMBOOzled here+
                                              --->+
60                (0.4)
61    TEA:        %hhh
                  %smiles --->
62    LIN:        er:: (0.7) so (0.4) %the (.) er% $(.) in ↑my perspective$
                                      %----2-----% $---points at herself--$
                  2: points at the paper herself, and paper again
63                +(.)we had five questions here↑ (0.3) and five questions
                  +points at the top and bottom of the paper --->
64                here%+ [(0.3) so *er:(0.2)now (0.4) er (0.2) i said that=
```

```
                          --->+
65    TEA:               &[no: (.)& *@(you) have (.) %as (.) miray is%
      lin                          *gestures with hand ---> line 67
      tea            &---3----&                    %-points at MIR-%
             3: horizontal head nod
                                    @nods her head --->
66               right (0.2) you have twenty five (  )
67    LIN:       =you know (.) er (.) there are a ↑lot of questions*
                                                    --->*

68               $now (.) i (.) i understand that@ you know$=
                 $-----------points at exam paper---------$
                                    --->@
69    TEA:       =hmm hmm=
70    LIN:       =*s- (.) the past few weeks↑ (0.4) so that's why↑ i said
                  *gestures with her hands ---> line 73
71               that i should @reduce the number (.) of the qu↑estions=
      tea                       @nods her head ---> 74
72    TEA:       =hmm hmm=
73    LIN:       =i already know that*
                                    --->*
```

In line 39, Tea states that she did not count the options and starts counting them to determine the ratio. At this point, we see that Tea's comment is marked with intra-turn pauses and hesitation markers. During Tea's comment on the ration of the options Lin is seen once again claiming understanding by providing acknowledgement tokens (Koole, 2010) in multiple different points. While Tea counts the options, Mir initiates another problematization on the grading of the questions in line 43 and expresses her confusion about how many points each answer is going to get. During her turn, Lin bids for a turn one more time by raising her hand (Sahlström, 2002); however, this goes unnoticed by Tea. This problematization of Mir does not receive orientation from Lin or Tea and Lin initiates a response to Mir's prior problematization regarding the number of questions.

In line 53, Lin self-selects and explains the reason why they designed to have so many questions stating that she did not know how the questions were counted (i wasn't sure what counted as ↑one question or five questions), which receives an acknowledgement token from Tea in line 56. Tea also raises her

eyebrows while providing this token, which signals understanding. Lin continues in line 57 to defend her design saying that she included so many questions in order not to face a problem in class. Tea responds to this with a smile while Lin states that her initial thought was that they had only ten questions in total by providing deictical reference by pointing at the questions on their exam paper Mondada, 2007). Overlapping with Lin's continuing explanation, Tea rejects Lin's account-giving on having only ten questions (`no: (.) (you) have (.) %as (.) miray is% right`) and displays agreement with Mir's earlier comment (from lines 5, 7, and 9) by pointing at her and providing a partial modified repeat (Stivers, 2005) of her explanation on the number of questions (`you have twenty five (  )`). Lin responds to this with an explicit claim of understanding (lines 67-68) while pointing at the exam paper again (Mondada, 2007). She continues to express that she acknowledges that they should reduce the number of questions and provides an explicit claim of knowing in line 73. Her response gets acknowledgement tokens from Tea in lines 69, 72, and 74.

Extract 2(c): Fifty percent (R6-P2)

```
74    TEA:        >∘hmm hmm good∘<@ (0.3) but (.) then (0.3) er: (.) er (.)
                                --->@
75                +(but) miray (.)+ mentioned something very important
                  +-points at MIR-+
76                she said=
77    LIN:        =%hmm hmm%=
                   %-nods--%
78    TEA:        =even if the students don't know the answer (0.3) they
79                can write (.)+true false true false true @false↑=
                              +gestures with her hand---> line 85
                                                    @smiles->line 82
80    LIN:        =%hmm hmm%=
                   %-nods--%
81    TEA:        =and they might (.) have a high chance of guessing the
82                correct answer@+=
                              --->@
83    LIN:        =%yes (.)∘okay∘ (.) not given%=
                   %------------nods----------%
```

```
84    TEA:      =this is the reason (.) why (.) whenever (0.2) okay (0.4)
85              hopefully (.)+ eh he you are not going to take any other
                      --->+
86              courses from me (.) .hh &[whenever  &=
87    EGE:                              &[no we will&=
                                        &----nods---&
88    TEA:      eh he he
89    EGE:      =[lexicon=
90    TEA:      =[wheneve- (0.5) whenever i prepare (0.6) $er: (.)  true
                                                         $--4-->line 106

              4: gestures with her hands
91              false questions in my exams↑ (0.2) usually (0.3) the
92              number of the trues (0.2) or the falses (.) is much
93              bigger (0.3) %[right↑%=
94    LIN:                   %[hmm    %
                             %-nods--%
95    TEA:      =er (.) on one exam i have (.) lots of trues↓ (0.4) and
96              (.) on the other exams (.) i have lots of falses↓=
97    LIN:      =%[hmm hmm%
98    TEA:       %[why↑    %(0.2) to prevent this (.) true false true
      lin        %--nods--%
99              false (0.2) +er: (.) structure=
                            +smiles ---> line 104
100   LIN:      =%okay%=
                 %nods%
101   TEA:      =or pattern (0.2) so (0.2) do the same thing
102   LIN:      %okay%
                %nods%
103   TEA:      to avoid↑ students' guessing↑ (0.3) er: (.) the correct
104              answer fifty percent of the %time↑+ (0.2) [give%=
                                             --->+
105   LIN:                                                 [yeah%
                                             %-------nods------%
106   TEA:      =let's say (.) lots of falses↑ (.) &or lots of trues↓$
                                                   --->$
      mir                                          &raises her hand--->
```

```
107   LIN:      *so er: (0.3)& the (.) heaton book said the same so (0.2)
                *gestures with her hand ---> line 111
                     --->&
108              %if you want to eliminate the >you know< fifty fifty
      tea        %---nods---> line 111

109              chance↓ (0.2) you should add not given (.) they sho- so i
110              added not given because @[of that*%
111   TEA:                              @[correct*% (0.2) but ↑also (.)
                                          --->*
                                          --->%
                                        @gestures with hands--->
112              >together with the< [not given↑@=
113   LIN:                           [okay      @
                                        --->@
114   TEA:      =try not to have an equal number of trues and falses↓
115   LIN:      %[okay%
                %nods-%
```

Following her acknowledgement in line 74, Tea provides an explicit positive assessment marker (Waring, 2008) (good) and adopts the contrastive marker "but" for once again drawing the focus to Mir's initial problematization starting in line 15. She reformulates Mir's account to highlight the fact that students can guess the correct answer by writing true or false randomly even if they do not know the answer. This comment of Tea receives claims of understanding through acknowledgement tokens (Koole, 2010) from Lin in lines 77 and 80. After this, Lin provides a confirmation token followed by an acknowledgement token and utters the phrase "not given" in line 83. This utterance does not get any response or orientation from Tea at this point of interaction. In line 84, Tea explains that she prefers to have a greater number of either true or false answers in the exams she prepares in order to prevent students from guessing the answer fifty percent of the time and suggests Lin to do the same thing in the exam her group wrote. Tea's explanation on how she prepares her true/false questions receives a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) from Lin in line 94 and her explanation as with her suggestion gets another claim of understanding (Koole, 2010) from Lin in line 97 and also the acceptance tokens "okay" in lines 100 and 102, which displays Lin's acceptance of Tea's suggestion.

Mir raises her hand to take a turn (Sahlström, 2002) but does not receive orientation from Tea. Following this sequence, Lin refers to an external resource (which is a resource they were required to read prior to coming to class) in line 107 while approving of Tea's comment and explaining the reason for including the "not given" option. Tea confirms the use of not given in line 111 (`correct`), but suggests that it should be used with one of the true-false options outnumbering the other. In lines 113 and 115, Lin provides acceptance tokens "okay" to Tea's suggestion.

What is interesting about this extract is that the test writer initially orients to the ALB instance provided by Mir only minimally by providing confirmation token (`yeah`) and does not include a comeback to this part of the feedback she received in her response which she started in line 53. She only responds to the criticism on the number of the questions they have in the section of the exam discussed and explains the rationale behind having so many questions. However, right after Lin's explanation of the rationale, we see that Tea reminds Lin of the feedback given to her (`(but) miray (.) mentioned something very important`) in line 75 and continues to expand on the ALB originally provided by Mir. Only after Tea's rephrasing of Mir's comment do we see a further orientation from Lin in relation to this comment (`yeah (.)°okay° (.) not given`) and later she expands on this starting in line 107 in her explanation on why she thought providing "not given" option can solve the problem with the design pointed out by Mir. Tea suggests a greater number of true or false answers regarding both Mir's ALB and Lin's defense on the inclusion of not given option. Based on this fact, it is implied that including "not given" option is not enough as a solution, which makes Mir's ALB a valid comment concerning the problem with the item design in the reading section of group three.

The same aspect of true-false questions is problematized with the use of ALB in Extract 3 below during another sequence which involves the exam written by group four. This extract also takes place during the sixth recorded session in which the reading sections of the groups are discussed. In this extract, it is seen that the reading section of the exam prepared by group four (DEN, CEY, BER, SER) receives feedback from group two (MIR, NES, GIZ, MEL), who also provided the feedback for the reading section of group three in the previous extract. In Extract 3, another member of group two, Nes, draws the focus to the true-false questions prepared for a reading passage included in the reading section of group four. Just

as Mir highlighted earlier, Nes also problematizes the fact that students can find the correct option just by randomly writing true or false in the questions.

Extract 3: True false (R6-P3)

```
1     NES:        hocam also there is a chance: (.) o:f finding the correct
                  teacher
2     →          option +(.) um: (0.7) er: fifty percent &(.) and rather
                        +gestures with her hand--->
      tea                                             &nods --->
3                 than+ %reading& this one=
                  --->+ %points at the paper ---> line 5
                          --->&
4     TEA:        =hmm [hmm %
5     NES: →           [they% $can just select true true &[true and&
6     TEA:                                                &[exactly &
                                                          &---nods--&


      nes                    --->% $gestures with head and hand--->
7     NES:        there would be (0.2) correct answers$ (.) *rather than*
      tea                                            --->$    *slight nod *
8                 &reading this one (0.5)& [i think (0.3) maybe↓=
9     TEA:                                 [and wasting their time
      nes         &--lifts up the paper--&
10    NES:        =*%maybe: (0.2)% they can change the: (0.2) &true false&
                    %---shrugs---%                            &-----1----&
                  1: points at paper
      tea          *looks at the paper she is holding--->
11                >format< because (.)+one of the (0.5) er:* group+ $that
                                      +-lifts her index finger up-+
                                                    --->*         $-2-->
                  2: points at her group members
12                we give (0.2) er we gave &feedback&$ (.) they also just
      tea                                  &--nods--&
                                                    --->$
13                used %true and false and it-% (0.2) i *think that it's
                       %--lifts up the paper--%         *---3---> line 15
                  3: gestures with hand and horizontal head nod
```

```
14                    not testing anything [(0.3) it- (0.2) they- *
15    TEA:                                 [hmm hmm (0.5) $for    *the fifth
                                                          --->*
                                                       $gestures --> line 21
16                    graders↑ (0.2) for the sixth graders↑ (0.2) that (.)
17                    might (.) be (.) okay↓ (0.7) but (.) for the seventh (.)
18                    and eighth graders (.) >(you) should< definitely have not
19                    given↑ (0.2) to make it &a little bit& more compli↑cated
      nes                                     &-slight nod-&
20                    (0.3) and the type of questions *you're asking (0.3)
      nes                                             *head nod --->
21                    should be varied$* &(1.0) okay&=
      cey                        --->$  &---nods---&
                                 --->*
22    NES:→          =since they are young children (.) [they don't %want to
                                                                    %--4-->
                      4: points at the paper
23                    read% (0.4) &er: sentences&
                      --->%        &--gestures---&
24    CEY:                                        [°so° (1.2) we may
25                    use (.) +justification↑
                              +gestures--->
26                    (0.6)+
                      --->+
27    TEA:            .hh $you can ask for justification but that is (.) even
                          $gestures with hand---> line 40
28                    better (.) so (.) we have a number of levels↓ remember
29                    heaton↑ *(0.2) he says* (0.2) one option (.) to improve
      cey                     *--head nod---*
30                    that true false (.) guessing game↓ &(0.3)& is to ask not
      cey                                                 &nods &
31                    given (0.4) even better option↑ (.) to make your
32                    questions even more difficult (0.4) giving more
33                    information related to their reading knowledge↑ (0.2) is
34                    asking for justification
35    CEY:            %hmm hmm%
                      %--nods-%
```

```
36    TEA:      and (0.2) for the ↑eighth graders↑ (.) i think (.) the
37              second option (.) is much better (0.5) ↑first (.) adding
38              not given↑&(0.3)&and (.)also asking for justifi*[cation*=
cey                        &nods &
39    CEY:                                                    *[yeah  *
                                                              *-nods--*
40    TEA:      =but (.) only for the f:alse (0.3) statements$=
                                                    --->$
41    CEY:      =%hmm hmm%=
                %-nods--%
```

The extract starts with Nes problematizing the design of the reading section prepared by group four and she states that the correct option can be guessed with a fifty percent chance in lines 1 and 2. Then, she expresses that the students may choose options randomly (`they can just select true true true`) instead of reading the text while making a deictical reference to the problematized test section by pointing at the exam paper (Mondada, 2007). She states that students may find the correct answers without reading. Like her group member's comment in the previous extract, Nes refers to non-present students with her ALB. The use of the third person personal pronoun "they" alludes to the students who will take the exam and invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners by assuming what they may possibly do upon encountering this item. Once again, the design is problematized as it is treated to be the source of the undesired outcome. Nes highlights what the students may prefer to do in her ALB by using the third-person plural pronoun "they" and emphasizes that students may answer the true/false questions randomly rather than reading the text as there is a high chance of finding the correct option without effort by simply guessing the answer of the true/false questions (Heaton, 1990). By using this ALB, Nes actually demonstrates the problem by making it more observable in students' behaviors. Thus, she uses ALB in order to bring evidence for the problem as well as demonstrating the problem. Tea provides an acknowledgement token (`hmm hmm`) in line 4 to Nes's comment on the fifty percent possibility of finding the answer and responds with a compliance token in line 6 (`exactly`) following Nes's ALB. It is also observed that in line 9 Tea provides an anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1996) to Nes's assumption on learners' preferring not to read the text by

stating this would waste students' time (`and wasting their time`), which shows that Tea affiliates with the stance of Nes on the problematized design (Hayashi, 2013). The tokens combined with the supporting comment suggests that Tea accepts Nes's ALB and agrees with it. Nes's statement also signals an act of policing since she highlights that this is a reading comprehension section with questions entailing true or false as an answer like the instance in Extract 3. This act of rule policing is acknowledged and confirmed by Tea in line 6 and line 9.

In line 10 Nes initiates a solution following the hedge "maybe" and suggests changing the format of the questions (`they can change the: (0.2) true false >format<`) combined with a deictical reference by pointing at the exam paper (Mondada, 2007). She gives reason to this by referring to the feedback they provided to group three (see Extract 2) where she performs self-initiated self-repair in line 12 and continues to explain that one of the groups that they provided feedback to (group three) used the same format while pointing at her group members (Mondada, 2007) to indicate that by "we" she refers to her group. Then, she enounces that this type of questions does not test anything. Her attempt to continue with her turn involves hesitation markers and hedges. Overlapping with this part of Nes's turn, Tea first provides an acknowledgment token (`hmm hmm`) and initiates another comment interrupting Nes. Starting in line 15, Tea expresses that such a format would be suitable for five to seven graders but it is not appropriate for eight graders, which is the grade for which this exam is prepared. In order to provide a solution to the problem with the item design, she states in the remainder of her comment that the option of "not given" should be added for this level and the format should be varied.

Nes remarks in line 22 that the students would not want to read such a text (`since they are young children (.) they don't want to read (0.4) er: sentences`) making another deictical reference by pointing at the paper (Mondada, 2007) once more. Hence, she provides another ALB that invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners by referring to how they would possibly react to the test item. This statement is not only an ALB, but it also provides supporting argument to her prior ALB starting in line 2.

In an overlap with Nes's comment, Cey provides another solution to the problem with the item design by suggesting that they can ask for students to provide

justifications to their answers. This marks that Nes's feedback was oriented to by classroom members other than Tea (Schwab, 2011). Tea's turn in line 27 initially provides agreement to Cey's suggestion by employing a confirmatory repeat of his utterance (Park, 2014), which is followed by the contrastive marker "but" and an expansion on her earlier suggestion of including "not given" option by referring to one of the resources the trainee teachers are supposed to read for the course. She expresses that the book recommends to add not given as a means to prevent students from guessing and asking for justification to enhance the difficulty level of their questions. By doing so, Tea provides a reference to a past learning event (Can Daşkın, 2017; Can Daşkın & Hatipoğlu, 2019) as she treats the external resource in a way that suggests they have studied it in the classroom as well as reading it as a preliminary resource (`remember heaton`). Following her explanation of what the book suggests, Tea continues to state that the solution with both the not given option and asking for justification is a better option and is suitable for eight graders – the grade for which group four prepared this exam. Cey claims understanding through acknowledgement tokens (Koole, 2010) (lines 35 and 41) during Tea's explanation and he shows alignment with Tea's suggestion on asking for justification with a compliance token in line 39. Following this extract Tea makes suggestions on the grading of these questions.

When the responses Nes's suggestion received are considered, it is seen that her ALB, which not only problematizes the item design but also accounts for the problem, is recognized and approved both by Tea and by the test writer group member Cey. During Nes's comment, Tea provides acknowledgement tokens and expands on the assumption with a supporting comment regarding students' wasting their time reading the text. Moreover, it is observed that Tea provides a further support for the instance of ALB by stating that the item design is not suitable for the age group this exam is intended for. Just after this, Tea suggests a solution for the problem with the item design as well. It is understood that Cey also accepts this ALB problematizing the item design since he also suggests a solution for this problem in his turn following Tea's suggestion and Nes's statement. The fact that both Tea and Cey provide ways to solve the problem with the item design implies that both parties accept the assumption on possible learner behavior and that this is a problem with the item design as the format of the questions allows for students to guess.

Use of ALB in response to the Problem Already Indicated

The extracts in this section involves instances of ALB which are employed after the problem with the focal test item has been indicated. The ALBs in these extracts are formulated by feedback provider groups as well. The first extract in this section is Extract 4, takes place during the fourth recorded session.

The focal point of discussion in Extract 4 is the grammar section of the test written by group three, which has instructions and rules provided as a one-page explanation at the beginning of the grammar section. These explanations apply not only to the grammar section but also to the whole sections of the exam prepared by group three, which is intended to be used with sixth grade students. One aspect of these explanations, the instructions provided in that page, are the central point of the discussion. The members of group two (MIR, NES, GIZ, MEL) are the current feedback providers in this extract while group three (EGE, FIR, DER, LIN, BIR) are the test writers who receive feedback.

Extract 4: Instructions (R4-P2)

```
1     NES:        also (ins)-
2     EGE:        and they do (0.4) agree to it (.) a- [a- a- agree with it
3     NES:                                             [also (.) (the)
4                 instructions are s- (.) er it's (.) instructions
5     EGE:        right=
6     NES:        =seem &to be: a bit hard to understand
      tea               &nods her head ---> line 9
7                 [for that level
8     EGE:        [right [i & %thought % (0.5)=
9     MIR:              [or& %too many%
      tea               --->& %----1---%
                  1: points at NES and looks at her while nodding
10    EGE:        =that part would be *(.) explained (0.2) by the
      tea                             *looks at EGE ---> line 14
11                instructor
12                (0.4)
13    MIR:        yes but [the* vocabu&[laries
14    EGE:                [so *
                          --->*
```

```
15   TEA:                              &[>no no no no no<&(0.3) instructions↑
                                       &-raises her hand-&
16                     (0.5) er (.) +should never need extra explanations
                                     +gestures in the air ---> line 19
17   EGE:              s:o this [includes the-
18   TEA:                       [explanation of the instruct- instruction for
19                     the instruction+ %(0.2) never%
                                     --->+ %-----2-----%
                       2: horizontal hand movement and head gesture
20   EGE:              so this include the first p- (.) this page as well
21   MIR:              &[yes
22   TEA:              &[this page as well&
                       &--nods her head---&
23   EGE:              okay
24   TEA:              as well
25   MIR:              it's so hard (0.2) *&if &
                                          *gestures with her pen --->line 30
     tea                                  &-3-&
                       3: nods at MIR
26   EGE:              okay well then [(    )
27   MIR:                            [if sometimes i miss (.) what er: (0.2)
28                     the >instructor< [(0.9) is explaining=
29   NES:                              [i felt %scared
     tea                                      %nods--->
30   MIR: →           =so %(0.8)*$i >couldn't-< i wouldn't understand that if i
                       --->% --->*$points at the paper NES is holding--->
31        →           (0.2) er: if i$ was a (.) sixth grade student
                                    --->$
32   EGE:              °okay° (0.2) well then (0.2) i thought maybe: (.)
33                     &we [needed&=
34   MIR:              &   [not   &
                       &-----4----&
                       4: wags her pen disapprovingly
35   EGE:              =like an extra instructor (.) so then (0.2)
36                     they [would=
```

```
37    MIR:              [yes
38    EGE:              =+explain↑ >but then no< okay (0.2)+ in [that case
39    MIR:                                                      [yes
      tea       +nods her head horizontally      +
40    EGE:      your criticism is valid
41    BIR:      (        )
```

Nes attempts to start a new feedback sequence in line 1. Her attempt is cut short by Ege's turn-in-progress which is related to the previous feedback sequence and in which he explains a function of one of the rules provided at the beginning of the exam. Nes restarts her first attempt which overlaps with the final turn constructional unit (TCU) of Ege's comment and she continues to point out that the instructions are problematic. Nes initiates a problematization of the difficulty level of the instructions provided in the explanatory page, stating that they are not appropriate for sixth grade students (`also (.) (the) instructions are s- (.) er it's (.) instructions seem to be: a bit hard to understand for that level`)., which also displays her orientation to an assumed shared testing principle (Can, 2020) on the difficulty level of the instructions. By stating this, she expresses that students in that grade in general would have problems with these instructions. In response to this, Tea slowly nods during Nes's comment starting in line 6 and lasting until after her turn is over. Considering the fact that Tea points and nods at Nes in line 9 after her comment, implying that Nes's comment is approved and treated as a preferred and affiliative response by Tea. Nes's comment also gets a supporting comment in line 9 from her group member Mir who states that the instructions may be excessive.

During Nes's comment on the difficulty level of the instructions, Ege provides a minimal agreement token in line 5 latching with Nes's turn. Overlapping with the final TCU of Nes, Ege once again provides a minimal agreement token (line 8) and employs the epistemic phrase "I thought" while introducing his epistemic stance (Kärkkäinen, 2012) on how the instructions would be explained to the students. Following Ege's defense, Mir provides a "pro-forma" agreement (Schegloff, 2007) with a compliance token followed by the contrastive marker "but" where she refers to the vocabulary involved in the instructions (`yes but the vocabularies`). This overlaps with Ege's continuing turn in the next line.

At this point, Tea initiates a comment in line 15 with polarity markers (`>no no no no no<`) to show her disagreement and objects to such an extra explanation from an instructor (Sert & Balaman, 2018) by problematizing such a practice. Tea's objection seems to be addressing the whole class as she formulates her objection as a general rule (Schwab, 2011). During Tea's objection, Ege initiates demonstration of understanding (Koole, 2010) in line 17; however, this initiation is cut by Tea's continuing comment. Ege once again self-selects in line 20 and demonstrates his understanding of the problem with the instructions on the initial page of the exam. In response to Ege's demonstration of understanding, Mir provides a confirmation token in an overlap with Tea, who provides a confirmatory repeat of the final TCU of Ege's response while nodding (Park, 2014). Upon these confirmations, Ege produces an acceptance token (`okay`) to these confirmations in line 23, which shows his agreement. After this, it is observed that Mir continues with the problematization of the instructions by stating that it is hard to understand the instructions once the listener loses track of the instructor's explanations, which is in line with Nes's earlier account.

Ege displays agreement and initiates an explanation in line 26, but is cut by Mir's continued turn in the next line. Following Mir's comment, Nes initiates another turn accompanied by a deictical reference by pointing at the exam paper that Nes holds (Mondada, 2007). Along with her deictical reference, Mir expresses that she felt scared by the instructions while Mir initiates a new comment in line 30 to say that she would not understand the instructions if she was a sixth-grade student, which constitutes an example of ALB as she highlights the fact that the students may experience such a confusion upon facing these instructions in the exam. This instance shows that Mir alludes to the non-present students who will take this exam with her statement where she adopts a hypothetical conditional to imply possible student reaction (`i wouldn't understand that if i (0.2) er: if i was sixth grade student`). This allusion invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners during Mir's feedback for her peers as her ALB implies that the students who may take this exam would struggle when reading these instructions. Her invocation also clarifies and exemplifies unfolding advice (Leyland, 2021) since her ALB articulates how the instructions may have a negative impact. This supports the teacher's advice on not having extra explanations for the instructions. This instance of ALB also

problematizes the design of the test since the construction of the instructions is treated by Mir as being erroneous.

Next, Ege is seen once again self-selecting in line 32 to explain what he had in mind when writing those instructions. He first provides an acknowledgment token (`okay`) and proceeds with a statement once again involving the epistemic phrase "I thought" and reformulates his earlier account from line 8 to 11, where he introduced his epistemic stance (Kärkkäinen, 2012). In lines 32 to 38, it is clearly observed that Ege is undergoing a change of state as a result of Nes and Mir's account with ALB as well as Tea's support of this account. His reformulation of his earlier stance is disapproved by Mir in line 34 both through the negative polarity marker "not" and embodied action, and she later provides compliance tokens in lines 37 and 39 to Ege's expression of his change of stance. Tea also shows disapproval through a nod in line 38 during Ege's continued explanation to signal that it is not acceptable to have an extra explanation provided by another instructor. Upon receiving Tea's disapproval through a nod, Ege adopts the contrastive marker "but" (line 38) and accepts that his stance is problematic (`then no`) and provides the acceptance token "okay". After this, he explicitly accepts Nes's and Mir's accounts in line 40 (`okay (0.2) in that case your criticism is valid`). This shows that Ege actually does not challenge the problem in the item. As Ege's suggested solution is not accepted and openly rejected (lines 15 to 24) by Tea, this leads to Ege's acceptance of the problem, demonstrating that Tea's epistemic authority also plays a role on this display of agreement. But it is after Nes's and Mir's accounts that Ege more explicitly displays agreement (line 40) to the problem.

It is seen in this extract that the ALB provided by Mir in fact supports and elaborates on the problem highlighted by Nes in lines 3 to 7 and she also reformulates Nes's account, making it clearer. During her initiation of problematizing, Nes does not openly employ ALB. However, as Nes and Mir elaborate on the problem and provide account supported by Tea, Mir's ALB emerges later in interaction and it projects what Nes problematized at the beginning. Instead of initiating the problem, Mir uses ALB in support of the problematization of Nes.

Like Extract 4, the next extract also presents an example of how ALB is used by a feedback provider in response to the problem already indicated. The following

extract, Extract 5, takes place during the seventh recorded session of summer school and it is dedicated to the feedback on the writing sections of the exams prepared by the groups. The sequence in this extract involves group five (YUS, MER, EDA, CAN, ALP) receiving feedback on a question in the writing section of their exam. Tea and Nes (group two) provide feedback to the question and Yus responds to these feedbacks. The question discussed in the extract is a writing question which requires the students to write why people visit the places listed/mentioned in the question.

Extract 5: For fun (R7-P1)

```
1     TEA:      *okay so (.) .hh wh- why people go↑ (0.2) to: (.) er:
                *gestures with her hand---> line 7
2               the↑ (.) er: (0.2) >in one or two< sentences (0.2)


3               in- in one sentence write why people go to the places
4               %listed below↓% (0.4) okay (.) >this is let's say<
                %-----nods----%
5               the new instruction +(0.8) u:m (.) and you shouldn't
      nes                            +raises hand---> line 13
6               have the parenthesis↑ (.) and why i:s: (.) the library:
7               (.) or the hospital or the bank (0.3) in capitals↓* (0.6)
                                                             --->*
8               &okay↑ (0.9)& @and i said (.) people go to the libraries↑
      yus       &slight nod & @takes notes--->
9               (.) +to read books  + &(0.5)@ is that enough
                    +points at paper+ &---1--->
                                            --->@
                1: raises eyebrows and gestures with palm facing up
10              (1.7)&
                --->&
11    YUS:      ◦(in) (.) i guess◦ £&(0.3) it's enough
                                    £smiles--->
      tea                            &smiles--->
12              (0.9)£&
                --->£
                 --->&
```

```
13    TEA:      okay (0.3) now (0.2) %in that+ @s- in that s- e- er:
                                     %points at paper--->
                                           --->+ @---2---> line 15
                2: walks forwards towards group 5
14              exercise↑% (0.5) +i didn't understand (0.2) whether you
                        --->%       +gestures--->
15              expect me to write+ (.)@*one sentence↓ (1.0)* %>or< three
                                   --->+   *-shows one finger--* %shows two
                fingers--->       --->@
16              sentences↓ (0.2)% &>or< two sentences
                               --->% &shows two fingers--->line 18
17              (0.5)
18    YUS:      *er: (0.2) er (0.3) each-*&=
                *---looks at his paper---*
                                       --->&
19    TEA:      =$>i mean< (0.3) er: (.) >what i mean by that is< (0.3)
                 $gestures---> line 24

20              do you (.) >er< (.) expect me to write about (.) the
21              library↑ (.) and the hospital↑ (.) and the bank↑ (0.4)
22              or do ↑you expect me to choose just one place (0.7) and
23              to describe why people are going there↓
24              £(1.2)$
      yus       £looks at his paper--->
                 --->$
25    YUS:      er: (0.4) you have to- (0.5) answer all of the: (0.3)£
                                                                --->£
26              places↑=
27              (0.5)
28    TEA:      *hmm hmm      *
      yus       *clears throat*
29    YUS:      =£you have to: (0.2) write (.) one or two sentences
                 £gestures--->
30              about (.) just one of ∘them∘ (0.4) but for each£
                                                          --->£
31              (1.2)
```

```
32   TEA:        +so %where are my instructions↑+ (0.3) telling me that
                 +------horizontal head nod-----+
                    %holds up the exam paper ---> line 36
33               (1.0)
34   YUS:        we'll (write) it
35               (0.3)
36   TEA:        $○okay○% (0.5)$ please
                 $-----nods----$
                    --->%
37               @(2.2)
                 @walks backwards--->
38   NES: →      $○they can○ even %say that we go for fun@%
                 $raises hand, gestures---> line 40   --->@
     tea                          %-----looks at NES------%
39               (0.3)
40   TEA:        +↑exactly$+ £(0.2) so would you accept that↑£
                       --->$
                 +----3----+ £--------looks at group 5-------£
                 3: nods and gestures with left hand
41               (0.7)
42   NES:        the ques-
43   TEA:        %so people >go to the-< (0.2) if they say (.) people
                 %gestures ---> line 46
44               go to the libraries for fun (0.5) people go to the
45               hospitals (0.2) for fun↑ (0.3) and people go to the
46               bank (0.4) for fun (0.4)% $+would you       + accept that↓
                                   --->% $+raised eyebrows+
                                           $---4---> line 49
                 4: gestures with palm facing up
47               (1.2)
48   YUS:        ○no○
49               %(2.6) %$
                 %smiles%
                    --->$
50   TEA:        *because grammar-wise↑ (0.4) the sentences are correct
                 *gestures --->line 52
```

```
51              (0.7) and (.) content-wise↓ (0.2) there might be some
52              people (0.6) @who ↓go (0.2) to the banks for ↑fun* (0.7)
                             @walks forwards towards G5--->  --->*
53              &right↑@ (1.3)& so (0.2) %<please be more specific> with
     yus        &-slight nod--&
                --->@                    %gestures, walks backwards--->
54              your (.) *instructions↓*%
     yus              *--slight nod-*
                             --->%
```

The extract starts with Tea recapping the instruction of the focal question which has been corrected right before the beginning of the extract. Following this she criticizes the use of parentheses in the question in lines 5 to 6 and problematizes the fact that the names of the places, for which students are expected to provide explanations on why people visit them, are written in capitals. She follows with a comprehension check (okay↑) which receives a head nod from Yus. Then, Tea reads the answer she wrote for the reason why people visit libraries in lines 8-9 while providing a deictical reference by pointing (Mondada, 2007) at the exam paper when she reads the focal part of the answer that the question asks for (to read books) and asks group five whether the answer she came up with for the question is acceptable by them. After a pause of 1.7 seconds, Yus responds to Tea's question in line 11 stating that it would be acceptable (◦(in) (.) i guess◦ (0.3) it's enough). Nonetheless, the 1.7-second pause combined with the word choice "I guess" employed by Yus implicates that he may not have the information regarding how the answers for that question is supposed to be marked. Throughout this interaction between Tea and Yus, Nes raises her hand to show her willingness to take a turn at this talk (Sahlström, 2002), which does not receive any orientation from Tea. Following Yus's account, Tea responds to this (line 13) with the acknowledgment token "okay" after a relatively shorter pause and states that she is not sure about how many sentences the test writers expect to be written for the focal question discussed accompanied by a deictical reference by pointing (Mondada, 2007) at the paper while referring to the question. Yus initiates a response in line 18, marked with hesitation markers and micro pauses, but his turn-in-progress is interrupted by Tea who takes the turn to clarify what she is confused about, stating

she did not understand whether she is supposed to write an answer for each place or whether she is supposed to choose among them.

There is a pause of 1.2 second after Tea's clarification and Yus takes the turn in line 25 by providing another hesitation mark and explains that an answer is expected for all the places mentioned in the question and employs multiple micro pauses in his response. Tea provides an acknowledgement token while Yus continues to explain that one or two sentences for each of the places is the expected answer. After Yus's account, Tea once again challenges the test writers with a remark on the fact that what is expected by the test writers is not mentioned in the instructions (`so where are my instructions↑ (0.3) telling me that`) as she holds up the exam paper and points at it, possibly at the focal question. Yus responds after a pause and says that they will add this. His response receives an acknowledgement token and a request from Tea (`◦okay◦ (0.5) please`).

Following a long pause of 2.2 seconds, it is seen that Nes, who did not receive any orientation to her earlier bid for a turn by raising her hand (lines 5 to 13), self-selects while raising a hand (Sahlström, 2002) in order to provide feedback on the focal question in line 38. She states that the students may provide a noncompliant response (`◦they can◦ even say that we go for fun`) to this question. Nes refers to the students who would take the exam by using the third person plural pronoun "they" in her statement, which initiates an assumption on possible learner behavior upon encountering this question. It is seen that Nes employs the verb "say" for describing the answers that the learners may "write". This acts as a pre-enactment (Leyland, 2016) of how the learners would possibly respond in the exam. By employing ALB, Nes invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners who will be the end-users of this exam and problematizes the item design, the ambiguity in the instructions, as the source of possible undesired behavior of the non-present students. With this ALB, Nes extends the problem initiated by Tea by making it more specific and observable just like in the previous extract. Hence, she invokes the learners by clarifying and exemplifying unfolding advice (Leyland, 2021). Her ALB demonstrates another outcome of the problem in the instruction by assuming what the students would possibly write due to the instructions problematized by Tea. Tea responds to this comment with a compliance token in line 40 (`exactly`) accompanied by a nod, and orients to group five by shifting her gaze and asking

whether this is an acceptable response for them (`so would you accept that↑`). However, this question does not receive any orientation from group five. Nes once again self-selects to and attempts to continue with her comment but her turn-in-progress is interrupted by Tea in line 43 who elaborates on how students would respond to this question the way Nes assumed. Following her elaboration, she repeats her earlier question on whether this is acceptable by them (`would you accept that↓`). This time, her question receives a response from group five after a pause. Yus answers with a polarity marker (`no`) in a quite tone in line 48. A longer pause takes place before Tea follows with a comment stating that the assumed behavior of the students that Nes mentioned is something the test writers may encounter as answering with for fun is both grammatically accurate and possible to occur. She follows with a comprehension check (`right↑`) for which Yus provides a head nod. After this, Tea states that they should be more specific when providing instructions.

Even though the ALB provided by Nes does not get any direct orientation from the test writers, it receives indirect recognition from them through Tea's elaboration and comments. After Nes provides the example of ALB, Tea questions whether group five would accept this behavior. Upon not receiving any answer, she elaborates on how this is problematic by providing examples to the possible answers the students may write and repeats her question on the acceptability of such answers. Yus expresses with his polarity marker that such answers would not be accepted; thus, he indirectly accepts that what the ALB implied is in fact a problem. Another point which may be accepted as Yus showing indirect acceptance of the ALB is when he responds with a nod to Tea's comprehension check after her explanation on why such behavior is likely to happen. Considering the fact that she expands on the instance of ALB and provides further comments on it, it is convenient to state that Tea agrees with this assumption provided by Nes.

Extract 6 continues with the seventh recorded session where writing sections of the exams receive feedback. In this extract, the writing section prepared by group three (EGE, FIR, DER, LIN, BIR) receives feedback from Tea and Ege suggests a solution to a problem in a question written by his group member. This suggestion receives objection from San (a member of group one). The following extract was also presented for data analysis in one of the data sessions organized by HUMAN

(Hacettepe University Micro-Analysis Network Research Center) for the purposes
of enhancing validity and reliability. The comments received on the extract provided
valuable insights both for the analysis of this extract and the other extract in this
data analysis. The transcripts of this and other extracts were improved in light of the
comments and suggestions received during the data session.

Extract 6: Select four items (R7-P2)

```
1     TEA:      %↑ne yapsın (.) hadi sınıfça (0.2) er (.) firuze'ye
                 what should she do? Let's help Firüze a little
                %orients to the whole class ---> line 3
2               birazcık &yardımcı olalım (0.3) artık siz bu kadar çok
      cey                 &raises his hand ---> line 4
                as a whole class. Now, you are as people who,
3               testing hani (0.4) konuşan >insanlar olarak mesela<%
                you know, discuss testing so much, like, er her
                                                          --->%
4               &(0.2)& er (.) gruptaki diğer arkadaşları ↑ne yapsın
                friends in her own group, what should Firuze do?
                &turns to and gestures at group 3 --->
                  --->&
5               (0.4) mesela firuze& (0.5) +[yani ne yaparsınız]
                              --->&
                I mean what whould you do?
6     EGE:                              +[i would su- (0.9) ] ◦hmm hmm◦
                                        +nods --->
7               i would+ suggest (.) ((clears his throat)) oh excuse me
                   --->+
8               (.) .hh i would suggest *to: go with (0.5) say: (.)◦what◦
                                        *gestures with hand --->line 11
9               (.) select (0.6) three items↑=
10    TEA:      =&hmm hmm&=
                 &--nods-&
11    EGE:      =select three appliances (0.5) and then (.) select*
                                                          --->*
12              +◦one two three◦ (0.3)+ &yes (.) three(0.2) prepositions&
                +----------1----------+ &nods and gestures with his hand&
                1: looks at his paper and counts items with right hand
```

```
13              %(0.4) and (0.7)% $fo:rm (0.5) three full sentences
      tea       %------nods-----%
                                  $gestures with hand --->
14              (0.2) full stop↓$
                          --->$
15    BIR:      (     )
16    TEA:      &hmm hmm
                &nods---> line 18
17    EGE:      *for b (0.2) at least     *
                *points at paper and nods*
18    TEA:      for b&
                 --->&
19    EGE:      %for a↑ (.) i would use the same structure again i would
                %gestures with hand and nods --->
20              say (0.7)% *select perhaps (.) four (0.3) >°this time° i
                     --->% *gestures both with head and hand --->line 28
21              don't know< (0.3) four items (0.8) from the list above↑
22    TEA:      >hmm hmm<
23              (0.5)
24    EGE:      a:nd (1.5) write full sentences
25    TEA:      +[huh
                +nods --->
26    EGE:      [using (.) wor:ds (0.7)+ [not ↑numbers=
                                    --->+
27    TEA:                              [which words
28    EGE:      =wor:ds*
                  --->*
29              (0.7)
30    TEA:      &to write the- (.) th- their prices&
                &-gestures in the air with her pen-&
31    EGE:      +yes:+
                +nods+
32    TEA:      &o:kay&
                &nods-&
33    SAN:      hocam %[(0.3) may i
                teacher
34    EGE:          %&[>does that< make sense↓&
```

65

```
       tea               %&looks at SAN ---> line 41
                          &---gestures with hand---&
35     SAN:        °say [something°
36     TEA:            [sure tabi ki=
                        of course
37     SAN:  →   =*but if: (0.2) they: (0.2) choose (.) four >out of<
                  *gestures with her head and hands ---> line 41
38               (0.2) the (0.3) six of them here=
39     TEA:      =hmm hmm=
40     SAN:  →   =then (.) they will choose the ones they know↓ so we:
41               (0.2)neve- we will never learn% +if they know the others*
                                        --->% +looks at EGE--->line 57
                                                          --->*
42     CEY:      şey $[a- (.) altıncı sınıf °di mi (bunlar)°
                  well they are sixth graders right?
                      $looks at DEN ---> line 46
43     TEA:          *[option (.)  * %vermiyoduk hani       %
                      *points at EGE* %sweeping motion with RH%
                      what happened to not giving options?
44               &(0.9)
                 &smiles ---> line 46
45     EGE:      +hmm         +
                 +slight nod+
46     CEY:      °altıncı sınıf°$&
                  sixth grade
                            --->$
                             --->&
47     TEA:      eh he he
48               (1.5)
49     EGE:      &true
                 &nods his head ---> line 51
50               (0.6)
51     TEA:      *o zaman*&
                 then?
                 *---2---*
                 2: nod and head gesture
                     --->&
```

```
52                    (0.9)
53    EGE:      +ya hepsi↑
                either all of them
                +gestures with right hand in the air ---> line 55
54    TEA:      &ya [hiç  &
                 or none
55    EGE:           [ya da& üç tane (0.2) ve üçü↓+
                     or three and all three of them
                                            --->+
      tea         &----3----&
                  3: tilts her head and gestures with right hand
56    TEA:      $∘aynen öyle∘$
                 exactly
                $-----4------$
                4: nods and gestures in the air with her hand
57    EGE:      %uh huh%+
                %-nods-%
                    --->+
```

Prior to the beginning of the extract, Tea problematizes the format of a question in the writing section and demands clarification from Fir, who is the member of group three responsible for the questions in the writing section, regarding what is expected of the students and how this question should be answered. Fir comes up with a few solutions for the problems with the format; however, Tea and Fir cannot come to a definite solution. The first language is used by both Tea and Fir during this discussion.

The extract starts where Tea demands ideas from the class by using the first language. This code-switch is quite possibly intended for encouraging learners to participate (Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005) in this newly-initiated discussion. She first orients to the whole class by turning away from Fir and towards the wider group of pre-service teachers in the class. Then, she turns towards Fir's group again while asking her group members on how the focal section of the exam can be redesigned, using the first language throughout her response pursuit. Tea's orientation to the whole class and the test writer group indicates that she refers to multiple addressees in this context by involving every person present in the classroom in the discussion and marks this interaction as a multilogue (Schwab, 2011). During Tea's orientation

to the whole class Cey (group four) raises his hand; however, his bid for a turn (Sahlström, 2002) is not noticed by Tea and he lowers it when Tea shifts her gaze to group three. Overlapping with the final TCU of Tea, Ege self-selects in line 6 to provide a possible solution. He starts his turn using the second language even though there is no external intervention or warning to do so. He proposes that students can select three items and three prepositions from the items and prepositions provided. His suggestion receives acknowledgement tokens from Tea in lines 10 and 16 accompanied by nods. This can be interpreted as a form of agreement. Bir, another member of group three, provides a comment in line 15 which is unfortunately unintelligible. Following Tea's acknowledgement token, Ege states in line 17 that this suggestion is for the section "b" of the first question with a deictical reference by pointing (Mondada, 2007) at the exam paper. Tea employs a confirmatory repeat (Park, 2014) of the first TCU of this turn to confirm that this a suggestion for "b" section.

Ege continues with a suggestion for section "A" in line 19 and proposes that this time students can choose four items from the items provided to write sentences which is marked with the hedge "I don't know" in line 21 and suggests to use words instead of numbers for the prices. Tea provides acknowledgement tokens and nods along his turn and asks for clarification on what words are expected in line 27. Her request for clarification remains unattended while her turn overlaps with Ege's explanation stating that word will be used instead of numbers. For this reason she clarifies in line 30 that the words used will be for the prices (`to write the- (.) th- their prices`). Ege provides a confirmation token (`yes:`) to this clarification in his next turn clarification, which receives an acknowledgement token (`o:kay`) and a head nod from Tea in line 32.

At this point of interaction San self-selects and asks for permission to provide a comment which overlaps with Ege's comprehension check for the suggestion he came up with for the problem with the questions. Ege's check does not receive any orientation from Tea or another person as Tea turns to San and provides the permission San has asked for through a go-ahead response (Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell, 2010) using code-mixing (`sure tabi ki`). In line 37, San employs the contrastive marker "but" that signals an upcoming opposition to Ege's suggestion (Can, 2020). Then, she problematizes the solution Ege suggested for the design

while invoking (Leyland, 2021) the learners with her ALB through a hypothetical conditional with the use of the third person plural pronoun "they". She states that students would choose the items they already know, which makes the problem with Ege's suggestion observable in possible student behavior. The invoking of the learners in this ALB shows that San treats the suggested design as problematic since she expresses that the test writers would not be able to measure whether students have knowledge about the remaining items given in the question. San's ALB (`they will choose the ones they know↓ so we: (0.2) neve- we will never learn% +if they know the others`) also involves rule policing (Sert & Balaman, 2018) as she hints at a principle of test item writing that is breached by giving the students options to choose and answer. While San invokes the learners and performs rule policing through her ALB, she also practices going general (Waring, 2017) while problematizing the suggested design. She uses the inclusive pronoun "we" pronoun instead of directly addressing the test writers (`so we: (0.2) neve- we will never learn`). This depersonalizes her comment and includes herself, and possibly the wider context of the classroom since the other groups are also involved in the process. Apart from depersonalizing her feedback, this ALB of San constructs a "standardized relational pair" (Leyland, 2021; Sacks, 1972 as cited in Silverman, 1998) where she positions the participants in the classroom as testers and the non-present students as test-takers.

During San's ALB, Tea provides an acknowledgement token to San's comment in line 39. After the end of San's comment, Tea orients to Ege and code-switches to Turkish while telling him that they were not supposed to let students choose from a variety of options to provide answers to (`option (.) vermiyoduk hani`). While she provides this comment directed at Ege, she also uses the personal pronoun "we" in first language and goes general by depersonalizing her comment just like San. This statement of Tea also constitutes an example of reference to a past learning event (Can Daşkın, 2017; Can Daşkın & Hatipoğlu, 2019) as her utterance signals that this rule was probably mentioned in one of the preliminary reading resources or something they studied during the lectures. Tea's statement aligns with the rule policing of San as well since she hints at a violation of a principle with her statement. After a short pause, Ege provides a token in line 45 which may be interpreted as a sign that he is thinking or a change-of-state token (Heritage,

1984). Tea responds to this with laughter tokens. Following a longer pause, Ege provides a confirmation token (`true`) in line 45 token and nods. Tea asks for what they should do and Ege provides another suggestion which does not let students choose from a variety of options by saying "ya hepsi (either all of them)", and Tea employs an anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1996) based on the either-or structure and suggests "ya hiç (or none)". However, Ege suggests another solution than what is proffered by Tea and states that three options would be provided where a response would be required for each option. Tea responds to this with an agreement token through a code-switch (`°aynen öyle°`) in line 56 to which Ege replies with a claim of understanding (`uh huh`) (Koole, 2010) and a head nod. The fact that Ege provides a new suggestion also demonstrates his agreement with and understanding of the problem with his earlier suggestion.

This example of ALB is significant for two reasons. The first reason is San provides this assumption to reject a candidate item design suggested in response to the problem with the item design rather than the actual design that is problematized by Tea at the beginning. Even though this item design is not provided in the exam copy she is provided with, San notices the problem with such a design and indicates why this is problematic by providing her assumption on how students would possibly react to such a item design. The second reason why this example is important is that it shows how Tea's and Ege's stances on the candidate item design changes upon hearing this assumption on how students would behave. San's use of ALB in fact brings up a problem that was initially unnoticed by Tea and Ege. Her ALB leads to a change in Tea's and Ege's epistemic state and it also creates a space for possible solution for the problem. Tea initially shows alignment with Ege's suggestion through her nodding and her acknowledgement tokens. However, in line 43, she provides a supporting comment to San's suggestion when she addresses Ege, stating that they should not give options to students. Thus, she signals that her stance on Ege's suggestion has changed she agrees with San's ALB. Upon Tea's challenging of his suggestion, Ege provides a confirmation token, which shows that he also agrees with San's ALB problematizing his candidate item design and comes up with a new suggestion that provides solution.

Use of ALB in order to Oppose the Feedback Provided

The extracts analyzed in this section involves ALBs formulated as a means of opposing the feedback provided by peers. Unlike the prior extracts analyzed so far, the instances of ALBs in this section are formulated by test writers instead of feedback providers. The first extract to be analyzed in this section comes from the fourth recorded session. Extract 7 involves the use of ALBs by test writers where group two (MIR, NES, GIZ, MEL) receives feedback from group four (DEN, CEY, BER, SER) on the third question of their grammar section. The sequence in the extract happens while group two present their grammar section in front of the whole class and they receive feedback from others. At the beginning of the extract Tea asks to check whether there are further comments on the grammar section of the exam written by group two.

Extract 7(a): Comparative (R4-P2)

```
1     TEA:      anything else
2               (0.7)
3     ARI:      for the first ques@[tion↑
4     CEY:                        @[er: (0.6) for the@ third one=
                                  @--raises his hand-@
5     TEA:      =%okay (.) for the [third question yes↑
6     NES:                         [third one
      tea        %looks at the doc in front of her ---> line 11
7               (0.2)
8     CEY:      y::ou are giving than (.) &so (0.2) obviously
                                         &looks at TEA ---> line 13
9               you are expecting (0.4) e r (0.5) like (.)
10              taller (1.0) right↑=
11    TEA:      =okay↑%
                   --->%
12              (1.5)
13    CEY:      i- is that a clue↑ (.)& or (0.2) it's normal
                                    --->&
14              (1.2) er tam emin olamadım yani (1.4) hani-
                      I'm not completely sure, so
15    DEN:      yani £ordaki than bold olsun mu olmasın mı£
```

71

that is, the than in there should be bold or not
                                £--gestures in the air with her hand-£

17   BER: **bold olsaydı↓=**
                if it was bold

18   CEY: **=he bold=**
                huh bold

19   NES: **=than mi↑**
                (do you mean) than?

20   CEY: **hmm hmm**

21   DEN: **[evet (zaten)-**
                 yes besides

22   BER: **[evet bold ol[saydı (daha mantıklı)**
                yes if it was bold it makes more sense

23   CEY: **[yani @şıkta dahil olmadığı**
                              well isn't the answer of the question
                                      @gestures with both hands--->line 25

24   **zaman sorunun cevabı ↑çok açık gözük[müyo mu↑@**
                 is quite obvious when it is not included in the option?

25   NES: **[bence   @**
                                                    I think
                                                          --->@

26   **comparative'i (0.5) kafasında oturtabilmesi**
                 in order to gain a clear understanding of

27   →   **için yani than=**
                 comparative I mean

28   CEY: **[(yani (.) eğere gel-)**
                  I mean it comes to if

29   NES: →   **=[olduğunda comparative olduğunu direkt**
                 when than is included s/he will immediately

30   →   **£bilicek (0.3) yani (0.2) *zaten burda comparative'i**
                 know the answer, I mean, besides here s/he may use
                 *£---1--->   *---2---> line 33*
                 1: looks at the computer screen in front of her
                 2: points at the computer screen in front of her

31   →   **kullanıp k- [yani %sam is tall**
                 comparative-, I mean, s/he may as well directly
                                      %looks at group 4---> line 36

                                                                        72

```
32    CEY:                    [iyi de zaten diğer-
                              well anyway the other-

33    NES:      £da işaretleyebilir direkt*
                choose Sam is tall
      tea       £flips through her papers---> line 39
                                    --->*

34    BER:      hayır kol- $kolaylık [(olmamalı diyo) (.)
                          $points at projected document---> line 36

35              kolaylık (olmamalı)
                no he says there shouldn't be effo- effortlessness
                there shouldn't be effortlessness

36    CEY:                        [diğer seçenek%$ (0.5) mantık
                                  in the other option the logic
                                    --->%
                                    --->$

37              olarak (.) tamamen şey değil mi↓ (0.3) tall than
                of it all is this, right? Tall than, isn't s/he

38    →         (0.8) @zaten olmicağını bilip bilmesi gerekmiyo mu↓
                is supposed to know, know that it is not possible?
                        @gestures with palm facing up ---> line 42

39              (0.7)£
                 --->£

40    NES:      ◦işte◦ [bilip bilmediğini ölçmek için zaten
                well we put this in order to measure whether

41              bunu koyuyoruz
                s/he knows that anyway

42    TEA:          [hayır onu test ediyo zaten@ biliyo mu
                    no it is testing that anyway whether
                                    --->@

43              (0.5) +[tall taller tallest'ı biliyo mu (.) onu
                s/he knows, whether s/he knows tall taller tallest,
                        +gestures with her hand--->

44              test ediyo ya↑+
                that's what this is testing
                     --->+

45    GIZ:          [(    ) adjective'ler de var
                    (    ) there are the adjectives
```

73

```
46    NES:        evet [zaten onu t- test ediyoruz
                  yes that's what we are testing anyway
47    TEA:            [bi de zaten (0.7) %bi de *question three (.)
                      besides, this is question three, I accepted
      nes                                  %smiles---> line 49
                                              *shows 3 fingers--->line 54
48                 hello questionlardan [bi tanesi % diye  +kabul ettim ben+
                   it as one of the hello questions
```

At the beginning of the extract, Tea asks for further comments by saying "anything else", which is not directed at a particular group but addresses the whole class (Schwab, 2011). Ari, a member of group one who has provided feedback to group two prior to the sequence in this extract, asks for clarification whether Tea's inquiry is intended for the first question. Her question does not receive any orientation from Tea while Cey raises his hand (Sahlström, 2002) and initiates a comment at the same time, which shifts the focus to the third question in a turn-terminal overlap Ari's clarification request. Tea accepts this shift of focus to the third question in her next turn (line 5) with an acknowledgement token and a confirmatory repeat (Park, 2014) followed by a token which functions as a go-ahead response (Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell, 2010) that signals Cey to continue with his comment (`okay (.) for the third question yes↑`). Nes acknowledges this shift in line 6 (`third one`). Cey continues in the next line and looks at Tea throughout his comment. He problematizes that the use of "than" in the question stating that it exposes the expected answer and asks for a clarification in the final TCU of his turn (`right↑`). The interesting thing is both his comment and clarification request are directed at Tea. His request does not get a response and Tea signals him to continue (`okay↑`) in line 11. Following a pause, Cey continues in the next turn to ask whether that is provided as a clue. At this point, he pauses for 1.2 second and he switches to the first language to state that he is not sure whether it is a clue or not (`er tam emin olamadım yani`). He pauses for a 1.4 second and attempts to continue when he gets cut by Den. The rest of the participants mostly follow with the first language after this.

Den asks in her turn whether "than" in the question should be bold or not. After her, Ber initiates a comment in line 17 on the boldness of than, but he ceases the comment without completing. Cey provides an acknowledgement token followed

by the word "bold", which signals that he initially tried to express this as well but could not come up with the word "bold". Latching with Cey's statement Nes asks for clarification (`than mi↑`). Cey provides a confirmation token (`hmm hmm`) to this in the next line. She also receives confirmation tokens from Den and Ber in lines 21 and 22 respectively in a turn-initial overlap (Jefferson, 1984). Following the overlap, Den discontinues her comment while Ber continues to explain the earlier suggestion he ceased in line 17 by saying that making "than" bold would be more logical. Cey initiates a comment in line 23 which overlaps with Ber's statement and demonstrates an orientation to an assumed shared testing principle (Can, 2020), expressing that having "than" in the question stem rather than the options leads to an obvious answer, which implies that he suggests positioning "than" in the options of the question.

Following Cey's comment, Nes initiates a defense in line 25 about the design of the question with an explanation saying that the students can answer the question if "than" is added into the options and that they may as well choose another option if they include "than" in the stem. Nes adopts two ALBs in this explanation when she invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners (1) by alluding to how the students would respond to the question when "than" is included in the stem by stating they would immediately find the answer (`than olduğunda comparative olduğunu direkt bilicek`) and (2) by expressing that the students may also choose the option with "tall" (`sam is tall da işaretleyebilir direkt`). The purpose of these ALBs is obviously to present counter argument to the feedback she received on the design of the focal question. While she counters the feedback, she also presents an example of resistance to advice as she objects to Cey's suggestion on adding the word "than" to the options of the question with the ALBs that she provides in lines 27 to 31.

Cey tries to initiate a comment in line 28 overlapping with Nes's defense, yet he gets cut by Nes's continued turn. He takes up this comment again in line 33, this time Ber interrupts him to say what Cey means is that the answer should not be found effortlessly. Cey initiates his comment once again in line 36 to question whether the students should know the other answer is not possible. At this point, he also provides an ALB on the epistemic status of the learners at the time of taking the exam. His comment receives opposing explanations from Nes and Tea. Nes

states in line 40 that this is what is aimed to be tested with this question. In line 42, almost in a turn-initial overlap (Jefferson, 1984) with Nes's comment, Tea provides a polarity marker followed by an expression similar to Nes's where she expresses that is the purpose of the question: to find out whether the students know the difference between the positive, comparative and superlative forms of the adjective. It is seen both in Nes's (line 40) and Tea's (line 42) turns that they treat the question's aim as assumed knowledge through their use of "zaten/anyway" (Can, 2020). Nes displays alignment with Tea's explanation in her following turn in line 46 by stating that they are trying to measure that anyway, who constructs a standardized relational pair (Sacks, 1972 as cited in Leyland, 2021) of tester-test taker with her full modified repeat (Stivers, 2005) of Tea's prior turn with her statement (`evet [zaten onu t- test ediyoruz`). Tea also adds in line 47 that question three is one of the hello questions meaning that it is supposed to be a relatively easy question based on the order of the exam questions. This reflects that the first few questions of an exam should be easy as a rule.

Extract 7(b): Comparative (R4-P2)

```
49    CEY:                          [yani mesela% (0.4)£+şöyle olsa    +
                                     well, for example, if it was like this I would have
      nes                                        --->%       +-----nods-----+
                                                             £---3--->line 51
50                 3: gestures with hands
                   (.)kabul ederdim (.)[tallest yazsa ilk şıkta(0.3)
                   accepted it, if it was tallest in the first option, I
51                 [derim ki ikisinin arasındaki farkı test ediyo↓£
                   would say it is testing the difference between the two
                                                     --->£
52    BER:                        +%[(gene de çok kolay değil aslında)%
                                   (well it's still not that easy though)
                                   %--------------4-----------------%
      tea                          +looks at BER---> line 55
                   4: looks at TEA, points at projected document, tilts his
                   head upwards
53    TEA:         [işte çok kolay olsun diye ilk üç sorular (.)
                   well the purpose is to make it easy, the first three
54                 hello question ya↑*
```

```
                        questions are hello questions, you know
                                    --->*
55      BER:    huh iyi (.) tamam+ [(o zaman)
                        well it is okay (then)
                                    --->+
56      MIR:                              [but there $[is than
57      NES: →                                        $[but direkt SAM is-
                                                        S/he may directly
                                                       $points at computer--->
58              (0.3) sam is'i görüp$ &tall'u da işaretleyebilir (.)    &
                see and choose Sam is tall but in order to
                                    --->$ &points at the projected document&
59              %ama burda grammar point'i anlayabilmesi için
                understand the grammar point here s/he has to read
                %points at the computer--->
60      →       cümlenin tamamını [okuması gerekiyo% &burda=
                the whole sentence s/he should be able to say
                                    --->% &gestures--->line 62
61      BER:                       [(         )
62      NES:→   =comparative var&=
                that there is
                        --->&
63      CEY:    huh ∘tamam∘
                                    okay
64      TEA:    =$bi de↑ (0.2) [i would suggest that you change it$=
                besides
65      NES:→                  =[diyebilmesi gerekiyo               $=
                                comparative here
        tea     $----------points at the projected document------$
66      CEY:     *[(anladım)]*
67      TEA:    =%*[(.)if- if]* it is too easy↑ (0.6)% @then you need to
        cey      *---nods----*
                 %------points at group four-------% @---5---> line 71
                5: gestures at the projected document
68              change it to question one (.) so that is your
69              +%[hello+ question↓    %=
70      CEY:    +%[aynen+ (0.4) mesela%
```

```
                    yes, for example
                    +gestures+
      nes            %------slight nod-----%
71    TEA:    =okay (0.8) +[if it is- (.)+ if it is &really easy@=
72    NES:               +[(can you-)    +                    @
                          +tilts her head+          &nods--->
                                                        --->@
73    TEA:    =$%and to me      % it is very easy too&$ (0.2)
               %points at herself%              --->&
               $-----------------nods-----------------$
74           *so change it to question one (.) and then you can say
             *gestures at the projected document--->
75           that this is your hello question %yes it is very easy↑*
      nes                                     %nods--->>          --->*
76           +(0.2) but this is our first question (.) and we
             +gestures with both hands--->
77           wanted to actually to start with something easy↓+
                                                          --->+
```

Cey continues with his argument in the following turn where he insists that the design of the question is erroneous (line 49). While Cey insists on his argument, Ber is seen providing a comment expressing that the question is not that easy with a deictical reference by pointing (Mondada, 2007) at the projected document. This receives an incompatible response from Tea who states that it is easy on purpose because it is a hello question (işte çok kolay olsun diye ilk üç sorular (.) hello question ya↑), which displays her orientation to an assumed shared testing principle (Can, 2020) regarding the organization of test items from easy to difficult. Ber responds to this with a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) (huh) followed by acknowledgement tokens (iyi (.) tamam (o zaman)). Following this sub-floor sequence between Tea and Ber, Mir responds to Cey's argument by expressing they provide "than" (but there is than). In line 57, Nes also initiates a defending comment on the item design where she invokes the learners by expressing that the students may choose the option with "tall" after seeing "sam is" in the question stem (sam is'i görüp tall'u da işaretleyebilir). This is a rephrased version of one of her earlier ALBs (line 31). She continues with her turn to state that the students are supposed to read the whole sentence to understand

which grammar structure is expected accompanied by deictical references by pointing (Mondada, 2007) at the projected document (line 58) and then at the computer (line 59 and 60). At this point, Nes also employs an ALB on the possible epistemic status of the learners at the time of taking the exam in her turn (from 60 to 65), emphasizing the knowledge the learners require to find the answer. By this explanation with ALB, she provides a justification as to why they have "than" in the question stem rather than in the options.

Aligning with a pause in Nes's comment, Cey provides a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) and acknowledgment (`huh °tamam°`) in line 63 that suggests he accepts the counter argument on the design of the question. After this, an overlap is seen between Nes and Tea's turns (line 64 and 65) where Tea initiates a suggestion to change the question order accompanied by her pointing at the projected document as a deictical reference (Mondada, 2007). She proposes a change to the placement of the focal question saying it is too easy and should be at the very beginning (`if it is too easy↑ (0.6) then you need to change it to question one`). While she makes a hypothetical reference to the difficulty level of the question, Tea points at group four (Mondada, 2007), which may be to indicate this is what group four suggested. Tea's hypothetical reference also implies a rule on ordering questions from easy to difficult, which marks her comment as an act of rule policing (Sert & Balaman, 2018) as Tea earlier stated that the first questions should be easy and this question is too easy to be the third question. Cey supports this suggestion in line 70 with a confirmation token and an aligning statement (`aynen (0.4) mesela`). Nes makes a comment on this; unfortunately, her comment is not intelligible. Tea continues with her explanation on why it should be moved to the beginning of the grammar section and expresses that they may say they want to move it to question one as it is very easy. Her falling intonation signals the end of this sequence.

In Extract 7, it is seen that there are three ALB instances which are utilized by a test writer to provide counter argument to the feedback received from another group and it is also observed that ALB is used in a different sequential position than the prior instances analyzed in this chapter. The use of these assumptions as counter arguments initially does not make any changes to the feedback providers' claims on the design of the question being problematic. On the other hand, an

expanded explanation involving a rephrased version of one of these three assumptions receives acknowledgement from one of the test writers. The explanation of Nes that continues throughout the extract and the ALBs she provides during her turns display her resistance to the criticism of her peers. It is interesting that the ALBs Nes provided in the form of counter argument is accepted by Tea as well as by feedback providers and her argument also receives agreement. This time, it is seen that ALB is used to demonstrate that the problem initiated by the feedback providers is not possible to be observed in student behavior.

Extract 8 below also demonstrates how ALB is used in order to provide counter argument to the feedback received from peers. Different than Extract 7, this time the test writer opposes the feedback received in written form. This extract comes from the sixth recorded session where the reading sections of the tests written by groups receive feedback. The sequence in this extract involves a discussion on the reading section prepared by group two (MIR, NES, GIZ, MEL) and the feedback providers to the focal test items are group three (EGE, FIR, DER, LIN, BIR). At the beginning of Extract 8(a), it is observed that Mir is the participant that has the floor and she opposes the written feedback her group received from group three prior to the class. The extract is analyzed in two parts for purposes of management. Unfortunately, since only the camera at the back of the class recorded this part of the lesson, the faces of the pre-service teachers involved in this sequence and some of their actions are not visible to the camera. For this reason, only the visible actions of the participants are included in the transcript.

Extract 8(a): Detailed reading (R6-P2)

```
1    MIR:         … we are going to- (0.2) er:: include it in ou:r
2                 specifications↑ (0.2) but i'm not in the same idea
3                 that our (0.3) er reading (0.3) requires (0.2) er:
4                 scanning >rather than< detailed (0.4) er reading↑
5                 >because< (.) er (.) all the questions are (0.4) er
6                 (0.4) require (0.2) students to: (0.2) read in detail
7                 for seventh grades is- (.) the text (.) is (0.2) er:
8                 >you know< (0.3) er- (1.1) n:ormal text (0.5) not er:
9                 so hard (.) but not so easy↑ (0.3) [>it's like ( )<
10   TEA:                                            [(er) did you: (.)
11                 calculate *[the *=
```

```
12    MIR:              *[y:es*
                        *nods *
13    TEA:      =%[level%
14    NES:       %[yep  %
                 %nods  %
15              (1.1)
16    MIR:      for the readability (0.3) er [it's a-=
17    TEA:                                    [hmm hmm
18    MIR:      =it was alright↑ (0.3) to the: (.) &according to site↑&=
                                                  &gestures with hand&
19    TEA:      =hmm hmm=
20    MIR:      =so: (0.3) we cannot say that >is just< er (.) +scanning+
                                                              +gestures+
21              (0.6) er it also (.) requires detailed reading in a sense
22              (0.2) for seventh grades for yes £(0.3) for me (0.4) i-
                                              £---1--->
              1: gestures towards the paper GIZ is holding
23              (.) i can£ +[do it without+=
                     --->£
24    NES:                 +[it is easy hh+
      mir                   +gestures      +
25    MIR: →    =$reading (.)$ also (0.6) but for seventh grades and
                 $--shrugs---$
26         →    (0.2) they have %little- limited time↑ (.)% they cannot
                                %--------gestures---------%
27         →    (0.3) only: (0.2) er scan >for< each (.) question (0.3)
28         →    they have to read it in detail
29    TEA:      o:[kay↑
30    MIR:        [at least once=
31    LIN:      =+yeah [er:         +
32    TEA:            [but because+ we don't have the time %(0.8) $we're
      lin        +--------2--------+
      giz                                                  %---3--->
      mir                                                        $-4-->
              2: raises hand, slightly turns towards group two
              3: points at the paper she is holding
              4: looks at where giz points,nods,points at TEA, says sth
```

```
33                    not sure% right↑$ (0.5) >er< how much time do they have
                          --->%    --->$
34                    for the reading section↓
35                    (0.5)
36      MIR:          er:: (.) in specifications +%[we write            %
37      TEA:                                      +%[it was-            %
        giz                                        +flips through papers->line 44
        nes                                          %points to MIR's table%
38      MIR:          fifteen minutes $(0.3) right↓
                                       $looks at GIZ's paper, horizontal nod--->
39      TEA:          you- you (.) but it is not$ %here (.) [right how(.) much=
                                            --->$
40      CEY:                                              [in the (.)part one
        tea                                        %points at the question--->
41      TEA:          =time% [do they have
                       --->%
42      MIR:              [n:o (.) but [in TOTAL THEY have-
43      NES:                           [no but in spe (.) in specification
44                    we wrote+ (0.5) @fifteen minutes (0.3)[(    )
        giz              --->+       @points at her paper--->
45      TEA:                                              [fifteen minutes(.)
46                    for those &questions (0.5) hmm@=
        mir                     &looks at where GIZ points and nods --->line 48
                                        --->@
47      MIR:          =er: (.) yes
48                    %(0.9)+
        nes           %looks at where GIZ pointed ---> line 51
                        --->+
49      LIN:          an:d
50      NES:          twelve
51      MIR:          twelve% minutes↑ >but<=
                        --->%
52      NES:          =twelve=
53      MIR:          =er: (0.2) in (.) at the beginning of exam↑ (0.2)
54                    er we are (.) er: we say that we are going to
55                    distribute (0.4) %er: (.) vocabulary grammar reading
                                        %gestures--->
```

```
56              and writing% *together↑ (0.2) they have (.) er: one
                     --->% *holds up four fingers--->
57              hour to +complete       (0.6)* @[that       @=
    nes             +nods--->line 60 --->*
58     TEA:                                    @[all of &this@
    mir                                        @---gestures--@
                                                &nods--->line 60
59     MIR:    =[all of this=
60     NES:     [all of that&+
                     --->&
                     --->+
61     MIR:    =£so (0.3) they are going to arrange their time according
                £gestures with hand and head ---> line 63
62             to that↓
63             (0.6)£
                --->£
64     TEA:    o:kay↓
65             (0.8)
```

Right before the beginning of the extract, Mir expresses her agreement with a comment they received on some information missing from the specifications of their exam and she is seen expressing that they will include that information in their specification. Following the contrastive marker "but", she initiates a rejection in line 2 regarding the feedback they received on the type of questions they have in the reading section and states that they have detailed reading questions and not scanning questions like the feedback providers suggested in their written comments. In line 5, she continues to provide justifications for her claim by explaining that it is necessary for seventh graders to read in detail based on the difficulty level of the reading passage which is average. Tea interrupts Mir in line 10 to question whether they checked the difficulty level. Both Mir and Nes provide confirmation tokens to Tea overlapping with her turn in lines 12 and 14 respectively. Mir takes the turn after Tea in line 16 and provides an anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1996) on the level of readability that expands on Tea's question. Then, she reinforces that the level of the text is suitable. Her statement receives acknowledgement tokens from Tea in lines 17 and 19 while she continues her turn in line 20, once again to object to the feedback they received by repeating her claim of having detailed reading questions

instead of scanning ones considering seventh graders. She uses the inclusive "we" pronoun that includes the classroom members other than her own group where she expresses that the questions cannot be called as only scanning questions (`we cannot say that >is just< er (.) +scanning`).

Mir insists on her claim by providing an assumption on how the learners would answer the question. In line 22, Mir expresses that she can answer the questions without reading, which receives a supporting comment from Nes in line 24 (`it is easy hh`). In line 25, she assumes that the students would have to read in detail because of the time limit and she refers to the students by saying "seventh grades" and by using the third person plural pronoun "they", remarking that they would have to read in detail in order to answer and that they cannot scan. Tea provides a confirmation in line 29 (`o:[kay↑`) that overlaps with the final TCU of Mir. The statement of Mir provides an example of ALB when she suggests what seventh graders would do while answering the reading questions. By employing ALB, Mir invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners as well since she refers to the non-present students who will encounter this section as the end-users of the exam, which responds and presents counter argument to written feedback received prior to class instead of oral feedback received in the classroom.

Immediately after the end of Mir's explanation, Lin, a member of group three, self-selects in line 31 while raising her hand (Sahlström, 2002) and provides the compliance token "yeah" followed by an elongated hesitation marker; however, she does not continue as Tea initiates a turn. Together with her confirmation token in line 29, Tea displays a "pro-forma" agreement (Schegloff, 2007) in line 32 with the contrastive marker "but" and the inclusive "we" pronoun and proceeds to highlight the uncertainty on whether students would have enough time to read in detail as the time given for that section is not included on the exam page. Tea involves herself, and possibly the other participants in the classroom, by going general (Waring, 2017) in her statement (`but because we don't have the time (0.8) we're not sure right↑`). The final token of her statement (`right↑`) indicates a confirmation check to which she does not receive any response from the test writers. She continues after a short pause and a hesitation marker to ask how much time is given to students for that section. Mir expresses that they provided this in the specifications of the exam and says it is fifteen minutes. She ends her explanation

with a confirmation check (`right↓`), which may indicate that she expects confirmation from her group members. During her explanation, Tea is seen initiating a turn; however, she is cut by Mir's continuing explanation. In the next line, she changes her earlier initiation and problematizes the fact that the time limit is not provided on the exam itself with a deictical reference by pointing at the exam paper (Mondada, 2007) while stating it is not written there. Cey, a member of group four, starts a comment (`in the (.) part one`) overlapping with Tea's turn, which possibly refers to where the time given is provided. Yet, he does not continue with his comment. During the final TCU of Tea's turn, Mir initiates an explanation on how much time they have in total; however, she is interrupted in line 43 by Nes, who explains that they wrote the time given for this section as fifteen minutes in the specifications. Tea repeats the final part of Nes's explanation and asks for confirmation with her next TCU (`fifteen minutes (.) for those questions (0.5) hmm`). Her final token signals that her skepticism on the time given still remains. Mir responds to Tea's confirmation request in line 47 with a confirmation token preceded by a hesitation marker and a pause.

At this point, it is observed that Lin self-selects one more time to initiate a comment, but she once again abandons it when Nes provides a token (`twelve`) to indicate that they provided twelve minutes after looking at the exam paper where Giz pointed at something. Mir confirms in the next line that it is twelve minutes after looking at where Giz pointed at. Nes repeats her statement once more in the next line latching with Mir's continuing turn. Starting in line 53, Mir expresses that they will give four sections of the exam together and will provide an hour to complete these sections. Tea's next turn in line 58 overlaps with the end of Mir's account-giving and she employs an anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1996) (`all of this`) while nodding. This can be interpreted as Tea acknowledging Mir's explanation. In response to this, both Mir and Nes provide confirmatory repeats (Park, 2014) in their subsequent turns. Following this, Mir continues with a statement highlighting that students are supposed to decide on how to use that time in the exam. Tea provides an acknowledgement token to this explanation in the following turn. After a short pause, Lin is seen initiating a comment while bidding for a turn from Tea by raising her hand (Sahlström, 2002) at the beginning of Extract 8(b) and Tea allocates the turn to her by nodding (Kääntä, 2010).

Extract 8(b): Detailed reading (R6-P2)

```
66    LIN:      so $+can i have a+ (0.5)$ er: *we said (.) scanning
                $raises her hand     $     *gestures--->line 73
      tea         +nods at LIN +
67              %to your question% because you know the (0.3) er:: (.)
                %looks at group 4%
68              description of scanning you know (0.3) £you: tr- you are
      tea                                          £nods--->line 71
69              trying to find specific [information you know=
70    TEA:                             [specific information (.) exactly
71    LIN:      =&it may require detailed reading but it's£ (.) in (.) in
                 &looks at group 4--->              --->£
72              this (   ) they are scanning questions (.) that& (.)
                                                          --->&
73              that's why* we said +scanning
      tea             --->*         +nods--->
74    TEA:      agree+ [especi]ally=
                 --->+
75    MIR:            [ye:s  ]
76    TEA:      =with questions (0.3) $er: i- it was very difficult for
                                      $gestures in the air--->
77              me because you have questions$ &(0.4) six (.) and seven
                                          --->$ &---5--->line 80
                5: looks at the back page
78              right↑ [er: (.)=
79    MIR:            [◦(yes)◦
80    TEA:      =then (.)& >but but< $here >at the very< beginning you
                     --->&           $points at the front page--->
81              have$ %questions a b (.) and c↓ (0.2) >i *would suggest
                --->$ %gestures with hand and head--->
      mir                                             *---6-->line 84
                6: flips through GIZ's papers
82              that< you revise that as well% (0.4) £answer the open
                                          --->%      £gestures--->line 87
83              ended questions↑£ (0.2) er: with (.) full sentences↑ (.)
```

```
84            after reading the text about mary↑* (.) &and her family↑
                                   --->*
85            &(.) and then (.) que- (.) er i expect question one↑ (.)
     giz      &takes notes on her papers--->
86            but i have question a↓& %@(0.9)>which is kind of<@
     giz                        --->&   @--------nods---------@
     mir                            %looks at GIZ's papers--->line 89
87            unusual(0.7)so(.)i >would suggest that< you restructure↑£
                                                          --->£
88            @+(.)the: £labelling (.) or the div- (.) how you [label%=
              @gestures in the air---> line 90
     giz       +flips the pages and takes notes---> line 90
     nes            £nods---> line 92
89   MIR:                                              [yes  %
                                                        --->%
90   TEA:     =*the different@ sections* of your+ [exam
               *---------nods----------*
                   --->@                    --->+
91   MIR:                                          [okay↓
92   TEA:     .hh so (.) +especially (.) questions *a£ and b↑  *+
                         +---------gestures in the air---------+
     giz                                          *takes notes*
                                                    --->£
93            @if you ask me↑ (0.2)@ [are scanning questions=
              @-flips to back page-@
94   GIZ:                          [(              )
95   MIR:     =yes=
96   TEA:     =$question c↑ is @a scanning question too↑ because (0.4)@
               $gestures with hand and head--->
     giz                        @----flips the page and takes notes----@
97            >you just< (0.2) l:ook at the dad (.) the information
98            related him↑ and you [end up with (the)$(0.2) answer
                                                --->$
99   GIZ:                          [(              )
100           (0.6)
101  MIR:     er: (.) so we are going (to)(.) er: +(0.6) change the
                                                  +---6--->
```

```
                    6: opens left hand palm and raises
102                 detailed reading+ %to scanning (.)*[(because if we) are
                              --->+ %gestures with left hand--->line 104
103    TEA:                                          *[let's $see (0.2)let's
                                          *---7---> line 106
       mir                                              $nods-->line 107
                    7: raises hand like a stop movement, then gestures
104                 @discuss% it↑ (.) and let's see [which=
       nes          @nods--->line 106
                        --->%
105    MIR:                                    [okay
106    TEA:          =questions are going to*   be@ scanning and which
                              --->* --->@
107                 questions$ are going to be detailed reading↓ …
                        --->$
```

Lin starts her response with an explanation as to why they defined the questions in the reading section as scanning questions, and provides a description of scanning by stating that it entails looking for specific information. Overlapping with Lin, Tea demonstrates her approval of this definition in line 70 with a partial confirmatory repeat (Park, 2014) of Lin's statement accompanied by a confirmation token (`specific information (.) exactly`). Lin continues in the next line by turning to group two and by stating that her group denominated their questions to be scanning questions because of the fact that they require students to find specific information. Tea responds to this with an agreement token in line 74 (`agree`) and initiates a comment. Overlapping with Mir's claim of understanding (Koole, 2010) (`ye:s`) in the next line, Tea attempts to provide examples to scanning questions from the focal exam (`especially with questions (0.3) er:`); however, she then states that she had difficulty understanding the questions' layout accompanied by a deictical reference through pointing (Mondada, 2007) at the front page of the exam and problematizes the disorder among the numbering of the questions as some are labeled using numbers while others are labeled using letters. She explains the difficulty she had and suggests them to change the labelling until line 90. Mir again provides claims of understanding through the acknowledgment token "yes" (Koole, 2010) in lines 79 and 89 during Tea's comments and responds with an

acknowledgment token (`okay↓`) to her suggestion for changing the labeling of the sections (line 91).

In line 92, Tea picks up the previous comment she initiated in line 74 and provides examples to scanning questions from the section being discussed (`.hh so (.) especially (.) questions a and b↑ if you ask me↑ (0.2) are scanning questions`). Giz provides a comment in line 94 which is unintelligible, yet Mir is seen providing another acknowledgment token (Koole, 2010) in the following line. Tea provides another example to a scanning question in the next line and explains the reason why it requires scanning. Giz once again provides an unintelligible comment in a turn-final overlap with Tea's final TCU. Following this, Mir states that they will change the category to scanning instead of detailed reading. Tea interrupts her in an overlap to suggest first discussing all of the questions and deciding on the categories later. Mir responds with a compliance token during Tea's suggestion (line 105). The fact that Mir provides confirmation and acknowledgement tokens to Tea's explanations on the scanning questions in their exam implies that she agrees with the comment they received on their reading questions. Her confirmation token in line 75, following Lin's explanation and Tea's agreement token, may also suggest that she accepts the feedback for which she provided a counter argument in Extract 8(a). In addition to this, it is observed that she proposes to change the category of their questions from reading to scanning in line 101, which can be considered as proof to accepting the feedback involving the claim about scanning questions.

Use of ALB in Counter Arguments in response to the Use of ALB by Feedback Providers. The instances analyzed in the extracts included in this section are used in response to the feedback provided as well. However, one particular difference in the sequence related to these instances is worth analyzing separately. The extracts involved in this section focuses on ALBs provided as counter arguments by test writers in response to the use of ALBs provided by feedback providers, which appears as a distinct feature among the other ALBs used in response to the feedback provided. With that said, the next extract not only involves such a use of ALB but it also exemplifies two more ALB instances which are adopted in response to the problem already indicated.

Extract 9 takes place during the seventh recorded session and it involves a discussion on the writing section of group five. Question six in the writing section of group five (YUS, MER, EDA, CAN, ALP) receives feedback from Tea and from group two (MIR, NES, GIZ, MEL) in this extract. The extract starts right after the point where Tea draws focus to a grammatical error in the instructions of the writing question discussed during this part of the lesson. The instructions provided by group five involves describing the features of the Sun in one or two sentences. Tea draws focus to this and problematizes the instructions by stating that it is not clear while also warning group five about this fact. Shortly after this, Mir raises her hand and Tea allocates the turn to Mir by pointing at her (Kääntä, 2010). The extract starts right after this allocation. For purposes of management, the extract is divided into two parts.

Extract 9(a): The Sun (R7-P1)

```
1     MIR: →      and also hocam (0.3) er: (.) will they accept if
                     teacher

2                 they say (0.5) sun is (0.3) green (0.7) %[sun is big %
3     TEA:                                              %[huh exactly%
                                                        %------1-----%

                  1: nods and points at group 5
4                 *(0.5) would you accept that=
                  *gestures with palm facing up---> line 8
5     YUS:        =£er there's- (0.3) er there is a: unit (.) about
                   £gestures---> line 10
6                 planets (1.0) so: w- (0.4) er: (.) we +(0.5) decided
                                                       +---2--->
                  2: points at his paper with his pen
7                 to >put this<-+ n- (.) include this question in order
                        --->+
8                 to (0.6) er: (0.2) test their (0.4)* knowledge about
                                                 --->*
9     →           the content (0.6) so (.) they should ↑know- (.) know
10                that (0.3) the (.) sun is the biggest star£ (0.2) in
                                                          --->£
11                the (.) solar system
12                (0.6)
```

```
13    TEA:      >so this is what you expect↓<
14              %(0.6)   %
                &gestures%
15    YUS:      °yes:°=
16    TEA:      =but then again £[the- (.)      +i-in the instructions↑£
17    NES:                    £[°what features +↓(of the sun)°       £
                              £---------horizontal head nod----------£
      tea                                    +holds up exam-->line 19
18    TEA:      (0.3) %you hh don't say that
                      %smiles--->
19              &(1.1)%   &+
                --->%
      yus       &slight nod&
                    --->+
20    TEA:      i- i said (0.2) the sun is big and hot
21              (1.4)
22    TEA:      and this &is actually↑ (0.8) >er< this sentence (.)
                        &points at the question--->
23              answers >your expectation↑ +your<+& instructions↓
      yus                                +nods +
                                         --->&
24              (1.5)
25    TEA:      *nowhere (0.4) £am i instructed to ↑say (0.5) er:£ (.)
                            £-----walks towards group 5-------£
                *gestures ---> line 28
26              the sun is the (.) biggest planet (0.2) or the sun
27              i:s (.) within the solar system and >stuff like that< or
28              the center of the solar system &and stuff like °that°↓*
                                                                --->*
      nes                                    &raises hand--->line 30
29              (0.2) okay↑
```

Mir states that students can provide answers that are content-wise problematic even though grammatically correct. She invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners with an ALB which is positioned in a question directed at Tea regarding whether it is acceptable for group five if students provide content-wise incorrect or erroneous answers (`will they accept if they say (0.5) sun is (0.3)`

`green (0.7) sun is big`). From the way that that Mir formulates her utterance, it is understood that the third person plural pronoun "they" in line 1 refers to the test writers (group five) that are present in the classroom while the second use of this personal pronoun in line 2 an invocation (Leyland, 2021) of the non-present students as the end-users of the exam; hence, Mir constructs a standardized relational pair (Leyland, 2021; Sacks, 1972 as cited in Silverman, 1998) of tester-test taker through her ALB, which challenges the test takers even though her ALB is directed at Tea. Once again, it is seen that the verb "say" is employed for the learners' hypothetical written response to the question. In this way, a pre-enactment (Leyland, 0216) of how the learners would possibly respond is presented in interaction. The ALB that Mir provides here suggests that this is a possible student reaction based on what is provided in the instructions since the expected features are not specified, which shows that this ALB is used in response to the problem initiated by Tea prior to the beginning of the extract. With this ALB, Mir highlights and demonstrates an error with the instructions by hypothesizing on what students may possibly experience and how they may possibly respond.

Overlapping with the final TCU of Mir's assumption, Tea provides an acknowledgement token (`huh`) followed by the compliance token "exactly". While doing this, she orients to group five, the test writers, by nodding and pointing at them. Then, she demands explanation from them in line 4 by asking whether such answers are acceptable for them. Yus takes the turn in line 5 to provide an explanation to Mir's assumption and Tea's demand. He expresses that information on planets is covered in a unit of the book with a deictical reference by pointing at the exam paper (Mondada, 2007) and indicates that the question has the purpose of assessing the students' knowledge about this content. Following this explanation, he orients to the assumed knowledge of the students (Can, 2020) regarding the features of the Sun in line 9 (`so (.) they should ↑know- (.) know that (0.3) the (.) sun is the biggest star (0.2) in the (.) solar system`). This statement of Yus constitutes an example of ALB that invokes the learners as Yus refers to the non-present students with the third person plural pronoun "they", aligning with the way that Mir referred to students at the beginning of the sequence. This statement reflects that the test writers included this question based on an assumption on the students' epistemic status at the time of taking the exam. The

learners' having the knowledge on the Sun is not only an exam requirement but also an assumption of the test writers about the learners. The second ALB provided by Yus in line 9 diverges from Mir's ALB (line 1) and from the prior instances of the phenomenon analyzed so far in this study. This divergence stems from the fact that Yus's ALB is employed in response to the use of ALB by a feedback provider. By employing ALB in response to Mir's ALB on how the students may answer the question, Yus provides counter argument that demonstrates a dissimilar assumption.

After Yus's explanation, Tea asks confirmation question in line 13 about the expected answer. This receives a confirmation token from Yus in line 15 in a quiet tone. Following this confirmation, Tea problematizes that this is not provided in the instructions (`=but then again the- (.) i- in the instructions↑ (0.3) you hh don't say that`) while holding up the exam but she also smiles, which mitigates her challenging of group five. This statement supports Mir's earlier ALB as Tea also points out that the expected answer is not specified in the instructions. In an overlap with Tea's comment, Nes is seen questioning the features expected by group five in a low voice (`°what features ↓(of the sun)°`). The comment of Tea also suggests that the answer expected by the test writers is not clear either for the feedback providers or for Tea. Yus reacts to these comments with a nod which signals that he agrees with the feedback. The fact that Tea challenges the test writers after Yus's ALB and his confirmation of the expected answer displays that it is Mir's ALB that receives acceptance rather than Yus's ALB in response to Mir's.

After a pause, Tea reads what answer she came up with in line 20. Following a 1.4-second pause, she takes the turn again and states that this answer is appropriate according to the current instructions and points at the question at the exam paper as a deictical reference (Mondada, 2007). Yus responds to this with a nod during Tea's comment, possibly to show his agreement with the comment. Tea continues after another pause to express that there is no instruction alluding to the expected answer as she points at the exam question. Tea provides a comprehension check (`okay↑`), but this does not receive any orientation from group five.

Extract 9(b): The Sun (R7-P1)

```
30   NES: →     %so       % if& they *use superlative in this que- in
     tea         %nods at NES%
                            --->&      *points at the paper--->
31             this question (.) they can use* (0.7) £f:or other ones
                                       --->*       £gestures--->line 34
32             (0.3) +[for the=   +
33   TEA:            +[◦(as well)◦+
                     +------3-----+
               3: looks at group 5, gestures with left hand and nods
34   NES:      =cha-£ (0.3) [chart=
                --->£
35   MIR:                  [but that-
36   NES:      =*◦part◦ (0.3)* rather than £comparing them they can just
                *-----4------*           £gestures--->
               4: looks back towards group 5
37             (0.4) use superlative then£
                              --->£
38             (0.7)
39   TEA:      %exactly%
               %---5---%
               5: nods her head, looks at group 5 and gestures
40             &(0.8)&
     yus       &nods &
41   MIR:      %and (.)◦it's not included in the specifications (.)
     yus       %marks something on the paper in front of him--->
42             +superlative◦%
                       --->%
     tea       +slight head nod, looks at group 5 ---> line 46
43   TEA:      hmm hmm
44   NES:      *◦it's not (.) illogical (0.2) there is no [(   )◦   *
45   TEA:                                       [not in the*
     nes       *--gestures as if balancing two things with her hands--*
46             specifications the superlative &(0.8)+& hh now let us
                                              --->+
     yus                                       &nods &
47             have a look at question seven
```

Extract 9(b) continues right after Tea's comprehension check where Tea nods at Nes to allocate the turn to her (Käänta, 2010) as she bids for a turn by raising her hand (Sahlström, 2002). Nes initiates another comment where she invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners with an ALB starting in line 30. Nes focuses on the possible grammar structure that the non-present students may use based on the expected answer that Yus provided in Extract 7(a). Yus expressed earlier that the expected answer may include the Sun being the biggest star in the solar system, which requires the use of a superlative adjective. Starting in line 30, Nes provides an ALB where she suggests that students may use superlative adjectives instead of comparative ones in the second question of this writing section where the students are supposed to compare animals using comparative forms. She emphasizes her argument by providing a deictical reference by pointing at the exam paper (Mondada, 2007) while referring to the grammar point. The ALB that Nes provides here treats both the expected answer of question six and the instructions of question two as problematic. Tea provides an anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1996) in line 33 with her TCU (∘(as well)∘) while she gestures at group five and nods her head. Her anticipatory completion accompanied by her embodied actions display Tea's affiliation with the stance of Nes (Hayashi, 2013). This overlaps with the statement of Nes on the possibility of using superlative adjectives for other questions, which is in line with Tea's proffered completion. After Nes completes her statement, Tea responds with the compliance token "exactly" in line 39 while nodding and gesturing at group five, which signals that Tea supports the assumption provided by Nes. Yus responds with a nod following Tea's remark and he is seen marking something on the paper (probably the exam copy he has) in front of him.

During Nes's turn, Mir tries to initiate a comment which resembles an opposition, but her initiation ends with an abrupt cut. Later in line 41, Mir self-selects once again and states that superlative is not a grammar point that the test writers included in the specifications of the exam they prepared. Tea provides an acknowledgement token to Mir's comment accompanied by a nod and then looks at group five again while Nes expresses that the use of this structure by students in the other questions is not illogical as the form is suitable for comparing those items. The final part of her comment is unintelligible as it overlaps with Tea's next turn. Tea demonstrates her agreement with this by employing a full modified repeat (Stivers,

95

2005) of Mir's statement on the fact that superlatives are not included in the exam specifications while she keeps her gaze at group five. Yus responds with a head nod to this orientation, which can be interpreted either as a sign of understanding of or agreement with the comments. The sequence comes to an end as Tea changes the focus to the next question.

Three examples of ALB have been analyzed in this extract, two of which belong to feedback providers while one example is suggested by a test writer. It is observed that the functions of the ALBs given by the feedback providers and the test writer differ. In this extract, the feedback providers utilize ALBs to problematize item designs while the test writer utilize an ALB in order to present a counter argument to the feedback he received.

The following extract presents another example of an ALB used in a counter argument in response to the use of ALB by feedback providers. Extract 10 is from the beginning of the sixth recorded session where the reading sections of the exams are discussed. The feedback on the reading section of group one (ECE, SAN, ZEY, ARI, SON) is about to begin. Prior to giving feedback to group one, a member of group three (Ege) asks whether group one would like to start or if they prefer group three to start. Zey states they can start at the beginning of the extract and Ege confirms to this. Zey says she agrees with some parts of the feedback given to them and Tea provides a laughter token with acknowledgement tokens. The extract starts immediately after this. In this extract, it is understood that Zey is responding to written feedback received from the feedback providing peers prior to the class since the feedback mentioned by the test writer does not take place in class in any of the feedback sessions.

Extract 10: Popular text (R6-P1)

```
1     ZEY:        yeah (0.3) er first of all (0.5) m::ost of our
2     →           friends said er: (.) a- +(0.3) including a popular
                                       +gestures with hands---> line 7
3     →           text (0.2) &like ice age&=
      tea                    &----nods----&
4     TEA:         [uh huh
5     ZEY:→       =[(would) be problematic for the students because
6     tea         they: (0.3) do not need to read the text (0.2) &to
```

```
                                                   &nods--->
7             comprehend it↓& i just want to ask this+ (0.2) [actually
                        --->&                        --->+
8       TEA:                                                  [uh huh
9       ZEY:  because er:: (0.5)& most of the movies (.) in the book  &
                                 &leans towards the papers on the table&
10            are: popular ones↑
11      TEA:  %hmm hmm%
              %-nods--%
12      ZEY: →  so: (0.5) >(and)< $once we (.) st(.)udied them in the
                                  $gestures--->
13            lesson$ (0.6) @students can (0.5) °can° always↑ &(0.7) &
        tea      --->$        @fixes one of the cameras--->line 19
                                                            &shrugs&
14            do them (0.6) because %we (.) we are (0.3) because
                                    %gestures with hands--->line 18
15            they are given (0.8) in the: (.) book $(0.9) and (0.2)$
        tea                                         $------nods-----$
16            that's why we s- (.) we use this (0.6) movie but we can
17            use (0.5) düğün dernek we can use harry potter (0.5) the
18            book has also these% (0.4) >movies i< (.) i would like
                            --->%
19            to ask this (0.8)@ &what& can we [do about this
        tea                --->@ &nods&
20      TEA:                                +[>you are< asking me+
                                            +-points at herself--+
21      ZEY:  +yeah+ what can we do about this like-
              +nods+
22            (0.7)
23      TEA:  we have [exactly the same problem=
24      ZEY:          [in (      )↓
25      TEA:  =with (.) the other section because (.) in the other
26            section they created or they used texts (0.3) er talking
27            about (.) the superheroes↓=
28      ZEY:  =>hmm hmm<=
              (lines 29-49 are omitted)
50      TEA:  okay (0.4) so £(.)↑my suggestion↓ (0.5) to them (0.3)
```

97

```
                          £gestures with both hands--->line 59
51            was (0.5) er (.) okay (0.3) we know tha:t (0.2) >the<
52            current generation (.) are >interested in< superheroes
53            (0.4) why don't you create your own @superheroes↑=
                                          @smiles--->line 61
54    Ss:     =[hmm
55    ZEY:    =[hmm
56            (1.0)
57    TEA:    with (0.2) specific characteristics↑ (0.4) and this is
58            going to allow you↑ (0.7) to test >whether the students<
59            really understand (.) the english£
                                    --->£
60    ZEY:    °okay°
61    TEA:    okay↑ (.) %that's the best solution@     %
                                    --->@
                    %gestures with head and hands %
62    ZEY:    thank you=
63    TEA:    =[okay↓
64    ZEY:     [°(that would be)° the best
```

In line 1, Zey expresses that their friends mentioned the problems with using a text with popular movie characters. Since this is the beginning of the feedback given session and no verbal oral feedback has been provided for their group, this statement implies that she is referring to the written feedback they received from the feedback providers through the cloud service where they upload their exams and their feedbacks.

Zey expresses that their friends found the use of a text on the movie *Ice Age* in their exam is a problem as the students would understand it without reading (lines 1 to 6). From the word choice of Zey, it is understood that the written feedback received from peers adopted ALB when highlighting the problem with the design as she remarks that their friends stated using a popular text is problematic for the students as "they" would not need to read the text. This wording suggests that she is projecting the ALB adopted by the feedback providers in the written feedback. Zey signals that she requests an explanation on this issue from Tea in line 7 (i just want to ask this). Her remark gets acknowledgement tokens from Tea in lines 4 and 8 in overlaps with her explanation. Zey continues to state that the movies

included in the book they use are popular in general, which also receives an acknowledgement token from Tea. Following her explanation on the feedback they have received and the movies involved in the book, Zey remarks in line 12 that the students can easily answer questions on these movies without reading the text after the movie and the information related to it have been studied in class (`once we (.) st(.)udied them in the lesson (0.6) students↑ can (0.5) °can° always↑ (0.7) do them`). With this remark, Zey invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners through an ALB, suggesting that students would provide responses to reading questions without reading the texts related to movies previously studies in class. Since her assumption indicates that including a text based on a movie other than *Ice Age* would lead to the same problem, this ALB functions as a counter argument to the criticism received from peers in the form of ALB. The feedback provided by the other groups, as Zey delivers it, indicates that the use of a text about *Ice Age* is problematized due to the movie's popularity. Zey presents a counter argument to this comment regarding *Ice Age* when she provides her assumption on the fact that students would easily answer questions of any text related to a movie studied in class. She also provides justification in line 14 for the inclusion of that movie in the exam when she explains that it is one of the movies given in the book itself (`because they are given (0.8) in the: (.) book (0.9) and (0.2) that's why we s- (.) we use this (0.6) movie`).

While she provides a counter argument to the criticism on the use of a text related to *Ice Age*, it is seen in line 18 that she repeats her previous request of explanation (`i< (.) i would like to ask this`) and she also asks for advice in the continuation of this request (`(0.8) what can we do about this`). This implies that she regards students' being able to answer questions without reading the text as problematic even though she objects to the criticism on the use of a text about *Ice Age*. Following Zey's request of explanation, Tea provides an acknowledgment token (`hmm`) and a confirmation check that projects the request of Zey (`you are asking me`) in line 20 which overlap with Zey's question for advice. In the next line, Zey responds with a confirmation token regarding the request and repeats her question on what they can do to solve this problem. She abruptly stops after she repeats her question and she ceases a comment she initiates during Tea's next turn whereas Tea states that this problem is also present in the exams written

by trainee teachers in the other section in the faculty who used texts related to super heroes. While Tea refers to the other students, she goes general (Waring, 2017) by adopting the inclusive "we" pronoun (`we have exactly the same problem`). This comment of Tea receives an acknowledgement token from Zey in line 28. After this, Tea continues to provides an example to a question they discussed in that other section which would be answered without reading the related text on superheroes, then she expresses problems with using popular movies and popular movie characters while orienting to the whole classroom with the shifts in her gaze (Schwab, 2011). This part is omitted from the transcript as it is irrelevant to the focus of this analysis.

Following her explanation on the problems of using popular characters, Tea expresses that she recommended the test writers in the other section that they can come up with their own superheroes with their own characteristic traits due to the fact that the next generation likes superheroes. This suggestion receives change-of-state tokens (Heritage, 1984) from Zey and other trainee teachers including some members of group one. Tea continues to indicate that such a text with original superhero characters can help the trainee teachers in testing the students' understanding. Zey responds to this with an acknowledgement token that claims understanding (Koole, 2010) (`◦okay◦`) in line 60. Tea follows after this with a comprehension check (`okay↑`) and states that this is the best solution. Zey expresses thanks to this in the next line. Tea signals the close of this sequence in her next turn (`okay↓`) while Zey acknowledges Tea's suggestion as the best solution in an overlap with Tea's signal.

Use of ALB in order to Recap the Feedback Received

The remaining four extracts to be analyzed in this section are all taken from the eighth recorded session of the summer school and it is the final day of this course where the groups present the final drafts of their exams to the whole class. The exams are updated after all the written and oral feedback they have received over the course of feedback sessions. All four extracts entail ALB instances provided by test writers in order to recap the feedback received on their tests during feedback sessions and in written form. Since the test writers present their final drafts to the whole classroom as well as Tea, and sometimes have more than one test writer

speaking as interlocutors; these interactions involve multiple addresses, which makes these examples of multilogue (Schwab, 2011) like the feedback session extracts analyzed so far. The sequences involved in the following extracts are all related to the feedback test writers received during the feedback sessions. The first extract to be analyzed here involves group two (MIR, NES, GIZ, MEL) is presenting the final draft of their exam during the presentation session. In Extract 11, it is seen that Giz presents the changes they have made to the vocabulary section of their test and the other members of group two and Tea contribute to Giz's presentation.

Extract 11: Plump/criticized (R8-P1)

```
1     GIZ:      okay (that) is the second part of (.) our ex↑am (0.9)
2               in our first question (0.4) we used (.) authentic
3               pic↑tures (1.0) &for matching& activity (1.5) %however %
                        &-----1------&                    %gestures%
                1: points at the laptop screen in front of her
4               we realized that ((coughs)) some of pictures are
5               +offensive↑ (0.8) and not appropriate for (.) appropriate
                +gestures with left hand--->
6               (.) for (0.5) $ou- %for our$ aim↑+
                            $----nods----$ --->+
      tea                        %nods--->
7     TEA:      hmm hmm%
                   --->%
8               (0.7)
9     GIZ:      actually we put a (.) plump woman↑ *(1.2) with the
                                                  *gestures--->line 11
10              thought that (0.2) woman (0.6) don't: (0.4) have (.)
11              don't have to be: (.) slim*
                                  --->*
12    TEA:      +hmm hmm+
                +--nods-+
13    GIZ:      @but (0.5) some of our friends@ (1.2) er:
                @---gestures with left hand---@
14              (1.3)
15    NES:      °criticized°
16    GIZ:      £%criticized£% (0.4) $and (0.2) but then (0.2)$ we
```

```
                    %-----1-----%        $---shrugs and gestures--$
        nes         £----nods---£
                    1: looks and nods at NES
17                  @changed it (0.3) pictures@ (.) +with into car- cartoons+
        tea         @-----------nods---------@
                                                  +----gestures and nod---+
18      TEA:        hmm hmm er [so what is the rule here (0.4) whenever=
19      GIZ:                   [to prevent (0.2) misunderstandings
20      TEA:        =we are planning to use pictures↓ (0.2) what are the
21                  rules that we need to follow↓
22                  (2.2)
23      NES:        +>excuse me<+ can you *[○repeat○
                    +-stands up-+
24      TEA:                              *[wh- whenever we are &planning to
                                          *gestures with right hand-->line 26
        nes                                             &---2--->
                    2: smiles and nods
25                  use pictures right↑& (0.2) what are the rules that we
                                     --->&
26                  should be careful about*
                                          --->*
27      NES:        they need to be:: (0.2) %er: (0.9) @they need to be: (.)%
                                            %--holds up both index fingers--%
        tea                                          @---3--->line 33
                    3: raises the thumb of left hand
28                  +○şey neydi+ %uyumlu olmak○
                    well what was it to be compatible?
                    +pokes MIR +
                              %snaps her fingers ---> line 30
29      MIR:        ○appropriate○=
30      GIZ:        =○appro% $&[priate○
31      NES:                 $&[appropriate with the aim of (.) the question
                             $gestures with both hands---> line 34
        tea            --->%  &nods her head slowly ---> line 33
32                  (0.2) [i mean&@=
33      TEA:              [oka:y↑&@
                            --->&
```

```
                                    --->@
34    NES:        =+we-$ (.) *for example in our writing section we: used
      tea          +raises thumb and index finger of left hand--->line 38
                   --->$      *points and gestures at the projected doc--->
35                 (.)er pictures @er: (.) we have already* $(0.3) gave the
      tea                         @slowly nods--->
                                            --->* $gestures--->
36                 sentences↑ (0.4) er: (.) given the sentences↑$ and it
                                                              --->$
37                 wa:s %useless% (0.9) becau:se@ (.) +they don't+ er: (.)
                       %---4---%              --->@       +-----5----+
                   4: opens hands on both sides
                   5: points at the projected screen
38                 @they are not helpful          @+
                   @gestures towards projected doc@
                                            --->+
39    TEA:        @hmm hmm
                   @opens left palm and nods--->
40    MIR:        and the other@ (0.5) i- important aspect is that (.)
                            --->@
41                 it shouldn't (0.3) be (.) offensive &[for: (0.5) other
42                 gen- (.) >over=
43    TEA:                                              &[it shouldn't be
                                                        &nods--->
44                 offensive to& (.) +<anybody>      +
                              --->&      +horizontal nod+
45    MIR:        =%generalization< (.) for example (.) she said% (0.2)
      tea          %--------------nods her head---------------%
46                 er: she is plump (0.3) [and er:=
47    TEA:                                [hmm hmm
48    MIR:  →      =s- students may think that (0.2) all women (0.6)
49                 are plump
50    TEA:        uh hu:h=
51    MIR:        =they shouldn't come to this conclusion
52    TEA:        uh huh
```

In line 1, Giz starts introducing the second part of their exam, possibly the vocabulary section. She expresses that they initially used authentic pictures for the

matching activity in the first question with a deictical reference by pointing (Mondada, 2007) at the laptop screen while mentioning the matching activity. She states that they realized the pictures were offensive and not suitable for the aim they had for that activity, which displays her retrospective orientation to a learning experience (Jakonen, 2018). Tea responds to this with a nod and an acknowledgment token (`hmm hmm`) in line 7. Giz continues in line 9 to state that they used the picture of a plump woman to give the message that women do not have to be slim, for which Tea provides another acknowledgement token with a nod in line 12. Then, Giz continues to enounce that they received criticism from their peers for the use of that picture (`but (0.5) some of our friends (1.2) er:`). She is observed to have difficulty with the word "criticized" as she pauses and provides a hesitation marker at the end of line 13. After another pause, Nes provides an anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1996) in line 15 which may also be considered an other-initiated repair as she provides a word (`∘criticized∘`) which Giz adopts immediately in the following line to complete her statement while looking and nodding at Nes. Then, Giz explains that they changed the authentic pictures with cartoons. Tea responds with an acknowledgement token followed by a question that invokes the prior learning experience (Jakonen, 2018) on what rule they should follow, which overlaps with Giz's explanation on why they used cartoons as she expresses that the purpose of it was to avoid misunderstandings.

Tea changes the focus in line 18 when she asks for what rule to follow and expands on this by asking what rules they need to follow if they use pictures in their exams by using the inclusive "we" pronoun. After a 2.2-second pause, Nes asks for repetition in line 23 to which Tea responds by reformulating the question she asked. Nes takes the turn in line 27 and starts to talk about a feature of the pictures they use (`they need to be:: (0.2) er: (0.9) they need to be: (.)`). Her turn involves multiple hesitation markers, micro pauses and elongated forms, which signals her hesitation. She switches to the first language in line 28 and turns to Mir to ask for the equivalent of compatible in the target language (`∘şey neydi uyumlu olmak∘`). Both Mir and Giz provide the word appropriate in their respective turns. Nes takes up their suggestion and adopts this word into her talk in line 31. She states that the pictures should fit the aim of the question they ask and displays knowing (Koole, 2010) one of the rules Tea has asked for. Overlapping with Nes's

continuing explanation Tea provides a confirmation token with a rising intonation (`oka:y↑`) which may be interpreted as signaling Nes to continue with her comment. Nes continues in the next line with an example of misuse of pictures in the writing section of their exam and provides deictical references to their writing section (line 34) and the item design they used (line 37) by pointing at the projected document (Mondada, 2007). She expresses that they initially used pictures which did not have any purpose and were unhelpful. Tea responds with another acknowledgement token and nods through Nes's comment.

Following this, Mir self-selects for the next turn in line 40 and initiates another display of knowing (Koole, 2010) the answer to Tea's question, stating that it is important to have pictures that are not offensive and that do not lead to overgeneralization. Tea listens to Mir's comment while still nodding her head and initiates a confirmatory repeat (Park, 2014) of the last part of Mir's comment (it shouldn't be offensive) which overlaps with Mir's continuing account. Tea states the fact that pictures should not be offensive for anyone and nods her head horizontally, adding emphasis to "anybody". Mir continues with her explanation on the focal rule discussed and refers to the example Giz has mentioned (`for example (.) she said (0.2) er: she is plump`). Then, she invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners with an ALB (line 48) by stating that having the picture of a plump woman may lead the students to overgeneralize and that they should not come get a misconception about women. This is also an enactment (Sandlund, 2014) of learners' thoughts as Mir refers to the idea that this question may lead the hypothetical learners to get. Tea responds to her comment with acknowledgement tokens in lines 47, 50 and 52.

This instance of ALB reflects a problem with the item design they had in their first draft. The fact that this ALB problematizes item design makes it different than the previous ALBs of test writers analyzed in this study as the previous test writer ALBs were providing counter argument to feedback. One particular aspect of this extract is that it shows the test writers mirroring previously received comment on the focal question discussed. Ege (group three), who provided feedback on the vocabulary section, also used similar expressions to what Giz and the other members have stated about the picture of a plump woman being offensive. However, the way group two members and Ege highlight the problem is different as Ege did not openly use ALB in his problematization during the feedback session

while the test writers problematize their earlier draft through employing ALB. Excerpt 1 shows the feedback Ege provided in the fifth recorded session.

Excerpt 1: Plump-Feedback (R5-P2)

```
1     EGE:      okay @in my opinion in my humble opinion (0.7)@ i think
                     @---points towards himself and gestures--@
2               (.) it is *extremely: (0.2) offensive (0.4) to:: (0.4)
                          *gestures with right hand---> line 4
3               if i'm correct c is supposed to be (.) she: is (0.4)
4               plump* (0.5) &is that @correct
      tea         --->*              @slight nod--->
                          &nods and turns to group 5 ---> line 9
5     TEA:      hmm hmm@
                   --->@
6               (1.0)
7     NES:      [yep
8     EGE:      [girls (.) +is that correct+ (.) okay& (0.3) um: (0.4)
                           +nods at group 5+     --->&
9               you see >we're already £struggling< a lot (.) with
                                       £gestures with right hand->line 12
10              empowering women &(0.8)and (.)& i don't think this is the
      tea                        &-slight nod-&
11              right picture to go with↓ (.) i think (0.3) this would£
                                                              --->£
12              %(1.1) perhaps% (.) offend (0.3) a lot of people (0.4)
                %------1------%
                1:shrugs and gestures with head and hand
13              [and=
14    TEA:      [hm
15    EGE:      =*(0.9) maybe we could (0.3) go with (0.3) >i don't know<
                 *gestures with right hand--->
16              (.) perhaps a fat panda*
                                   --->*
17              (0.7)
18    TEA:      %hmm hmm%
                %-nods--%
19    EGE:      *[right↓
```

```
20    TEA:        *[or a baby↓
                  *smiles and then nods---> line 23
21    EGE:        $or ↑could be a baby$ %↑could be cat% (0.5) @something
                  $---points at tea---$ %points  right%     @gestures--->
22                that we cannot really <empathize>* with@(0.2) &right↑&(.)
                                          --->* --->@         &-nods-&
23                or +something that we cannot use (0.3)to+ $dehumanize the
                     +------gestures with right hand------+ $points away-->
24                *other ones (.)$ right↑*%(0.2) does that make sense girls
      tea         *---------nods---------*
                            --->$          %turns to group 5 ---> line 28
25    NES:        [yeah
26    TEA:        [yeah% &>i *think we discussed& this< (.) er:
      ege          --->% &---nods his head-----&
                              *gestures in the air---> line 29
27                 [basically (.) remember=
28    EGE:        %[yeah (.) before (0.3) yeah%*
                  %-----nods and gestures-----%
                                          --->*
29    TEA:        =and we said that nobody &should be offended& (0.2) we
      ege                                  &--slight head nod-&
30                should be very careful=
31    EGE:        =%absolutely%=
                   %---nods---%
32    TEA:        =whenever we are choosing our pictures↑=
```

Excerpt 1 shows group two receiving feedback from group three member Ege on the pictures they used in the activity that is discussed in Extract 11. It is observed that Ege also draws focus to the picture of the plump woman used by group two and highlights that it is offensive (i think (.) it is extremely: (0.2) offensive). He turns to group two and asks for confirmation in line 4 and receives a confirmation token from Tea in line 5 (hmm hmm) and from Nes (yep) in line 7. Upon receiving the confirmation he asks for, Ege provides an account of why the picture is offensive. By adopting the inclusive we" pronoun while stating the struggle with empowering women, Ege problematizes the use of this picture due to its being against this struggle for empowering women. He also states in line 11 that it can offend a lot of people. This statement of his is not considered as an example of ALB since the word

"people" does not directly indicate a reference to the students and it rather seems like a general statement.

When Giz's statement in lines 3 and 4 of Extract 11 is observed, it is seen that she states they realized the picture was offensive. This may be alluding to Ege's statement of the picture being offensive. The evidence for this comes from Giz's following lines in Extract 11 where she expresses that they had the idea of showing women do not have to be slim and that this received criticism from their friends. She adds that this is why they changed the pictures. Changing the picture with something else is also a suggestion proposed by Ege (lines 15 to 19 of Excerpt 1) marked with the hedges "maybe" and "I don't know" that downgrades his assertion against group two's design. During this, Tea also suggests the use of a picture of a baby to which Ege's responds with a confirmatory repeat (Park, 2014) and offers a further example. He expresses that the pictures should be non-offensive and should not be open to use for dehumanizing others. He employs the inclusive "we" pronoun along his explanation which depersonalizes his comment (Waring, 2017). He ends his explanation with a comprehension check (line 24), which receives a claim of understanding (Koole, 2010) from Nes in the next line and a confirmation from Tea. Following the suggestion of Ege, Tea refers to a past learning event (Can Daşkın, 2017; Can Daşkın & Hatipoğlu, 2019) about pictures (`yeah i think we discussed this< (.) er: basically (.) remember`) and this receives confirmation tokens from Ege. Tea expresses what they have discussed about pictures in prior classes. Considering these, it is possible to say that the test writers took up the feedback they received in this earlier feedback session. Even though Ege downgraded his assertion when suggesting changing the pictures, Extract 11 demonstrates that group two acknowledged his suggestion as they state that they changed the pictures after the criticism they received from their friends.

The next extract analyzed here involves group one (ECE, SAN, ZEY, ARI, SON) presenting the final draft of the exam they prepared. The question discussed here comes from the vocabulary section of their exam. Extract 12 starts with San stating that she will present the vocabulary section and showing the first version of their exam through the projector. Then, she shows and explains the changes they have made.

Extract 12: Number of pictures (R8-P2)

```
1     SAN:        so er: i will continue with the vocabulary part↑
2                 (1.7) ºer:º (2.0) ºu:mº (1.0) er: (.) at the beginning
3                 of:: (1.0) um in our first draft +(3.5) it hh (0.2)
                                                  +scrolls the projected
                  document--->
4                 was like this↑+ (.) er:: er we used (0.6) &ten vocabulary
                            --->+                            &---1--->
                  1: points at the projected document
5                 items and (.) ten pictures an:d& (0.4) first of all we
                                                --->&
6                 learned +from the feedbacks from our (0.4) >peers and<
                          +gestures towards the class and TEA --->
7                 from you↑+ that er: @the number of the: (.) pictures
                       --->+          @gestures towards the projected
                  document and hand gestures in the air---> line 13
8                 shouldn't be the same as the &number of >the vocabulary
                                               &nods--->
9      →          items↑< because (.) .hh (.) the students& can easily:
       tea                                              --->&
10                >just< (0.4) er mark the last one (.) %they we- (0.6)
       tea                                             %---2--->
                  2: nods and gestures with left hand
11                we cannot% u::m (0.6) er (.) we cannot see if they know
                        --->%
12                &the word or not↑&@=
       tea        &------nods------&
                            --->@
13     TEA:       =hmm hmm=
14     SAN: →     =so $they can (.) even do it by chance↓$ (.) er so::
                     $---gestures with palm facing up---$
15                in: £the: (0.5) second one in our (1.2) last version
                     £scrolls the projected document--->
16                (2.0) huh (0.5)£ we just- (.) we decided to use five
                            --->£
17                pictures↑ an-(0.2) and we have (0.3)er@ three +more
                                                       @gestures-->line 20
```

```
        tea                                              +nods--->
18                  vocabulary items+ so that we can (0.6) a hundred percent
                              --->+
19                  >understand that our< students lear↑ned the vocabulary
20                  items↑ le- (.) learned@ (0.5) a::nd er here in the first
                              --->@
21                  (0.3) first draft we:: hh (.) some of the pictures were
22                  not (0.3) in the:: same format of the other pictures …
```

San draws the focus to the first version of a matching question they had in the vocabulary by expressing how they structured it (`we used (0.6) &ten vocabulary items and (.) ten pictures`) and by pointing at the presentation (Mondada, 2007). Then, she provides a retrospective reference to her and her peers' prior learning experience (Jakonen, 2018) regarding the focal test item, expressing that they learned not to give equal number of items for a matching activity as a result of the feedback they received (lines 5 to 9). She gestures at Tea and her classmates while indicating that this is something they learned as a result of their feedback. In her statement, it is seen that she refers to both Tea and her peers as the source of that feedback. When the recorded feedback sessions are observed, it is seen that Tea provides a warning for group one to include extra pictures in their matching activity during the feedback session on the vocabulary sections of the groups. However, no oral feedback on the equal number of pictures and items is observed to be provided by any feedback provider. Thus, it is deduced that her reference to the feedback they received from their peers can possibly be alluding to the written feedback they got through from the feedback providing groups.

After here reference to the feedback they received, she provides justification to the problematization in the feedback. In line 9, she invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners by providing an ALB which states that students would just match the final picture (`because (.) .hh (.) the students& can easily: >just< (0.4) er mark the last one`) and that they cannot really know whether the students know the answer or not. Her use of personal pronoun "we" in line 11 positions herself and her group members as testers (`we cannot see if they know the word or not`) in a standardized relational pair (Leyland, 2021; Sacks, 1972 as cited in Silverman, 1998). Through this statement, she also constructs the non-present students as test takers in this standardized relational pair of tester-test taker. She speculates on how

students would act when answering this question and this is based on previous feedback received from Tea and their feedbacks as she expressed earlier in the extract. On the other hand, it is not possible to say whether this is a statement they received in a feedback or something that the test writers inferred from the feedback. In either case, San's ALB problematizes the design of this question from the first draft they prepared.

Tea frequently nods her head during San's explanation for the first question and she provides an acknowledgement token in line 13 after San remarks that they cannot understand if the students actually know the answer. Following Tea's token, San continues to problematize the first draft of the question by providing an ALB stating that the students may provide a coincidental answer for the picture one (line 14). Then, she explains how they structured this question in the final draft by stating that they added extra five pictures to make sure the students answer consciously. Tea provides nods during this explanation of hers as well.

The next extract follows from the presentation of group one as well. This time, group one is seen presenting the reading section of their exam. Ari takes the turn to present the final draft of the reading section of the exam they prepared for fifth graders. She draws the focus to the question type they initially used and the problem with the items they had.

Extract 13: General knowledge (R8-P2)

```
1     ARI:        the @f:irst question was supposed to be: a:: scanning
                    @gestures with hands---> line 4
2     →          question (.) but (.) er: since students are (.) er::
3                 (0.3)*>will be er< students will be (0.4) knowing the:(.)
                     *smiles--->
4                 movie they (.) can@ +a- answer the question +(0.7) like*=
                            --->@ +points at the proj. doc+     --->*
5     SAN:        =from +their general [knowledge=
      tea              +nods---> line 7
6     TEA:                            [hmm hmm=
7     ARI:        =@yeah@+ (.) from their general know[ledge↑
                  @nods @
                    --->+
8     TEA:                                          [+remember like ↑me+
```

```
                                                        +points at herself+
9                    (0.5) %[(because)=
                          %laughs while speaking ---> line 15
10   Ss:                  +[eh he he+
     ari                  +laughs   +
11   ARI:        so: *[we-
12   TEA:           =*[i knew the characters by heart=
     ari             *smiles---> line 14
13   SAN:        =hmm hmm=
14   TEA:        =what was their relationship (.).hh so*£ i (  ) didn't
                                            --->*£gestures->line 17
15               have to read the text↑%=
                                    --->%
16   SAN:        =hmm hmm=
17   TEA:        =+i just answered+  the£ questions
     ari          +------nods-----+ --->£
18   ARI:        so @we changed the first question into: a (refer:) (0.2)
                    @gestures---> lines 20
19               question↑ (0.6) where: we ask the: (0.2) er: (.) ask what
20               pronouns $[we: @-
21   TEA:                 $[have@ you watched this film↑              $
                            --->@
                          $points at group one and at the projected doc $
22   ARI:        +yeah          +
                 +nods and smiles+
```

Ari states that in line 1 that in the first draft of the exam the first question was supposed to be a scanning question. Following this, she demonstrates an orientation to the assumed knowledge of the students (Can, 2020) with an ALB by expressing that the students can answer the question from their general knowledge as they would know the movie (line 2), accompanied by a deictical reference by pointing (Mondada, 2007) at the projected document. San provides an anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1996) as a final TCU for Ari's comment (`from their general knowledge`) while Tea nods and provides an acknowledgement token (`hmm hmm`) overlapping with San's turn. In her next turn (line 7), Ari provides a compliance token to San's TCU and repeats the TCU San came up with to confirm (Park, 2014) that this is how the students may answer the question (`=yeah+ (.) from their`

`general knowledge↑`). By stating that students would answer from their general knowledge as they would know the movie, Ari invokes (Leyland, 2021) the learners through an ALB since she makes assumptions both on how students would respond to the question and on their epistemic status. Her statement problematizes the design they initially had for this section and provides justification for the change they made.

Although there is no reference to an earlier feedback received, it has been observed that group one receives feedback on the reading section and the movie they used in the reading passage regarding its popularity and its questions that can be answered through general knowledge. One example of such comment happens during the sixth recorded session where the reading sections receive feedback. Tea is seen expressing that one question can be answered from general knowledge. However, her comment indicates that the general knowledge required to answer the question does not come from the movie but from having information about animal species. The other feedback received on the popularity of this movie is observed in Extract 9 analyzed here as Zey, a member of group one, expresses in that extract that they received feedback on how popular *Ice Age* is and that this was problematized by the feedback providers as it would allow the students to answer without reading, hence, through their general knowledge.

After the explanation of Ari, Tea provides a reference to a past learning experience (Can Daşkın, 2017; Can Daşkın & Hatipoğlu, 2019) by referring to her comment from the sixth recorded session on the problem. She highlights the possibility to answer through general knowledge by stating that she knew the answer because she knew the movie and its characters and adds that she answered without reading the text. The beginning of Tea's comment receives laughs from the class. During Tea's turn Ari attempts to continue with her explanation no the final version of the question, yet she is cut by Tea's continuing statement. San provides understanding acknowledgement tokens during Tea's explanation and, following the completion of Tea's comment, she explains how they changed the question in the final draft. She expresses that they asked refer questions which requires the students to provide the pronouns. At this point she receives a question from Tea that changes the focus of the discussion.

The final extract to be analyzed in this study comes from the presentation session as well. Extract 14 involves a sequence from the presentation of group four (DEN, CEY, BER, SER) where they present the final version of the true-false questions they had in the reading section of their exam. The extract starts with Cey expressing their initial thoughts when they were constructing these questions.

Extract 14: They get points (R8-P2)

```
1    CEY:        so (0.3) we thought that (.) at first true and false (.)
2                %will be e↑nough% (.) but *then (.) you said (.) it's so
     tea         %-----nods------%
                                        *gestures and smiles--->
3                +simple+* (0.6) er:- (0.4) also (.) $[the students-
     tea         +-nods-+
                    --->*
4    TEA:                                              $[>but< why did i
                                                     $---1--->
                 1: gestures with left hand with palm facing up
5                say that↓$
                    --->$
6    CEY: →       £because students can er: &throw tha- that away (.) like=
                 £gestures---> line 11
     tea                                   &---2---> line 14
                 2: opens her hands on both sides and nods her head first
                 horizontally, then vertically
7    BER:        =%randomly  %=
                  %open palms%
8    CEY:        =>true false @[true false=   @
9    BER:                      @[even if-      @
                              @raises eyebrows@
10   CEY:        =[true false<£=
11   TEA:         [↑exactly   £
                        --->£
12   CEY:        =*and they get (0.3) [g- (0.2) points        *
13   BER:                             [even if they don't know*=
     cey         *----gestures with both hands and smiles----*
14   TEA:        =£↑exactly£&
                  £--nods--£
```

```
                        --->&
15    CEY:      so (.) we- we +$[have changed it↓
16    TEA:                  +$[especially if you have an equal number
      cey                   +makes the ppt full screen--->
                            $opens hands on both sides--->
17              of true and false (.) answers↓$+ (0.5) [remember↑
                                          --->$
                                          --->+
18    BER:                                        [∘eh he∘ (.)%>false
                                                          %--3-->
                3: laughs and gestures with index finger
19              *[false false ∘false false∘<  *%
                                          --->%
20    CEY:      *[yes: (0.4) yes (.)          *exactly↑ (0.5) er:(.) and
                *smiles at TEA, gestures, nods*
21              ↑then (0.2) we thought that (.) we should change it (.)
22              $er::(0.2) £a bit$ (0.2)er::(0.3)more (.)complicated one=
      tea       $---slight nod---$
                        £gestures with both hands---> line 24
23    TEA:      =uh [huh£
24    CEY:          [with£ ∘th- (0.3) mo- (.) [more complicated one∘
                     --->£
25    TEA:                                    [and this is &not only our
                                                          &---4--->
                4: points towards herself
26              suggestion (.) right↑& +this is=
                                --->& +points outwards and nods--->
27    CEY:      =yeah=
28    TEA:      =%the (.) suggestion% of the experts as well↓+
      ber        %--nods his head---%                    --->+
29    CEY:      &yes & (0.4) then we (.) we added (.) not given (0.3)
                &nods&
30              option↑ (0.4) and↑ (0.3) *o- (0.2) of course we (.)
                                        *gestures---> line 34
31              changed the text (.) because %it was% (0.2) @er: simple↑=
      tea                                    %--5---%
      tea                                                @--6-->
```

```
                    5: lifts her index finger
                    6: turns to the table at the back, shuffles exam papers
32    TEA:          =hmm hmm=
33    CEY:          =so we made it (.) er (.) a bit (.) more (0.2) er: (.)
34                  %complicated↑    %*
      tea           %picks up a paper%
                              --->*
35    TEA:          hmm hmm
```

Cey explains in line 1 that in the first draft. He adopts the epistemic phrase "we thought" and explains their stance on their choice of true and false as the options for this activity (Kärkkäinen, 2012). Following this, he displays a retrospective reference to a prior experience (Jakonen, 2018), expressing that the feedback they received from Tea showed that it was too be simple (but then (.) you said (.) it's so simple). By stating this, he puts forth that the change in their stance on the design resulted from Tea's comment. He attempts to continue with his explanation; however, Tea nods and interrupts to ask him the reason why she made that comment through a reference to a past learning event (Can Daşkın, 2017; Can Daşkın & Hatipoğlu, 2019) (>but< why did i say that↓) by utilizing past form to allude to that past experience as a way to get Cey to explain why the design was problematic. Starting in line 6, Cey provides an ALB which invokes the learners by using idiomatic language (Leyland, 2021) as he states that students can "throw that away" by writing true or false and get correct answers even though they do not know the correct answer. This receives an anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1996) from Ber in line 7 (randomly). Through this ALB, Cey problematizes the prior item design they had and provides justification to the altered item design. He receives support from Ber in lines 9 and 13 who implies that students would provide random answers even if they do not know the answers. Cey's explanations receive explicit positive assessment markers (Waring, 2008) from Tea in lines 11 and 14, while she also provides confirmation with her gestures to Cey and Ber's explanations. Her assessment markers and gestures mark the explanations of Cey and Ber as affiliative response that comply with Tea's pedagogical focus for asking the question "why did I say that".

Following Tea's confirmation token to Cey and Ber's statements, Cey continues in line 15 to express that this is the reason why they changed the item

design. Tea overlaps with Cey during this explanation and expands on how random guessing of true and false answers by the students can be a problem for them (`especially if you have an equal number of true and false (.) answers↓ (0.5) remember↑`), which also refers to a past learning event (Can Daşkın, 2017; Can Daşkın & Hatipoğlu, 2019) where they discussed the ratio of the true and false answers for such questions. Ber provides a laughter token to this in line 18 in a turn-final overlap with Tea's expansion and he provides a supporting comment to her final comment as he illustrates how students would provide answers randomly. While Ber provides this comment, Cey responds to Tea's remark with confirmation tokens followed by the compliance token "exactly" in line 20 and continues to explain that they changed the design to make it a bit more complicated. Tea provides an acknowledgement token to Cey's explanation in line 23 and once again initiates a comment in line 25 in an overlap with Cey's explanation. She states that experts suggest this kind of a change as well since the level of the exam prepared by group four requires such complexity. Her statement is accompanied by a deictical reference to "the experts" by pointing outwards (Mondada, 2007). Cey provides a confirmation token in line 27 (`yeah`) while Tea provides her comment. After the end of Tea's comment he continues to explain that they added not given as an extra option to make it more complicated and changed the text with a more advanced one. Tea provides acknowledgement tokens during his explanation.

One interesting aspect of this extract is that Cey's ALB in fact mirrors the feedback his group received from Nes in Extract 3. Nes is seen providing feedback with an ALB through which she states students would provide random answers (`rather than reading this one they can just select true true true and there would be (0.2) correct answers`). Cey's ALB in Extract 14 (`because students can er: throw tha- that away (.) like >true false true false and they get (0.3) g- (0.2) points`) is quite similar to what Nes provides in her feedback. Based on this similarity, it is possible to infer that Cey's assumption shows evidence for take-up of the feedback they received and may also indicate a retrospective orientation to the learning experience (Jakonen, 2018) related to that feedback.

Summary

On the whole, this chapter has demonstrated the emergence of ALB instances in pre-service teachers' turns during feedback and presentation sessions in a testing and evaluation course context. The analyses revealed that the use ALBs by feedback providers and test writers differs in the functions they perform and their emergence point in interactional sequences. Feedback provider ALBs predominantly problematize item designs whenever they occur in interaction. On the other hand, test taker ALBs mainly propose counter argument to feedback received or recap the feedback. While this is the case, all ALBs have the main feature of invoking the learners, regardless of the owner, the function, or the use of ALBs. The findings in this chapter will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 5
Discussion and Implications

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the findings of the previous chapter in relation to the research questions presented in the first chapter. Following this, possible implications of the findings will be discussed in terms of L2 teacher education, classroom learning of pre-service teachers, and testing and evaluation course. The use of ALBs emerging in interactions will be discussed in the first section. The functions that ALBs perform in interaction will be given in the second section of this chapter. The next section will involve the aspects of the pre-service teachers' test items that evoke ALBs. After this, how ALBs provide learning opportunities for pre-service teachers in terms of their testing abilities will be described. Following these sections, implications in relation to L2 teacher education, classroom learning of pre-service teachers, and testing and evaluation course will be discussed.

The Use of ALBs Emerging in Interaction

In line with the first research question of this study, the uses of ALBs will be discussed in relation to how the sequences unfold as well as how the interaction unfolds following ALBs. The analysis of the data showed that there are four main uses of ALBs by pre-service teachers in relation to the sequential unfolding of interaction during feedback and presentation sessions.

Use of ALB in order to Initiate the Problem. When the instances of ALBs are analyzed in detail, it is seen that the use of ALB in order to initiate the problem is second most recurrent. The data analysis showed that twenty instances of ALBs are used when initiating the problem with test items or test sections during feedback sessions by feedback providers. The fact that pre-service teachers frequently use assumptions on possible learner behavior to initiate a problem may be interpreted as pre-service teachers' mindfulness of the hypothetical learners when they review and provide feedback to test items. An awareness of the hypothetical learners would be the incentive for pre-service teachers to resort to this use of ALB so often in interaction when they look for possible problems with the test items at hand. As the data revealed, this use often led to the pre-service teachers to notice and accept

problems related to their test items. That is, this use of ALB is practical when expressing what the problem is and why it is a problem from a perspective that considers the non-present learners. Such a use of ALB can be helpful in other contexts where teachers review test items in order to determine problems with tests, which can contribute to the assessment literacy levels of pre-service teachers. Therefore, encouraging pre-service teachers to assume learner behavior whenever they try to determine problems with test items can be beneficial for teacher learning in that it may contribute to improvements in their item writing and item reviewing skills, resulting in higher levels of assessment literacy. Keeping in mind the learners for whom they prepare tests and assuming how they would possibly react to tests can enable teachers to find and fix problems with their tests prior to implementing them.

The general structure of the instances with this use of ALB starts with a feedback provider initiating a comment to indicate a problem in the focal test item or test section. This initiation may or may not be preceded by a turn-allocation from the teacher. The ALB is produced within this initiation of the problem by feedback providers (FP). In most cases, the feedback providers' initiation receives acknowledgement tokens from the teacher (T) in order to encourage the pre-service teachers to continue with their turns. After the initiation accompanied by ALB, the teacher is seen providing agreement with the problem indicated and expand on it in the following turns in most uses of ALB in order to initiate the problem. This agreement and expansion provided by the teacher also leads to consensus on the problem with minimal or non-minimal agreement from peers and/or test writers (TM). This general structure of sequences can be represented with a sequential organization as follows; however, teacher follow-up turns and the test writer or peer follow-up turns may switch places in cases:

T: Turn-allocation / No turn-allocation

FP: → Initiation of the problem with ALB

T: Agreement and/or expansion (minimal or non-minimal)

TM or Peer: Orientation and/or agreement (minimal or non-minimal)

As indicated above, the use ALB in order to initiate the problem exclusively occurs in feedback provider turns in feedback sessions. Extract 1 and Extract 2 in the data analysis represents sequences where the teacher allocates the turn to the feedback providers while in Extract 3 an example of the feedback provider self-selecting to initiate a comment is observed. In the extracts presented in the data analysis for the use of ALB in order to initiate the problem, it is exemplified that the teacher demonstrates acknowledgement and agreement and expands on the feedback in her follow-up turns. In terms of the response this use of ALB receives from the test writers or peers, an example to minimal orientation from the test writers is seen in Extract 1 in which San orients to the feedback minimally by taking notes following the teacher's agreement with the problematization while it is also seen that a peer group member non-minimally orients to the initiation of the problem with the use of ALB by providing alignment and affiliation in Extract 1. As examples to non-minimal orientation of test writers, it is presented in Extract 2 and Extract 3 that test-makers may provide acknowledgment of the problem and expansion on it beginning either prior to teacher follow-up (Extract 2) or after it (Extract 3).

Use of ALB in response to the Problem Already Indicated. The analysis of data revealed that the most common use of ALB in sequences is the use of ALB in response to the problem already indicated with twenty-one instances occurring in feedback sequences. The majority of these instances are formulated in feedback provider turns like the problem initiation ALBs, though there are two instances provided in test writer turns. The fact that this use is the most frequent one can also be an indicator of pre-service teachers' mindfulness of the hypothetical learners when reviewing items. Different than the previous use, this use of ALB rather acts as a justification for why there is a problem for the non-present learners. This use can be especially helpful in terms of teacher learning to understand the extent to which an indicated problem jeopardizes a test item. An understanding of possible learner reaction to a noticed problem can enable teachers to find appropriate solutions to problems with test items. Encouraging to be mindful of (hypothetical or real) learners when trying to solve a problem with test items can lead teachers to revise tests more effectively and can improve their assessment literacy in relation to test writing and item reviewing. For this reason, prompting and preparing pre-

service teachers to assume learner behavior whenever they try to edit problems in test items can enable pre-service teachers to produce more valid test items.

When the general structure of these sequences is examined, it is seen that these instances start with a problem initiation. These initiations may be done either by the teacher or a feedback provider. A discussion on the problem indicated follows after the initiation which involves the teacher, feedback providers and test writers, though not all parties may be present in all cases of this use. The use of ALB in response to the problem already indicated usually takes place following this discussion and involves further problematization of the test item or test section. This initiates expansion by prompting further discussion which leads to agreement on the problem. One common occurrence in these sequences is that the feedback provider that adopts an ALB is generally a different pre-service teacher than the feedback provider that indicated the problem in the first place (if the initiation is not provided by the teacher). This general structure of sequences can be represented with a sequential organization as follows:

T or FP (1):   Initiating the problem

                    (discussion on the problem indicated)

FP (2): →   Use of ALB in response to the problem indicated

                    (consensus on the problem minimally or non-minimally)

In the data analysis, the initiation of the problem by a feedback provider is seen in Extract 4. It is seen that the discussion that follows afterwards involves the test writer, feedback providers and the teacher. In Extract 5 and Extract 6, the initiation of the problem by the teacher is exemplified where the teacher challenges the test writers by problematizing the test items. It is seen that the discussion following the indication of the problem involves the teacher and a test writer in Extract 5 and Extract 6. In terms of the use of ALB in response to the problem indicated, it is exemplified in all three extracts that a feedback provider provides a further problematization of the focal point which leads to the teacher's alignment with the comment on the problem and the test writers' acceptance of the problem.

It is also seen in Extract 4 that the feedback provider that uses ALB in response to the problem already indicated is a different pre-service teacher than the feedback provider that initiated the problem at the beginning of the sequence. In all three extracts analyzed in the data analysis, it is demonstrated that the test writers display alignment with the problematization and the use of ALB for the problem.

Use of ALB in order to Oppose the Feedback Provided. Opposing the feedback provided by adopting ALBs is a use exclusively seen in test writer turns within the instances observed. This use of ALB is observed in twelve cases where negative feedback or suggestions are provided, primarily by feedback providers. Following the feedback or suggestion, test writers are observed to object through adopting ALBs in their response turns. This use of ALB sometimes provided good explanations for the claimed problems while in other cases proved to be not so effective. Such a use of ALB can be helpful whenever there are misunderstandings regarding the test items being reviewed and can be used to express why the claimed problem or solution does not comply with the test item. Although these ALBs did not always contribute to a better understanding of the focal test items, this use of ALB also indicates pre-service teachers' mindfulness of hypothetical learners, even when responding to feedback. In some cases, this use also proved to be useful for expressing acceptable rationale for the test items written. For this reason, it can be concluded that an awareness of hypothetical learners, or real learners, can contribute to the validity of test items. This once again implies that what should be encouraged in pre-service teachers regarding the uses of ALB is an awareness of the learners for whom they construct tests, which can contribute to improvements in the assessment literacy levels of pre-service teachers as well.

The general structure of the sequences with this use usually starts with a feedback provider turn involving a negative feedback or a negative feedback accompanied by a suggestion for change. However, there is also a case where this negative feedback or suggestion is not provided in classroom but in written feedback provided beforehand. After the feedback, test writers follow with a response that opposes the feedback accompanied by ALBs. The follow-up turn occurs in two distinct ways with the teacher either aligning with the feedback provider or aligning with the test writer. Based on this unfolding, the general structure can be represented with an organization like this:

FP: Negative feedback or suggestion

TM: →   Opposing feedback with ALB

T: Alignment (with FP or TM)

In the data analysis, Extract 7 represents both an instance of opposing negative feedback and an instance of opposing a suggestion received from a feedback provider. It is seen that a feedback provider initiates a problematization of the focal item in Extract 7. An example of opposing the feedback provided with an ALB is seen after this problematization. The teacher provides alignment with the test writer in this sequence. In remainder of the sequence, the same feedback provider is observed to continue with his problematization and this time provides a suggestion for change. In response to this, another example of the use of ALB in order to oppose the feedback received is provided. This time, the teacher's alignment with the feedback provider is observed. Apart from opposing the feedback provided in classroom interaction, an example of opposing the written feedback received prior to the class is exemplified in Extract 8. This sequence is initiated directly with the opposition of a test writer in response to the feedback received. The use of ALB in order to oppose the feedback is provided in this initiation. The teacher in this case first displays her skepticism and then displays alignment with the feedback provider after the clarification provided by the feedback provider who gave the written feedback in the first place.

Use of ALB in Counter Arguments in response to the Use of ALB by Feedback Providers. The instances that involve the use of ALB in counter arguments in response to the use of ALB by feedback providers is quite similar to the use of ALB in order to oppose the feedback provided and is less frequent than those instances. However, this structure is separately analyzed as the use of ALB in response to the use of ALB is considered a distinct sequence compared to the use of ALB for opposing. These instances all start with a problematization by feedback providers accompanied by the use ALBs in their feedback. In the following part of the sequence the test writers are seen initiating a response with the use of ALB as well. This response may or may not be preceded by a teacher turn. Like the

124

case of a use of ALB in order to oppose the feedback provided, an instance of using ALB in response to the written feedback received is observed in this use of ALB and it is included in the data analysis. Following the opposition of the test writer with the ALB, teacher expansion is observed. After this follow-up, test writer alignment is observed either as minimal or non-minimal orientation. In line with this unfolding, a general structure for the instances involving this use can be represented as follows:

FP: →   Use of ALB in feedback

TM: →   Use of ALB in response to the use of ALB by FP

T: Teacher expansion

TM: Alignment

In the data analysis, two cases are analyzed in order to exemplify the use of ALB in counter arguments in response to the use of ALB by feedback providers. In Extract 9, it is seen that a feedback provider initiates a problematization on the focal test item accompanied by a use of ALB. This is followed by a question from the teacher that directs the feedback provider's problematization at the test writers. Following this, a test writer initiates a response with a use of ALB, which is a counter argument directly opposing the problematization of the feedback provider. This is followed by the teacher's expansion that displays agreement for the problematization of the feedback provider or the test writer's counter argument. In response to the teacher's expansion and agreement, the test writer is seen providing minimal alignment. Unlike Extract 9, Extract 10 demonstrates a use of ALB in a counter argument in response the use of ALB in written feedback. This is understood from the test writer's word choice when reformulating the feedback her group received. The sequence in Extract 10 displays the test writer reformulating the feedback received with the use of ALB. Then the test writer proceeds with her counter argument that involves the use of ALB and directs a question at the teacher. This leads to the teacher's expansion and explanation on the focal problem, which leads to the test writer's alignment.

Use of ALB in order to Recap the Feedback Received. It is seen that the use of ALB in order to recap the feedback received exclusively occurs in test writer turns during the presentation session. In fact, the majority of the ALBs occurring in the presentation session involves this use. Out of the fourteen instances of ALBs in the presentation session, ten instances involve the use of ALB in order to recap the feedback received either from the teacher or the feedback providers.

This use of ALB builds on the feedback pre-service teachers received from others in relation to the problems with their test items. What is interesting about this use of ALB is that pre-service teachers provide assumptions on learner behavior when explaining why there is a problem, even when the feedback given did not make any such assumptions regarding the hypothetical learners. In this respect, this use resembles the use of ALB in response to the problem already indicated. Like that use, this use of ALB when recapping feedback can be helpful in terms of teacher learning to understand the extent to which a problem jeopardizes a test item and why the problem needs to be fixed. This use implies that pre-service teachers had an awareness of the hypothetical learners when they edited their test items as they expressed these when justifying the problem and its extent. This can be an indicator that an understanding of possible learner reaction to a problem may have led these pre-service teachers to find appropriate solutions to problems with their test items. For this reason, it is once again emphasized that encouraging pre-service teachers to assume learner behavior when editing problems in test items can enable pre-service teachers to improve their assessment literacy and produce more valid test items and revise their tests more effectively.

The general structure of these instances usually starts with the initiation of an explanation by test writers. This explanation is generally followed by the teacher's acknowledgment and/or expansion on the focal point, which prompts follow-up turns from the test writers. The use of ALBs in order to recap the feedback received from others either takes place in the initiation of an explanation by test writers or in their follow-up turns after the teacher's expansion. The general structure of these instances can be represented with a sequential organization as follows:

TM: → Explanation (with or without ALB that recaps feedback)

T: Acknowledgment and/or expansion

TM: Follow-up/Expansion (with or without ALB that recaps feedback)

In the cases that are provided in the data analysis, sequences involving both ALB in first test writer turn and the follow-up test writer turn are exemplified. In Extract 12 and Extract 13, it is seen that test writers provide explanations on the updated version of their tests and use ALBs that recap the feedback they received earlier in class or in written form. In these extracts, the teacher provides acknowledgment tokens for the explanations of the test writers, which signals the test writers to follow up in next turns. The teacher's expansion on the focal point is exemplified in Extract 13. In Extract 11 and Extract 14, it is observed that the test writers initiate explanation on their tests without ALBs and receive acknowledgment tokens from the teacher. In both extracts, the teacher expands the discussion with a question directed at the test writers regarding the focal point. Examples of the use of ALB that recaps the feedback provided are provided in the following turns of the test writers in these extracts. The ALBs that test writers provide while recapping the feedback they received indicates their uptake of the feedback they received. Especially in Extract 14, it is observed that the ALB provided by a feedback provider in a feedback session is mirrored by the test writer in the presentation session.

Summary

This section discussed and demonstrated where and how ALBs occur in classroom interaction during feedback and presentation sessions. It is seen that the pre-service teachers adopted ALBs for the majority of the instances for four different uses. The use of ALB in response to the problem already indicated is the most common of these four uses. After this, the use of ALB to initiate the problem is also quite frequent. Although these two uses are almost exclusively adopted by feedback providers, test writers were observed to use ALBs to oppose or recap the feedback, and to counter other ALBs. The analysis of these four uses of ALBs indicated that encouraging pre-service teachers to assume possible learner behavior can lead to more valid test items and better item review practices. Especially the uses of ALB

on initiating the problem and in response to the problem already indicated are found to be useful. These two uses are recommended to be encouraged in pre-service teacher education contexts to support pre-service teachers' test writing and item reviewing abilities, which in turn can contribute to better assessment literacy in pre-service teachers.

The uses of ALB and their impact on the improvement of test items and their possible contributions to the assessment literacy of pre-service teachers indicate insights for the literature on the assessment literacy and assessment needs of pre-service teachers. Earlier research reported that pre-service teachers had low assessment literacy levels and needed further training and practice in assessment (see Chapter 2 for details). On the other hand, this study indicated that assuming learner behavior contributed to the assessment skills and assessment literacy of pre-service teachers by enabling them to notice and understand problems with their own test items as well as contributing to their item review skills. In this way, the findings of this study contrast with the earlier studies regarding the assessment literacy levels and assessment skills of pre-service L2 teachers.

One reason why such a practice like ALB emerged in and through interaction in this ELTE course setting can the fact that this course followed a flipped classroom design. This helped pre-service teachers to have more time for practicing item writing and item reviewing, which gave them more chances than a traditional lecture-based classroom to interact with others and display their testing abilities. Another explanation for the emergence of ALB and pre-service teachers display of their testing abilities can be peer interaction and peer feedback. As a requirement of the course, pre-service teachers had to give meaningful feedback to their peers regarding the tests they constructed. This requirement benefited pre-service teachers in terms of communicating more with their peers more, improving their item writing and item reviewing, and developing their ability to express and justify their feedback with practices such as ALB. These indicate that a flipped classroom design and opportunities for peer interaction and peer feedback can contribute to the assessment literacy of pre-service teachers positively within the context of L2 testing and evaluation courses.

This section discussed ALBs in relation to their uses in sequential organization and provided explanations on what these uses indicate regarding the

testing skills and assessment literacy of pre-service teachers. The next section will discuss ALBs in terms of the functions they perform in classroom interaction.

ALBs and the Functions They Perform

In line with the second research question of this study, this section will discuss the functions that ALBs perform in and through classroom interaction of pre-service L2 teachers in testing and evaluation course. The analysis of data revealed that ALBs perform a variety of functions. This study focused on two functions of ALBs that form the majority of the collection of instances. One of these functions predominantly occurs in feedback provider turns while the other one mostly takes place during test writer turns.

Invoking the Learners. One function that consistently appears in all ALBs of both feedback providers and test writers is "invoking the learners". Leyland (2021) talks about invoking the reader as a pedagogical tool during advice-giving of tutors for academic writing. Similar to the tutors' practice in Leyland's (2021) study, this study showed that pre-service teachers resort to invoking the learners during their interaction through ALBs. This practice of ALBs repeatedly occurs in feedback-giving or feedback-countering of peers for test construction as well as in presenting the final drafts of exams prepared.

In Leyland's (2021) study, invoking the reader was used during giving advice to international students' writing as a way to offer affordances for claims of understanding "by describing the reader's needs and characteristics" (p. 2). The use of ALBs by pre-service teachers within the context of this study offers affordances in a similar way. As they are described in this study, ALBs involve assumptions on (1) what the students would possibly think, (2) feel, and/or (3) do upon encountering the test item(s) or the test section(s), or they may refer to (4) the epistemic status of the students they possibly possess at the time of encountering the test item(s) or the test section(s). This definition indicates that pre-service teachers' ALBs provide a description of the hypothetical learners in a way by assuming their possible behavior like the tutors' description of the reader's characteristics in Leyland's (2021) study. Both in Leyland's (2021) research and this study, the invoked parties are the end-users of the written product being reviewed in interaction. By invoking the readers or the learners, these non-present categories of people are included in

the process. As the tutors establish "a shared understanding of 'the reader' and use this as a pedagogical tool" (Leyland, 2021, p. 4), pre-service teachers often manage to establish a shared understanding of the hypothetical learners by assuming their possible behavior in interaction with their peers.

The analyses of extracts and the entire collection of instances reveal that ALBs are a form of invoking the learners by pre-service teachers in the testing and evaluation course context. This repeated use of ALBs also indicate that pre-service teachers treat the non-present learners who are the end-users of the tests they prepare as a component of the test construction process. This is also apparent in cases where pre-service teachers construct the standardized relational pair (Leyland, 2021; Sacks, 1972 as cited in Silverman, 1998) of tester-test taker where they position themselves as testers and the non-present learners as test takers. Apart from invoking the learners, there are several categorical functions of ALBs.

Pre-service teachers' ALBs also constitute examples to a practice called "pre-enactments" (Leyland, 2016) and, in some cases, "enactments of talk or thought" (Sandlund, 2014). By demonstrating how the hypothetical learners, an absent party, would react to the test items, pre-service teachers produce pre-enactments (Leyland, 2016) of possible future exam situations through ALBs. Especially when they voice the hypothetical learners' possible answers, actions, or thoughts via quotatives (such as "like"), this practice is clearly observed in the ALBs.

Pre-service teachers' enactment of possible problematic future behavior of learners during exams through their ALBs enables them to predict problems, provide solutions, and edit test items accordingly. Through this practice in feedback processes, they are able to make arrangements to avoid the possible future problems presented in enactments. For this reason, it can be inferred that invoking the learners through enactments with ALBs is one tool that enables pre-service teachers to write improved tests as pre-enacting a possible future scenario allows for time and opportunity to come up with appropriate solutions. This may be an indicator that ALBs are useful interactional practices for item writing and item reviewing.

Problematizing the Design. The most frequent categorical function of ALBs that the data analysis revealed is the function of "problematizing the item design".

This function recurrently takes place during feedback sessions between peers and dominates the number of ALBs produced by feedback providers. However, this type of ALBs occur in test writer turns as well, especially during the presentation session. For this reason, examples of this type of ALBs produced by both test writers and feedback providers were included. The data analysis chapter of this study includes eight instances of ALBs with this function produced by feedback providers. In Extracts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9, it is seen that the ALBs produced by pre-service teachers performed as part of a problematization. On the other hand, four instances of ALBs with this function produced by test writers are included in the data analysis. Pre-service teachers are also observed to use ALBs for problematizing the design of the prior version of their tests in Extracts 11, 12, 13, and 14.

In light of the data analysis, a definition as to what problematizing the item design refers to has emerged. The working definition for problematizing the item design in this study is "any utterance that involves negative assumptions on the behavior, cognition, or feelings of learners which would possibly stem from the way that a test item or a section of the test is designed". This definition applies to instances occurring in situations where assumptions of learner behavior are provided based on the original form of the test item regardless of the party that produced it.

The fact that problematizing the design is the most recurrent function performed with ALBs indicates some inferences in relation to how pre-service teachers review items and how they improve them. Pre-service teachers frequently resort to negative assumptions when producing ALBs. This may imply that their assumptions on possible learner behavior usually concentrated on what could go wrong when learners encountered test items since their ALBs indicated negative behavior in relation to the hypothetical learners. In terms of how they review and improve test items, this may signal that the pre-service teachers in this study had a tendency to improve test items based on problematic reactions that the items may get from learners.

The analysis of data revealed at which point of feedback sequence ALBs problematizing the item design take place. It was revealed that ALBs of this type are formulated at different points of a feedback sequence. The analysis of the emergence patterns showed that the majority of ALBs problematizing the item

design occurring in feedback sessions, twenty out of thirty-four instances, take place at points where topic shifts occur. More specifically, these ALBs occur in turns that direct the focus to some other aspect of the focal test item as they occur in interaction and expand the discussion on the related test item. Other than topic shifts, seven ALBs are identified to be occurring where previous or current discussion is expanded. The expanding of discussion is either minimal or non-minimal depending on the uptake and orientation of the other participants. The remaining eight instances occur at various points in feedback sequences.

When the instances of ALBs problematizing the item design produced in the presentation session are analyzed, it is noticed that the sequences and the pattern in the emergence of these ALBs are divergent from the other ALBs in the feedback sessions. All of the fourteen ALBs in the presentation session have the function of problematizing the item design and all of them are provided by test writers. This is expected considering the presentation session only involved pre-service teachers' presentations of their own tests. The ALBs in this session all emerge within sequences in which the test writers explain the rationale for the changes and adjustments they have made in the exams they prepared. In some of these cases (see Extracts 11, 12, and 14), they even mirror the feedback they received during feedback sessions while explaining the problems in their tests and the changes they have made. In one particular case, this mirroring also involves adopting an ALB to mirror an ALB provided by a feedback provider (Extract 14).

The patterns in the responses the ALBs received from the peers and from the teacher has also been investigated. The analysis of the responses to ALBs problematizing item design indicated that the patterns in the teacher's and the peers' responses differ. The responses from the teacher to the instances of this type of ALBs occurring in feedback sessions showed that twenty-six of these thirty-four instances received agreement tokens and/or supporting comments from the teacher. In three instances, the teacher oriented to the turn involving ALBs minimally by providing a nod and/or a repair without further comments on them and another four instances received no orientation or uptake from the teacher.

The response from the peers, however, proved to be much more complex in the patterns they formed. In four instances, the test writers provided agreeing comments to the turn involving ALB while two ALBs received agreeing comments

from the test writers only after the teacher's supporting comments. In six instances the test writers responded only with a head nod after the ALB, after five of the ALBs the test writers provided explanations in order to justify their choices in the test items, and in five instances the test writers suggested a solution after the teacher's comments supporting the ALBs. In only four instances, it is observed that a peer from the group member of the pre-service teacher who formulated the ALB or another peer provided support with a comment. In fifteen instances of the thirty-four ALBs formulated by the feedback providers, the test writers do not show any uptake of or orientation to the ALBs.

In some instances, it is observed that ALBs problematizing the design are performing another function as well. The ALBs used in certain cases (as exemplified in Extract 1, 3, and 6) for problematizing the design also involve acts of rule policing (Sert & Balaman, 2018). In order to problematize the design, pre-service teachers refer to a rule or principle that is breached while assuming possible learner behavior based on this breach. Thus, such cases both serve the function of problematizing the design and rule policing.

Providing Counter Argument. The second type of function that the ALBs perform is named as counter argument. Counter argument occurs as the second major function of ALBs after problematizing the item design. Counter argument ALBs in this study are defined as "any utterance that involves an assumption on the learners' behavior, cognition or feelings as response to the teacher's or another pre-service teacher's statement". The analysis revealed that this function is predominantly performed in ALBs produced by test writers (thirteen out of eighteen instances). The analysis has revealed that no "counter argument ALBs" occur in the presentation session, presumably due to the fact that feedback practices are minimal in the presentation session if they happen. The data analysis chapter of this study includes five instances of ALBs with this function in Extracts 7, 8, 9, and 10, all of which are produced by test writers.

Although these ALBs occurred less frequently than problematizing the design ALBs, they provide similar indications in relation to pre-service teachers' item reviewing and item improvement practices. The pre-service teachers' ALBs in counter arguments were produced in response to feedback and generally involved negative assumptions on hypothetical learners' responses to test items. Different

than problematizing ALBs, these ALBs provided negative assumptions not on the item itself, but the feedback and suggested design provided for the item. While this is the case, counter argument ALBs of pre-service teacher has a similar indication like problematizing ALBs. The fact that pre-service teachers mostly based their counter argument ALBs on learners' negative behavior may imply that they usually concentrated on what could go wrong, just like in problematizing the design ALBs.

The analysis of data revealed at which point of discussion that counter argument ALBs take place as feedback sequences unfold. It was observed that counter argument ALBs are consistently formulated in the aftermath of negative and/or challenging comments. Some of these ALBs happen after another ALB (Extract 9). The analysis of the emergence patterns showed that fourteen out of eighteen counter argument ALBs take place in turns following such comments delivered either by a feedback provider or the teacher. The remaining two instances are found to be occurring against suggestions of another party on how to improve a test item. Just like ALBs problematizing the design ALBs, counter argument ALBs also lead to expansion of discussion which is either minimal or non-minimal depending on the uptake and orientation of the other participants.

The patterns in the responses that counter argument ALBs received is varied as the patterns in the responses to the previous type of ALBs. Out of the eighteen instances of counter argument ALBs, six received opposing comments from the opposite group of peers, either feedback providers or test writers. Group members of test writers or feedback providers show support to the ALB provided by their peers in two cases while in one instance the opposing group's member provided agreement tokens to the counter argument. In seven instances the peers do not show any uptake or orientation to the ALB. Regarding the teacher's responses, it is observed that the teacher provided acceptance or supporting comments to the pre-service teacher who formulated the ALB in six instances while she did not show any uptake or orientation to four instances. In the remaining five cases, the teacher either questions the argument of the ALB or opposes the argument. Although the responses to the counter argument ALBs are divergent, twelve of the instances received non-minimal orientation from the other parties that led to expanded feedback sequences. One instance receives minimal orientation and two instances do not receive any orientation or uptake from any of the participants.

Summary

While all instances of ALBs perform the function of invoking the learners, the number of the cases of the ALBs problematizing the item design and counter argument ALBs constitute sixty-four of the seventy-five cases of ALBs. These instances occurred at different points of interaction. One common pattern in the emergence of the ALBs problematizing the item design appears to be topic-shifts for feedback session instances. The most common emergence pattern for counter argument ALBs was revealed to be the turns following negative and/or challenging comments from others during feedback sessions. The majority of all ALB instances received non-minimal or minimal orientation from the other participants and only a small number of instances remained unattended. Only seven instances of all seventy-five ALBs did not receive any uptake. While the responses the ALBs received were diverse, the most recurring response was the teacher's agreeing or supporting comments. The peer responses were revealed to be less consistent and showed a wider range of occurrences as discussed above.

A significant feature of most ALBs is that they constitute examples to pre-service teachers' cognition-in-interaction (Li, 2020). It is obvious in ALBs that pre-service teachers put their perspectives and understandings of learners when discussing the test items. In fact, teacher cognition-in-interaction (Li, 2020) is at the core of ALBs since the definition of ALB entails assumptions of pre-service teachers in relation to the learners. It was observed in pre-service teachers' assumptions that they clearly reflect their own perceptions in relation to the behavior they expect from the learners in interaction with the teacher and their peers. As Li (2020) expresses, "Cognition is socially mediated or influenced by others in social interaction; thus, it is socially-shared cognition" (p. 279). This socially mediated cognition is what occurs in the ALBs of pre-service teachers as they emerge in interaction with others, which in turn becomes socially-shared. Such instances of teacher cognition emerges in interaction within the abundant instances of ALBs.

One reason for such abundant instances of ALBs to occur and such varied responses to be received in this testing and evaluation course context is the student-fronted nature of the feedback and presentation sessions. What is seen in all cases of extracts is examples of multilogue (Schwab, 2011). Especially in feedback

sessions, it is observed that what occurs is "an interaction format in whole-class settings where more than two participants are involved, either directly or as bystanders and listeners who follow the ongoing interaction and who may take part in it" (Schwab, 2011, p. 15). Such a context has allowed the pre-service teachers in this testing and evaluation course to actively participate and, along with the teacher's initiatives, has been conducive to student-fronted classroom interaction. The teacher is often observed to leave the floor to the pre-service teachers for the majority of time during these sessions instead of dominating the discussions, regulates the feedback discussions with her comments and questions, and provides explanations and elaborations in the discussion on the test items. This student-fronted classroom design has provided the pre-service teachers with the opportunities to have prolonged peer interaction and provide quality peer feedback to each other.

Aspects of Test Items That Pre-Service Teachers Orient to in ALBs

In line with the third research question of this study, this section will discuss what aspects of test items evoked ALBs of pre-service teachers. The sequences that involve ALBs have been examined in order to uncover whether there are patterns in the way the ALBs emerge and the different aspects of the test items focal to the current discussion at that point in interaction. Both problematizing the item design ALBs and counter argument ALBs has been reviewed to see whether there are parallels between the aspect of the test item that is discussed and the ALB that emerged. The review showed that there are recurring patterns in interaction between the emergence of ALBs and the aspect of the test item discussed. The review of the ALB sequences showed that recurring patterns in the aspects of test items show similarities in both types of ALBs. With the exception of a few deviant instances, the aspects of test items discussed could be grouped into several categories.

The aspects of test items that pre-service teachers orient to in their ALBs give insights into their assessment abilities and how they improve test items. The data analysis revealed that pre-service teachers had a tendency to focus on the general format of the questions in their ALBs. This aspect involves the features of the format such as the question type or the design of the question. This was the most common

aspect of test items that evoked ALBs both for problematization ALBs (25 out of 50 instances) and counter argument ALBs (9 out of 18 instances). The fact that the general format is the main focus in ALBs indicates that pre-service teachers prioritized how the test items were structured over other aspects such as content when they provided assumptions on how the learners would react to the test items. As this was a frequent practice, it may be said that pre-service teachers in this study oriented to more general features over specific ones when providing assumptions on learner behavior during reviewing test items. What the frequency of ALBs on this aspect indicates that they may have reviewed the general outlook and structure of the items more often than other aspects.

In fact, the second most common aspect of items that evoked ALBs correlates with this claim that pre-service teachers followed a path from general to specific when reviewing test items, with focusing on the general format over other aspects in most cases. The instructions of test items were the second most common aspect that evoked ALBs with twelve instances. This aspect involves assumptions on learner behavior such as misunderstandings related to the way that the instructions were written. The third most common aspect evoking ALBs was seen to be the options of the test items, especially during discussions on how the options of a question would lead to undesirable learner behavior. The content of the items was the fourth and final recurring aspect for evoking ALBs by pre-service teachers.

The aspects of test items that pre-service teachers oriented to in their ALBs indicate that the general format was discussed most frequently when making assumptions on learner behavior. This was followed by the instructions of test items, the options, and, finally, the content of the items. This suggests that these pre-service teachers' inclination to make assumptions on learner behavior followed a "top-down" pattern, starting with the item format and elements of item construct then moving on to its content.

It is seen that the general format of the question(s) dominates the instances where pre-service teachers formulate ALBs. This is the case for the presentation session as well where nine out of fourteen ALBs provided were evoked by the general format. This indicates that pre-service teachers resorted to ALBs most frequently when they were discussing about the design and/or the question type of the items or sections in the exams. A part of Extract 12 is reproduced below in order

to show an instance where ALB is adopted while discussing the design of a test item. The extract comes from the presentation session where the members of group one presents the final version of their exam.

Extract 12: Number of Pictures (R8-P2)

```
1     SAN:        so er: i will continue with the vocabulary part↑
2                 (1.7) °er:° (2.0) °u:m° (1.0) er: (.) at the beginning
3                 of:: (1.0) um in our first draft +(3.5) it hh (0.2)
                                                 +scrolls the projected
                  document--->
4                 was like this↑+ (.) er:: er we used (0.6) &ten vocabulary
                          --->+                              &---1--->
                  1: points at the projected document
5                 items and (.) ten pictures an:d& (0.4) first of all we
                                                --->&
6                 learned +from the feedbacks from our (0.4) >peers and<
                          +gestures towards the class and TEA --->
7                 from you↑+ that er: @the number of the: (.) pictures
                       --->+          @gestures towards the projected
                  document and hand gestures in the air---> line 13
8                 shouldn't be the same as the &number of >the vocabulary
                                               &nods--->
9     →           items↑< because (.) .hh (.) the students& can easily:
      tea                                                --->&
10                >just< (0.4) er mark the last one (.) %they we- (0.6)
      tea                                              %---2--->
                  2: nods and gestures with left hand
11                we cannot% u::m (0.6) er (.) we cannot see if they know
                        --->%
12                &the word or not↑&@=
      tea         &------nods------&
                             --->@
13    TEA:        =hmm hmm=
```

In Extract 12, San is seen explaining a change they have made to the vocabulary section of their test. While expressing the reason for the change made to the item, San refers to the students and states that they can match the final word with the remaining picture. This constitutes a problem for the test writers as it is not

138

possible to know whether the students matched that item on purpose or due to a lack of more remaining options. As San presents their choices in designing the question as the source of the problem, this instance represents an instance where ALB is used for discussing the design of a test item.

In a similar way to the discussion of the design, ALBs are adopted when discussing the question type of a test item. A part of Extract 3 is reproduced here in order to show how this takes place in interaction. In this extract, Nes, a feedback provider, problematizes the focal test item of the exam written by group four.

Extract 3: True false (R6-P3)

```
1     NES:        hocam also there is a chance: (.) o:f finding the correct
                  teacher
2     →          option +(.) um: (0.7) er: fifty percent &(.) and rather
                        +gestures with her hand--->
      tea                                                    &nods --->
3                than+ %reading& this one=
                 --->+ %points at the paper ---> line 5
                        --->&
4     TEA:       =hmm [hmm %
5     NES: →         [they% $can just select true true &[true and&
6     TEA:                                              &[exactly &
                                                        &---nods--&
      nes             --->% $gestures with head and hand--->
7     NES:       there would be (0.2) correct answers$ (.) *rather than*
      tea                                              --->$    *slight nod *
8                &reading this one (0.5)& [i think (0.3) maybe↓=
9     TEA:                               [and wasting their time
      nes        &--lifts up the paper--&
```

This extract shows that Nes initiates a problematization of the focal section of the test based on the fact that they are true-false items. She expresses that the students may choose to mark answers randomly instead of reading text provided in the section. In the remainder of this extract, it is seen that the teacher also agrees with this comment of Nes and provides suggestions for improvement. Nes's problematization indicates that her ALB in this discussion is related to the question type chosen for the test items included in the focal test section.

ALBs and Learning Opportunities for Testing Abilities

In line with the fourth research question, this section will discuss the learning opportunities that ALBs provide for the testing abilities of pre-service teachers. Another topic for the discussion in this section is the cases of ALBs in the presentation session which involves the pre-service teachers' practice of mirroring previously received feedback through ALBs as display of uptake.

Emergence of Teacher Follow-up after ALBs. As seen in the data analysis chapter and in the first section of this chapter, ALBs have been observed to be leading to further discussion on a particular subject. This further discussion sometimes allowed the teacher to provide suggestions to pre-service teachers in order to improve their exam questions. In some other cases, the ALBs were observed to enable the teacher to provide explanations on the problems related to test items. In this way, it can be said that ALBs provide room for learning opportunities through facilitating the display of classroom interactional competence (CIC) (Walsh, 2011) both as a result of the contributions of the teacher and the pre-service teachers.

In some cases, ALBs received support from the teacher on highlighting a problem or an argument, which resulted in the opposite pre-service teacher group's acceptance and/or confirmation through verbal or non-verbal responses or provide suggestions for solutions. In six instances of ALBs it was seen that the teacher followed with a comment or token that expands on the claim of the ALB or provide support for the claim, which in turn received acceptance or confirmation from the opposite peer group. Examples to this can be seen in Extracts 4, 5, 6, and 9 in the data analysis chapter. In some cases (five instances in the collection), the teacher's comments on the ALB were followed by suggestions for possible solutions from the opposite peer group. Examples to such cases can be seen in Extracts 2, 3, and 6. Learning opportunities also emerged after ALBs through teacher explanations. These cases involved no direct support of the ALB itself, but they rather allowed the teacher to explain a practical issue related to the exam items/sections (as can be seen in Extract 10). Though not every ALB led to learning opportunities, one common pattern in ALB cases facilitating learning opportunities is seen to be the teacher turns following ALBs.

Pre-service Teachers' Uptake. The follow-up turns of test writers and feedback providers that display a change of state or uptake emerged in two ways during classroom interaction: (1) following teacher follow-up turns and (2) as follow-up after ALBs. The most common pattern was that pre-service teachers demonstrated uptake after the teacher's follow-up turn to ALBs. In these cases, it was observed that test writers would demonstrate their acknowledgment of the problem through providing tokens and/or head nods (see Extracts 4, 5, and 9), or would suggest possible solutions. The cases where they acknowledged the problem after the teacher's follow-up turns sometimes demonstrated change of state in pre-service teachers (see Extract 4), though not in all cases. On the other hand, the cases where they provide possible solutions (see Extracts 3, 6, and 8) suggested change of state in pre-service teachers since their suggestion for solution shows that they accept the problem highlighted by their peers.

As for the instances where pre-service teachers provided follow-up turns to ALBs provided by their peers, it was observed that some of these cases demonstrated uptake or change of state in pre-service teachers. In some cases, it was observed that test writers displayed their acknowledgment of the problem with the design (see Extract 2) after a feedback provider problematized the item or a feedback provider accepted the counter argument of a test writer upon their problematization (see Extract 7). Acknowledging the problem with the item design or accepting the counter argument in response to problematization both signal that there is a change of state taking place in pre-service teachers.

Mirroring Previously-received Feedback. Apart from the learning opportunities that ALBs provide during discussions in feedback sessions, pre-service teachers were found to be mirroring previously received feedback using ALBs in some of the instances that took place during the presentation session while explaining the changes and arrangements they did to their exams.

In mirroring previously received feedback instances, it was observed that the pre-service teachers utilized ALBs even though the original feedback they received did not involve ALBs. In seven instances out of the fourteen ALBs provided during the presentation session, it is observed that the pre-service teachers mirrored previously-received feedback. In expressing the changes they did to their exams the pre-service teachers were noticed to rephrase and state the feedback they received.

They were seen to use ALBs in their account-giving even though the original comment did not adopt ALBs in order to allude to the learner behavior. One particular instance (Extract 14); however, presented a unique case where the feedback mirrored using an ALB also involved an instance of ALB in itself. This case stands out as an exception in the other mirroring previously-received feedback instances.

The fact that pre-service teachers mirror the feedback they received in their ALBs while explaining the changes they have made to their tests demonstrates that pre-service teachers took notice of the feedback and has recalled that feedback when adjusting as well as while presenting their tests. This reflects Koschmann's (2013) perspective on learning being "an accountable, public, and locally occasioned process" (p. 2). The ALBs in these instances not only brings evidence to pre-service teachers' recall of the feedback received and the change in their epistemic stance on the problematized test items, but they also demonstrate where these changes may have stemmed from. Especially in instances where pre-service teachers explicitly refer to the feedback they received in feedback sessions (see Extracts 11, 12, and 14), this shows a retrospective orientation to learning (Jakonen, 2018).

Summary

In light of the collection of instances and the extracts analyzed in this study, it can be concluded that ALBs facilitate learning opportunities for testing abilities through further discussion involving teacher talk and learner talk during feedback sessions. Regarding the presentation session, it was noticed that some cases of ALBs pre-service teacher formulated were mirroring prior feedback received from peers. One of these prior feedback from peers involved ALB itself while others were not necessarily provided through ALBs. These instances of ALBs mirroring prior feedback are considered to be displays of uptake of the feedback pre-service teachers received.

Implications

The investigation of classroom interaction in testing and evaluation course in this ELT program uncovered patterns in interaction regarding ALB. In light of the

analysis of these patterns in interaction among participants, this section provides implications in terms of L2 teacher education, classroom learning of pre-service teachers, and testing and evaluation course.

Implications for L2 Teacher Education. The focal L2 teacher education classroom was revealed to be a context rich in interaction among pre-service teachers. This peer interaction emerged between pre-service teachers with or without teacher initiation. The peer interaction allowed the pre-service teachers to provide feedback to each other as well as supporting each other and providing explanations when needed. All these practices of pre-service teachers facilitated and enriched both peer and classroom interaction. On account of these contributions of peer interaction of pre-service teachers, this study inferred that practices that enable peer interaction in L2 teacher education contexts should be encouraged.

The interaction of pre-service teachers during feedback sessions not only enriched classroom interaction but it also facilitated support for peer learning as well. The analysis of interaction showed that peer interaction, especially peer feedback was often seen to lead to expanded discussions which resulted in displays of understanding by pre-service teachers. The use ALBs has been observed to play a significant role in expanded discussions and lead up to displays of understanding of their peers. One reason for ALBs to extend sequences of discussion is the fact that they enable to bring the external component of learners into the classroom. By invoking the non-present learners with ALBs while providing account for problems or countering them, pre-service teachers involve the end-users of the tests in the process of preparing the tests, which helps pre-service teachers demonstrate the reaction the tests may get from the learners even with tests designed for a hypothetical group of learners. This practice of assuming possible learner behavior has led to improved tests in this context and may also enable pre-service teachers in other testing contexts to account for problems and improve testing material.

Another implication that this study has in terms of L2 teacher education is on test item reviewing practices of pre-service teachers. It is common practice for L2 teachers to construct and administer their own tests once they start working in the field. Test item reviewing plays a crucial role in preparing proper and efficient tests. L2 teachers get involved in the process of preparing and reviewing test items with

their colleagues (see Can, 2020) as well as on their own when they enter workplace. While this is the case, pre-service teachers in L2 teacher education programs in Turkey generally do not receive training dedicated to test item reviewing. The data analyzed in this study has demonstrated that pre-service teachers developed improved tests through receiving feedback from and giving feedback to their peers on the tests they constructed. In light of this, it is suggested that pre-service teachers receive training on test item reviewing in L2 teacher education programs in order to prepare them for test constructing and item reviewing responsibilities they will bear when they enter workplace. By training pre-service teachers in test item reviewing, they may become better equipped for constructing efficient tests as well as for evaluating the efficacy of tests constructed by other authorities.

Implications for Classroom Learning of Pre-service Teachers. In terms of classroom learning of pre-service teachers, this study suggests that peer feedback is a practice that enhances classroom learning of pre-service teachers. In this regard, it is proposed that occasions requiring peer feedback practices can be increased in order to assist classroom learning of pre-service teachers.

The findings of this study showed that pre-service teachers displayed learning during presentation sessions through using ALB for recapping the feedback they have received. The pre-service teachers not only provided an account of their test development by showing the changes they have made and providing justification for them in presentations sessions, but they also displayed their own development and provided evidence for learning when they employed ALBs to refer to the feedback they have received in past sessions. This implicates that giving the opportunity to discuss their own development may allow pre-service teachers to demonstrate learning. Thus, this study encourages practices for reflection on development for pre-service teachers in order to provide them with the opportunities to display learning.

Implications for Testing and Evaluation Course. This study also showed that testing and evaluation course context was enhanced by the feedback practices of pre-service teachers. One factor that encouraged and provided room for abundant peer feedback in this context is that the flipped classroom model was adopted for this testing and evaluation course. The fact that pre-service teachers complete the required readings at home and discuss their prepared exams in the

classroom allowed them to have more opportunities to interact and provide feedback to each other. For this reason, this study suggests that flipped classroom model, where there is room for reflection and feedback in and through interaction be applied more to testing and evaluation courses in teacher education programs.

Another suggestion that this study proposes about testing and evaluation courses is related to ALBs that pre-service teachers utilized. It was observed that ALBs enabled pre-service teachers to hypothesize about possible learner behavior during real exam situations and this gave chances to pre-service teachers to come up with improved test items. In this sense, the use of ALB both contributes to and provides insights into the validity of the tests constructed by pre-service teachers. Test writers' ability to develop effective tests is dependent on the review of test items (Haladyna, 2004). Becoming too involved in the test that a test writer is constructing may prevent the test writer from regarding test items in an objective way (Heaton, 1990). It is suggested that at least one other colleague look at the test constructed by teachers prior to implementing it (Brown, 1996) as the examination of items by others can reveal the troubles with the test (Heaton, 1990). The importance of such a practice is once again observed in this study. It is understood that if the test writers did not receive feedback on possible learner behaviors from others, the limitations of the test items were going to be unnoticed resulting in poor validity. This shows how vital feedback and interaction is when it comes to constructing tests. Thus, feedback and interaction in testing and evaluation courses also prove to be crucial for pre-service teachers to develop testing and evaluation knowledge and skills.

The use ALB provides insights into the relation of tests and test takers as well. Brown (1996) suggests that test items should be adopted in accordance with the average ability level of the learner group the test is intended for. Accordingly, Haladyna (2004) argues that (along with the domain measured and the purpose of the test) the intended test takers should be taken into consideration while constructing, scoring and administering tests. If the level of the test takers is neglected while constructing a test, this may cause trouble for test takers to provide answers to test items (Hatipoğlu, 2009). The pre-service teachers' assumptions on the possible learner behavior demonstrate that they acknowledge the level and abilities of the target learner groups and notice the relation between the tests they construct and the (hypothetical or real) test takers. Thus, the use of ALB shows how

the importance of considering students and their level discussed in theory emerges in practice in and through interaction, which allows noticing of possible learner behaviors. As a result of this outcome of ALBs, it is suggested that pre-service teachers be encouraged to adopt a perspective that considers possible learner behavior when preparing exams during testing and evaluation courses.

Chapter 6
Conclusion

This chapter presents a summary of the study, conclusions and implications drawn from its findings. Following these, the limitations of the study and suggestions for further research are discussed in this chapter.

Conclusions and Implications

This study has looked into the classroom interaction of pre-service L2 teachers in a testing and evaluation course in the teacher education program of a state university in Turkey. Based on a corpus of video-recorded classroom interaction (12 hours), this study revealed the unexplored phenomenon of "Assuming Learner Behavior" (ALB) through the lens of Conversation Analysis (CA). The study has explored how ALB emerges and how pre-service teachers make use of it during feedback and presentation sessions.

The findings of the study revealed that pre-service teachers employed ALB with a variety of uses and functions within classroom interaction. According to the ALBs in interaction, sub-categories have been determined as the main uses of ALBs, which are the use of ALB (1) in order to initiate the problem, (2) in response to the problem already indicated, (3) in order to oppose the feedback provided, (3.1) in counter arguments in response to the use of ALB by feedback providers, and (4) in order to recap the feedback received. Through the use of ALB, it was observed that the pre-service teachers invoked the learners that allowed bringing the external component of learners into the process of writings tests and giving feedback for tests. For the majority of the instances, these practices had the function of either problematizing the item design or providing counter argument. The discussion of these results revealed that ALBs often led to expanded discussion sequences and provided learning opportunities for pre-service teachers.

In light of the findings of this study, it has been observed that providing ample room for peer interaction enriched classroom interaction through facilitating pre-service teachers' problematizing, countering, supporting and agreeing in feedback sessions. Therefore, one suggestion of this study is to encourage practices of peer interaction in order to enhance classroom interaction in L2 teacher education as well as facilitating peer learning. In this study, one reason for such enhanced classroom

interaction has been determined to be the flipped classroom design adopted for this testing and evaluation course. The findings showed that having a flipped classroom design allowed this much room for peer interaction and peer feedback for pre-service teachers. Based on this finding, another suggestion of this study is to adopt the flipped classroom design in testing and evaluation courses in order to allow more opportunities for peer interaction.

This study has also demonstrated that the use of ALB enabled pre-service teachers to hypothesize on possible learner behavior in real exam-taking situations, which catered for improved tests and allowed for pre-service teachers to understand problems with their test items. For this reason, this study suggests that pre-service teachers should be encouraged to develop a perspective that takes possible learner behavior into account when preparing exams or teaching materials for students. This study further showed that pre-service teachers have benefited from ALBs when recapping previously-received feedback in order to explain why they made some of the changes to their exams during the presentation session. These sequences where pre-service teachers provided account for the changes through mirroring feedback has enabled pre-service teachers to display learning when they reflected on their process of test development. In accordance with this, it is suggested that practices that facilitates reflection on development should be encouraged in order to give opportunities to pre-service teachers to demonstrate learning.

Limitations

While this study provided insights into classroom interaction of pre-service teachers in a testing and evaluation course, it is limited in terms of its scope. This study looked into only one testing and evaluation course in an L2 teacher education context and its results may not be generalizable to other testing and evaluation course contexts in L2 teacher education programs. While this is the case, the frequency and variety in its uses by the pre-service teachers both during feedback and presentation sessions suggest that ALB may be a phenomenon that occurs in testing and evaluation contexts.

Further Research

L2 teacher education plays an important role for the success of language education processes. Pre-service teachers' ability in testing and evaluation is a crucial element of the role that teacher education plays because testing language development gives the opportunity for teachers to improve and to change the way they teach. However, we still do not have enough research in the area of teacher education in terms of how they learn to test. Although how teachers teach and how teachers test has been investigated, little is known about how teachers learn.

In terms of pre-service teachers, their teaching skills has been investigated frequently while the general research tendency on their testing and evaluation skills has been limited to the investigation of assessment literacy. The processes related to the development of those skills and how they learn to test still remain unexplored. By investigating classroom interaction in the testing and evaluation course, this study contributes to filling this gap in the literature. While this is the case, more research is needed in this area in order to better understand the nature of classroom interaction of pre-service teachers in testing and evaluation contexts. For this reason, this study calls for research focusing on testing and evaluation contexts in L2 teacher education so that the intrigue process of teacher learning can be explored more comprehensively. As the current study only focused on one testing and evaluation course context in a single teacher education program for the investigation of ALB, exploring ALB in different teacher education programs as well as across different teacher education courses can provide further insights into how ALB is employed by pre-service teachers and also by teacher educators.

References

Andrews, S. (2003). 'Just like instant noodles': L2 teachers and their beliefs about grammar pedagogy. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 9*(4), 351-375.

aus der Wieschen, M. V., & Sert, O. (2018). Divergent language choices and maintenance of intersubjectivity: the case of Danish EFL young learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 1-17.

Badem-Korkmaz, F., & Balaman, U. (2020). Third position repair for resolving troubles in understanding teacher instructions. *Linguistics and Education, 60*, 1-13.

Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics, 25*(2), 243-272.

Batlle, J., & Seedhouse, P. (2020). Affiliation and negative assessments in peer observation feedback for foreign language teachers' professional development. *Applied Linguistics Review,* 1-25.

Breen, M. P., Hird, B., Milton, M., Oliver, R., & Thwaite, A. (2001). Making sense of language teaching: principles and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(4), 470-501.

Brown, J. D. (1996). *Testing in language programs.* Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, J. D., & Bailey, K. M. (2008). Language testing courses: What are they in 2007?, *Language Testing, 25*(3), 349-383.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Büyükahıska, D. (2020). English language testing and evaluation course through the lens of EFL student teachers. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, 19*, 581-596.

Büyükkarcı, K. (2014). Assessment beliefs and practices of language teachers in primary education. *International Journal of Instruction, 7*(1), 107-120.

Büyükkarcı, K. (2016). Identifying the areas for English language teacher development: A study of assessment literacy. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi, 6*(3), 333-346.

Cabaroğlu, N. (2012). Prospective EFL teachers' perceptions of classroom management and misbehaviour. *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal, 41*(1), 117-132.

Can, H. (2020). *A micro-analytic investigation into EFL teachers' language test item reviewing interactions* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Middle East Technical University.

Can Daşkın, N. (2017). *A conversation analytic study of reference to a past learning event in l2 classroom interaction: Implications for informal formative assessment* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Middle East Technical University.

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

Chan, Y. (2008). Elementary school EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of multiple assessments. *Reflections on English Language Teaching, 7*(1), 37–62.

Cherrington, S., & Loveridge, J. (2014). Using video to promote early childhood teachers' thinking and reflection. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 41,* 42-51.

Copland, F. (2011). Negotiating face in feedback conferences: A linguistic ethnographic analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43,* 3832-3843.

Çalışır Gerem, T., & Yangın Ekşi, G. (2019). Teachers' declared beliefs and actual classroom practices: A case study with five EFL teachers. *ELT Research Journal, 8*(1), 22-41.

Çapan, S. A. (2014). Pre-service English as a foreign language teachers' belief development about grammar instruction. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(12), 131-152.

Çimenli, B., & Sert, O. (2017). Orientations to linguistic form in meaning and fluency contexts in a Turkish as a foreign language classroom. In G. Schwab, S.

Hoffmann, & A. Schön (Eds.), *Interaktion im Fremdsprachenunterricht: Beiträge aus der empirischen Forschung* (pp. 17-32). Münster: LIT Verlag.

Davison, C. (2004). The contradictory culture of teacher-based assessment: ESL teacher assessment practices in Australian and Hong Kong secondary schools. *Language Testing, 21*(3), 305–334.

de Lange, T., & Wittek, L. (2018). Creating shared spaces: Developing teaching through peer supervision groups. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 25*(4), 324-339.

Demiraslan Çevik, Y., Haşlaman, T., & Çelik, S. (2015). The effect of peer assessment on problem solving skills of prospective teachers supported by online learning activities. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 44,* 23-35.

Demiraslan Çevik, Y. (2015). Assessor or assessee? Investigating the differential effects of online peer assessment roles in the development of students' problem-solving skills. *Computers in Human Behavior, 52,* 250-258.

Demirbulak, D. (2012). Fostering propensities for reflective practice at undergraduate methodology and practicum courses. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 48,* 39-58.

Dinkelman, T. (2000). An inquiry into the development of critical reflection in secondary student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16,* 195-222.

Duran, D. (2017). *Student-initiated questions in English as a medium of instruction classrooms in a Turkish higher education setting* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Hacettepe University.

Duran, D., & Jacknick, C. M. (2020). Teacher response pursuits in whole class post-task discussions. *Linguistics and Education, 56,* 1-15.

Duran, D., Kurhila, S., & Sert, O. (2019). Word search sequences in teacher-student interaction in an English as medium of instruction context. *Interactional Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 1-20.

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

Erkmen, B. (2014). Novice EFL teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning, and their classroom practices. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education), 29*(1), 99-113.

Evnitskaya, N., & Berger, E. (2017). Learners' multimodal displays of willingness to participate in classroom interaction in the L2 and CLIL contexts. *Classroom Discourse, 8*(1), 71-94.

Fard, Z. R., & Tabatabaei, O. (2018). Investigating assessment literacy of EFL teachers in Iran. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 5*(3), 91-100.

Farrell, T. S. C., & Ives, J. (2015). Exploring teacher beliefs and classroom practices through reflective practice: A case study. *Language Teaching Research, 19*(5), 594-610.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(3), 397-417.

Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment literacy for the language classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 9*(2), 113-132.

Gan, L., & Lam, R. (2020). Understanding university English instructors' assessment training needs in the Chinese context. *Language Testing in Asia, 10*(11), 1-18.

Gaitas, S., & Alves Martins, M. (2015). Relationships between primary teachers' beliefs and their practices in relation to writing instruction. *Research Papers in Education, 30*(4), 492-505.

Genç, E., Çalışkan, H., & Yüksel, D. (2020). Language assessment literacy level of EFL teachers: A focus on writing and speaking assessment knowledge of the teachers. *Sakarya University Journal of Education, 10*(2), 274-291.

Giraldo, F., & Murcia, D. M. (2019). Language assessment literacy and the professional development of pre-service language teachers. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 21*(2), 243-259.

Gonen, K. & Akbarov, A. (2015). Instructors' principles and practices in the implementation stage of classroom-based language assessment in higher education in Turkey. *Journal of European Education, 5*(3), 28-38.

Graves, K. 2009. The curriculum of second language teacher education. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 115-124). Cambridge University Press.

Guerin, E. M. C. (2010). Initial findings from a pilot Italian study of foreign language teachers' stated language assessment knowledge-base and needs. *Papers from the Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching, 4*, 80–103.

Gwyn-Paquette, C., & Tochon, F. V. (2002). The role of reflective conversations and feedback in helping preservice teachers learn to use cooperative. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*(2), 204-226.

Hakim, B. (2015). English language teachers' ideology of ELT assessment literacy. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies, 3*(4), 42-48.

Haladyna, T. M. (2004). *Developing and validating multiple-choice test items* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hale, C. C., Nanni, A., & Hooper, D. (2018). Conversation analysis in language teacher education: An approach for reflection through action research. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education (HUJE), 33*(Special Issue), 54-71.

Han, T. & Kaya, H. I. (2014). Turkish EFL teachers' assessment preferences and practices in the context of constructivist instruction. *Journal of Studies in Education, 4*(1), 77-93.

Harris, A. R. (2013). *Professionals developing professionalism: The interactional organisation of reflective practice* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Newcastle University.

Hasselgreen, A., Carlsen, C., & Helness, H. (2004). European survey of language testing and assessment needs. Part one: General findings. Retrieved from http://www.ealta.eu.org/documents/resources/survey-report-pt1.pdf

Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2009). Writing and evaluating multiple choice Items. A training module prepared for the E-INSET Project.

Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2010). Summative evaluation of an English language testing and evaluation course for future English language teachers in Turkey. *English Language Teacher Education and Development (ELTED), 13,* 40-51.

Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2015). English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) training in Turkey: Expectations and needs of pre-service English language teachers. *ELT Research Journal, 4*(2), 111-128.

Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2017). History of English language teacher training and English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) education in Turkey. In Y. Bayyurt & N. S. Sifakis (Eds.), *English language education policies and practices in the Mediterranean countries and beyond* (pp. 227-257). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Hayashi, M. (2013). Turn allocation and turn sharing. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (1st ed., pp. 167-190). Blackwell Publishing.

Heaton, J. B. (1990). *Writing English language tests.* Longman.

Hellermann, J. (2013). Conversation analysis and language acquisition. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 112–125). Blackwell Publishing.

Herder, A., Berenst, J., de Glopper, K., & Koole, T. (2020). Conversational functions of 'I know', 'you know' and 'we know' in collaborative writing of primary school children. *Classroom Discourse,* 1-31.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge University Press.

Hoey, E. M., & Kendrick, K. H. (2017). Conversation analysis. In A. M. B. de Groot & P. Hagoort (Eds*.), Research Methods in Psycholinguistics: A Practical Guide* (151-173). Wiley Blackwell.

Huth, T. (2011). Conversation analysis and language classroom discourse. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 5*(5), 297-309.

Hyland, F., & Lo, M. M. (2006). Examining interaction in the teaching practicum: Issues of language, power and control. *Mentoring & Tutoring, 14*(2), 163-186.

İnan Karagül, B., Yüksel, D.& Altay, M. (2017). Assessment and grading practices of EFL teachers in Turkey. *International Journal of Language Academy, 5/5 CUELT Special Issue,* 168-174.

Jacknick, C. M. (2011). "But this is writing": Post-expansion in student-initiated sequences. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 5*(1), 39-54.

Jacknick, C. M., & Duran, D. (2021). Transforming student contributions into subject-specific expression. *System, 98,* 1-16.

Jakonen, T. (2018). Retrospective orientation to learning activities and achievements as a resource in classroom interaction. *The Modern Language Journal, 102*(4), 758-774.

Jannati, S. (2015). ELT teachers' language assessment literacy: perceptions and practices. *International Journal of Research in Teacher Education, 6*(2), 26-37.

Jefferson, G. (1984). Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset. In V. D'Urso and P. Leonardi (Eds.) *Discourse analysis and natural rhetoric* (pp. 11-38). Padua, Italy.

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

Jenks, C. J. (2011). *Transcribing talk and interaction.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Jin, Y. (2010). The place of language testing and assessment in the professional preparation of foreign language teachers in China. *Language Testing, 27*(4), 555-584.

Johnson, K. E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 24*(1), 83-108.

Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective.* Routledge.

Johnson, R., Becker, P., & Olive, F. (1999). Teaching the second-language testing course through test development by teachers-in-training. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 26*(3), 71-82.

Joughin, G. (2009). Introduction: Refocusing assessment. In G. Joughin (Ed.), *Assessment, Learning and Judgement in Higher Education* (pp. 1-11) Springer.

Kääntä, L. (2010). *Teacher turn-allocation and repair practices in classroom interaction: A multisemiotic perspective* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Jyväskylä.

Kagan, D. M. (1990). Ways of evaluating teacher cognition: Inferences concerning the Goldilocks principle. *Review of Educational Research, 60*(3), 419-469.

Karakaş, A., & Yükselir, C. (2020). Engaging pre-service EFL teachers in reflection through video-mediated team micro-teaching and guided discussions. *Reflective Practice,* 1-14.

Kardaş İşler, N., Balaman, U., & Şahin A. E. (2019). The interactional management of learner initiatives in social studies classroom discourse. *Language, Culture and Social Interaction, 23,* 1-10.

Kärkkäinen, E. (2012). I thought it was very interesting. Conversational formats for taking a stance. *Journal of Pragmatics, 44,* 2194-2210.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A Conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 117-142). Routledge.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 34,* 171–212.

Kavaklı, N., & Arslan, S. (2019). Towards a continuum from know-how to show-how for developing EFL student-teachers' assessment literacy. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET), 6*(1), 223-232.

Kim, Y., & Silver, R. E. (2016). Provoking reflective thinking in post observation conversations. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(3), 203-219.

Kirkgoz, Y., Babanoglu, M., & Ağçam, P. R. (2017). Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions and practices of foreign language assessment in primary education. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research, 4*(4), 163-170.

Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (1st ed., pp. 229-256). Blackwell Publishing.

Kleinsasser, R. C. (2005). Transforming a postgraduate level assessment course: A second language teacher educator's narrative. *Prospect, 20*(3), 77-102.

Koole, T. (2010). Displays of epistemic access: Student responses to teacher explanations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 43*(2), 183–209.

Koschmann, T. (2013). Conversation analysis and learning in interaction. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1038–1043). Blackwell Publishing.

Lam, R. (2015). Language assessment training in Hong Kong: Implications for language assessment literacy. *Language Testing, 32*(2), 169-197.

Lazaraton, A., & Ishihara, N. (2005). Understanding second language teacher practice using microanalysis and self-reflection: A collaborative case study. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(4), 529–542.

Lerner. G. H. (1996). On the "semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 238-276). Cambridge University Press.

Leyland, C (2016). 'Pre-enactment' in team-teacher planning talk: Demonstrating a possible future in the here-and-now. *Pragmatics, 26*(4), 675-704.

Leyland, C. (2021). The interactional construction of the academic reader in writing tutorials for international students: An advice-giving resource. *Linguistics and Education, 61,* 1-13.

Li, L. (2012). Belief construction and development: Two tales of non-native English speaking student teachers in a TESOL programme. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 6*(1), 33-58.

Li, L., (2013). The complexity of language teachers' beliefs and practice: One EFL teacher's theories. *The Language Learning Journal, 41*(2), 175-191.

Li, L. (2020). *Language teacher cognition: A sociocultural perspective.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Li, L., & Walsh, S. (2011). 'Seeing is believing': Looking at EFL teachers' beliefs through classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 2*(1), 39-57.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. Continuum.

Malabarba, T. (2019). 'In English, sorry': Participants' orientation to the English-only policy in beginning-level EFL classroom interaction. In H. T. Nguyen & T. Malabarba (Eds.), *Conversation Analytic Perspectives on English Language Learning, Teaching, and Testing in Global Contexts* (pp. 244-267). Multilingual Matters.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Markee, N. (2005). Conversation analysis for second language acquisition. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 355-374). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Markee, N., & Kunitz, S. (2015). CA-for-SLA studies of classroom interaction: Quo vadis?. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction* (1st ed., pp. 425-439). Wiley-Blackwell.

Mazeland, H. (2006). Conversation analysis. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 153-163). Elsevier.

Mede, E., & Atay, D. (2017). English language teachers' assessment literacy: The Turkish context. *Ankara Üniversitesi TÖMER Dil Dergisi, 168*(1), 43- 60.

Mohammadi, E., Kiany, G.R., Samar, R. G., & Akbari, R. (2015). Appraising pre-service EFL teachers' assessment in language testing course using revised Bloom's Taxonomy. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 4*(4), 8-20.

Mondada, L. (2007). Multimodal resources for turn-taking: Pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies, 9*(2), 194-225.

Mondada, L. (2018). Multiple temporalities of language and body in interaction: challenges for transcribing multimodality. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 51*(1), 85-106.

O'Loughlin, K. (2006). Learning about second language assessment: Insights from a postgraduate student on-line subject forum. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL, 1,* 71-85.

Ölmezer-Öztürk, E., & Aydın, B. (2018). Investigating language assessment knowledge of EFL teachers. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education), 34*(3), 602-620.

Ölmezer-Öztürk, E., & Aydın, B. (2019). Voices of EFL teachers as assessors: Their opinions and needs regarding language assessment. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi - Journal of Qualitative Research in Education, 7*(1), 373-390.

Öz, H. (2014). Turkish teachers' practices of assessment for learning in the English as a foreign language classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5*(4), 775-785.

Öz, S., & Atay, D. (2017). Turkish EFL instructors' in-class language assessment literacy: Perceptions and practices. *ELT Research Journal, 6*(1), 25-44.

Park, Y. (2014). The roles of third-turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 35*(2), 145–167.

Pehlivan Şişman, E., & Büyükkarcı, K. (2019). A review of foreign language teachers' assessment literacy. *Sakarya University Journal of Education, 9*(3), 628-650.

Restrepo Bolivar, E. M. (2020). Monitoring preservice teachers' language assessment literacy development through journal writing. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, 17*(1), 38-52.

Rodman, G. J. (2010). Facilitating the teaching-learning process through the reflective engagement of pre-service teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(2), 20-34.

Sahlström, J. F. (2002). The interactional organization of hand raising in classroom interaction. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction, 37*(2), 47-57.

Sandlund, E. (2014). Prescribing conduct: Enactments of talk or thought in advice-giving sequences. *Discourse Studies, 16*(5) 645-666.

Saraç Süzer, H. S. (2007). Teacher knowledge on grammar teaching: A case study. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 32,* 255-265.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis.* Cambridge University Press.

Schwab, G. (2011). From dialogue to multilogue: a different view on participation in the English foreign-language classroom. *Classroom Discourse, 2*(1), 3–19.

Seedhouse, P. (2004a). Conversation analysis methodology. In P. Seedhouse, & R. F. Young (Eds.), *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective.* Wiley-Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. (2004b). Conversation analysis as research methodology. In K. Richards, & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying Conversation Analysis* (pp. 251-266). Palgrave Macmillan.

Serdar Tülüce, H. (2019). The correspondence between beliefs and practices of an EFL teacher regarding l2 grammar teaching. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education, 8*(3), 791-806.

Sert, O. (2010). A proposal for a CA-integrated English language teacher education program in Turkey. *Asian EFL Journal (Special Issue on English Language Teacher Education and Development: Issues and Perspectives in Asia), 12*(3), 62-97.

Sert, O. (2012). Integrating digital video analysis software into language teacher education: Insights from conversation analysis. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70,* 231-238.

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

Sert, O. (2019). Classroom interaction and language teacher education. In S. Walsh & S. Mann (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teacher Education* (pp.216-238). Routledge.

Sert, O., & Balaman, U. (2018). Orientations to negotiated language and task rules in online L2 interaction. *ReCALL, 30*(3), 355–374.

Sert, O., & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education, 27*(6), 542–565.

Sevimel Sahin, A., & Subasi, G. (2019). An overview of language assessment literacy research. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi [Journal of Theoretical Educational Science], 12*(4), 1340-1364.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1-21.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction.* Wiley-Blackwell.

Silverman, D. (1998). *Harvey Sacks: Social science and conversation analysis.* Oxford University Press.

Sluijsmans, D. M. A., Brand-Gruwel, S., van Merrienboer, J. J. G., & Bastiaens, T. H. (2003). The training of peer assessment skills to promote the development of reflection skills in teacher education. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 29,* 23-42.

Stivers, T. (2005). Modified repeats: One method for asserting primary rights from second position. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 38*(2), 131-158.

Sultana, N. (2019). Language assessment literacy: An uncharted area for the English language teachers in Bangladesh. *Language Testing in Asia, 9*(1), 1-14.

Şahin, S. (2019). *An analysis of English language testing and evaluation course in English language teacher education programs in Turkey: Developing language assessment literacy of pre-service EFL teachers* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Middle East Technical University.

Tavassoli, K., & Farhady, H. (2018). Assessment knowledge needs of EFL teachers. *Teaching English Language, 12*(2), 45-65.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Tsagari, D., & Vogt, K. (2017). Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers around Europe: Research, challenges and future prospects. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment, 6*(1), 41-63.

Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(3), 302-325.

Valizadeh, M. (2019). EFL teachers' writing assessment literacy, beliefs, and training needs in the context of Turkey. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 10*(6), 53-62.

Vogt, K., & Tsagari, D. (2014) Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers: Findings of a European study. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 11*(4), 374-402.

Walsh, S. (2001). QTT vs. TTT: never mind the quality, feel the width?. *Journal of Education and Development*, 16-21.

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

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

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

Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh Press University.

Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*(4), 577–594.

Waring, H. Z. (2013). Two mentor practices that generate teacher reflection without explicit solicitations: Some preliminary considerations. *RELC Journal, 44*(1), 103-119.

Waring, H. Z. (2017). Going general as a resource for doing advising in post-observation conferences in teacher training. *Journal of Pragmatics, 110*, 20-33.

Watanabe, A. (2016). Engaging in an interactional routine in EFL classroom: The development of L2 interactional competence over time. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(1), 48-70.

Xie, Q., & Tan, S. (2019). Preparing primary English teachers in Hong Kong: Focusing on language assessment literacy. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 16*(2), 653-673.

Xu, Y. (2019). English language teacher assessment literacy in practice. In X. Gao (Ed.), *Second Handbook of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1-23). Springer.

Yastıbaş, A. E., & Takkaç, M. (2018). Understanding the development of language assessment literacy. *Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 8*(15), 89-106.

Yavuz Kırık, M. (2008). *Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğretmenlerinin ölçme değerlendirme bağlamında tutum ve yaklaşımları* [Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi]. İstanbul Üniversitesi.

Yeşilçınar, S., & Kartal, G. (2020). EFL teachers' assessment literacy of young learners: Findings from a small-scale study. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science, 13*(3), 548-563.

Yuan, R., Mak, P., & Yang, M. (2020). 'We teach, we record, we edit, and we reflect': Engaging preservice language teachers in video-based reflective practice. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-20.

Yüksel, İ., & Başaran, B. Ç. (2020). Reflective peer feedback in the practicum: Qualitative and quantitative practices. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI), 11*(1), 85-109.

APPENDIX-A: Jefferson (2004) Transcription Convention

[	indicates the point of overlap onset
]	indicates the point of overlap termination
=	contiguous utterances of different speakers or the turn of the same speaker continues below at the next identical symbol
(3.2)	an interval between utterances indicated by tenths of seconds.
(.)	a brief interval within or between utterances
<u>word</u>	underlining indicates speaker emphasis
::	colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. The longer the colon row, the longer the prolongation.
-	a single dash indicates an abrupt cut-off
↑↓	arrows indicate shifts into especially high (↑) or low (↓) pitch
?	rising intonation, not necessarily a question
,	a comma indicates low-rising intonation, suggesting continuation
.	a full stop (period) indicates falling (final) intonation
WORD	upper case indicates especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk
∘word∘	degree signs bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicates that the sounds are softer than the surrounding talk.
>word<	indicate that the talk they surround is produced more quickly than neighboring talk
<word>	indicate that the talk they surround is produced slowly and deliberately
( )	a stretch of unclear or unintelligible speech
(guess)	indicates transcriber doubt about a word
.hh	speaker in-breath
hh	speaker out-breath
→	arrows in the left margin pick out features of especial interest
(( ))	doubled parentheses contain transcriber's descriptions

* *	Descriptions of embodied movements are delimited between
+ +	two identical symbols (one symbol per participant's line of action) and are synchronized with corresponding stretches of talk/lapses of time.
*-->	The action described continues across subsequent lines
-->*	until the same symbol is reached.
≫	The action described begins before the extract's beginning.
-->>	The action described continues after the extract's end.
....	Preparation.
------	Full extension of the movement is reached and maintained.
,,,,,	Retraction.
ava	Participant doing the embodied action is identified when (s)he is not the speaker.
fig	The exact moment at which a screen shot has been taken is indicated
#	with a symbol showing its temporal position within turn at talk/segments of time.

APPENDIX-C: Ethics Committee Approval

Sayı: 28620816 / 332

04 EKİM 2019

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Doç.Dr. Çiler HATİPOĞLU, Nilüfer Can DAŞKIN

"**İngilizce Öğretmen Adaylarının Ölçme ve Değerlendirme bilgi ve becerilerine yönelik gelişimlerinin sınıf-içi etkileşim içinde izlenmesi**" başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülmüş ve **332 ODTÜ 2019** protokol numarası ile onaylanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla bilgilerinize sunarız.

Prof. Dr. Tülin GENÇÖZ

Başkan

Prof. Dr. Tolga CAN

Üye

Doç.Dr. Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ali Emre TURGUT

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Şerife SEVİNÇ

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Müge GÜNDÜZ

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Süreyya Özcan KABASAKAL

Üye

T.C.
HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı : 51944218-300
Konu : Etik Komisyonu İzni

YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANA BİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞINA

İlgi : 09.10.2020 tarihli ve 1278921 sayılı yazı.

Ana Bilim Dalınız İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Nilüfer CAN DAŞKIN'ın danışmanlığını yürüttüğü öğrencilerden Reyyan Zülal YÖNEY ve Nakşidil DÜZÜN'ün tez çalışmaları için ODTÜ'den alınan etik komisyonu izninin geçerli olması uygun bulunmuştur. Bilgilerinizi ve gereğini rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır
Prof. Dr. Selahattin GELBAL
Enstitü Müdürü

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü 06800 Beytepe-ANKARA
Telefon:(0 312) 297 85 70-71 Faks:(0 312) 299 85 66 E-posta:ebe@hacettepe.edu.tr

Aysun ALTUN

168

APPENDIX E: Declaration of Ethical Conduct

I hereby declare that…

- I have prepared this thesis in accordance with the thesis writing guidelines of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences of Hacettepe University;

- all information and documents in the thesis/dissertation have been obtained in accordance with academic regulations;

- all audio visual and written information and results have been presented in compliance with scientific and ethical standards;

- in case of using other people's work, related studies have been cited in accordance with scientific and ethical standards;

- all cited studies have been fully and decently referenced and included in the list of References;

- I did not do any distortion and/or manipulation on the data set,

- and **NO** part of this work was presented as a part of any other thesis study at this or any other university.

23/06/2021

(Signature)
Reyyan Zülal YÖNEY

APPENDIX-F: Thesis/Dissertation Originality Report

13/07/2021

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY

Graduate School of Educational Sciences

To The Department of Foreign Language Education

Thesis Title: Assuming Learner Behavior as an Interactional Resource in L2 Testing and Evaluation Classroom Interaction in a Teacher Education Context

The whole thesis that includes the *title page, introduction, main chapters, conclusions and bibliography section* is checked by using **Turnitin** plagiarism detection software take into the consideration requested filtering options. According to the originality report obtained data are as below.

Time Submitted	Page Count	Character Count	Date of Thesis Defence	Similarity Index	Submission ID
13/07/2021	170	290961	23/06/2021	%8	1619139093

Filtering options applied:
1. Bibliography excluded
2. Quotes included
3. Match size up to 5 words excluded

I declare that I have carefully read Hacettepe University Graduate School of Educational Sciences Guidelines for Obtaining and Using Thesis Originality Reports; that according to the maximum similarity index values specified in the Guidelines, my thesis does not include any form of plagiarism; that in any future detection of possible infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility; and that all the information I have provided is correct to the best of my knowledge.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

Name Lastname:	Reyyan Zülal YÖNEY	
Student No.:	N19130486	
Department:	Foreign Language Education	Signature
Program:	English Language Teaching	
Status:	☒ Masters ☐ Ph.D. ☐ Integrated Ph.D.	

ADVISOR APPROVAL

APPROVED
(Assist. Prof. Dr. Nilüfer CAN DAŞKIN)

170

APPENDIX-G: Yayımlama ve Fikrî Mülkiyet Hakları Beyanı

Enstitü tarafından onaylanan lisansüstü tezimin/raporumun tamamını veya herhangi bir kısmını, basılı (kâğıt) ve elektronik formatta arşivleme ve aşağıda verilen koşullarla kullanıma açma iznini Hacettepe Üniversitesine verdiğimi bildiririm. Bu izinle Üniversiteye verilen kullanım hakları dışındaki tüm fikri mülkiyet haklarım bende kalacak, tezimin tamamının ya da bir bölümünün gelecekteki çalışmalarda (makale, kitap, lisans ve patent vb.) kullanım hakları bana ait olacaktır.

Tezin kendi orijinal çalışmam olduğunu, başkalarının haklarını ihlal etmediğimi ve tezimin tek yetkili sahibi olduğumu beyan ve taahhüt ederim. Tezimde yer alan telif hakkı bulunan ve sahiplerinden yazılı izin alınarak kullanılması zorunlu metinlerin yazılı izin alınarak kullandığımı ve istenildiğinde suretlerini Üniversiteye teslim etmeyi taahhüt ederim.

Yükseköğretim Kurulu tarafından yayınlanan "**Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına ilişkin Yönerge**" kapsamında tezim aşağıda belirtilen koşullar haricince YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi / H.Ü. Kütüphaneleri Açık Erişim Sisteminde erişime açılır.

- o Enstitü/Fakülte yönetim kurulu kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihinden itibaren 2 yıl ertelenmiştir. [1]

- o Enstitü/Fakülte yönetim kurulunun gerekçeli kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihimden itibaren … ay ertelenmiştir. [2]

- o Tezimle ilgili gizlilik kararı verilmiştir. [3]

23/06/2021

(imza)

Reyyan Zülal YÖNEY

"Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge"

(1) *Madde 6. 1. Lisansüstü tezle ilgili patent başvurusu yapılması veya patent alma sürecinin devam etmesi durumunda, tez danışmanının önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü Üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulu iki yıl süre ile tezin erişime açılmasının ertelenmesine karar verebilir.*

(2) *Madde 6.2. Yeni teknik, materyal ve metotların kullanıldığı, henüz makaleye dönüşmemiş veya patent gibi yöntemlerle korunmamış ve internetten paylaşılması durumunda 3.şahıslara veya kurumlara haksız kazanç; imkânı oluşturabilecek bilgi ve bulguları içeren tezler hakkında tez danışmanın önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulunun gerekçeli kararı ile altı ayı aşmamak üzere tezin erişime açılması engellenebilir.*

(3) *Madde 7. 1. Ulusal çıkarları veya güvenliği ilgilendiren, emniyet, istihbarat, savunma ve güvenlik, sağlık vb. konulara ilişkin lisansüstü tezlerle ilgili gizlilik kararı, tezin yapıldığı kurum tarafından verilir*. Kurum ve kuruluşlarla yapılan işbirliği protokolü çerçevesinde hazırlanan lisansüstü tezlere ilişkin gizlilik kararı ise, ilgili kurum ve kuruluşun önerisi ile enstitü veya fakültenin uygun görüşü Üzerine üniversite yönetim kurulu tarafından verilir. Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler Yükseköğretim Kuruluna bildirilir.*
Madde 7.2. Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler gizlilik süresince enstitü veya fakülte tarafından gizlilik kuralları çerçevesinde muhafaza edilir, gizlilik kararının kaldırılması halinde Tez Otomasyon Sistemine yüklenir

* Tez danışmanının önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulu tarafından karar verilir.