HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Department of Foreign Language Education

English Language Teaching Program

THE CONTRIBUTION OF REPETITION EXERCISES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION TO THE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT OF PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Sümeyye Merve TOPTAŞ

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2025

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

THE CONTRIBUTION OF REPETITION EXERCISES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION TO THE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT OF PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

İLKOKUL ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENİMİNDE TEKRAR ALIŞTIRMALARININ DİL GELİŞİMİNE KATKISI

Sümeyye Merve Toptaş

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2025

Acceptance and Approval

To the Graduate School of Educational Sciences,

This thesis / dissertation, prepared by **Sümeyye Merve TOPTAŞ** and entitled “The Contribution of Repetition Exercises in Foreign Language Education to the Language Development of Primary School Students” 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.

Prof. Dr. Arif SARÇOBAN

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice ERGÜL (Supervisor)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nilüfer CAN DAŞKIN

This is to certify that this thesis/dissertation has been approved by the aforementioned examining committee members on 29/09/2025 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. İsmail Hakkı MİRİCİ

Director of Graduate School of Educational Sciences

Abstract

English language instruction for young children is currently widespread worldwide. In our country, especially with the integration of English education at the primary school level, there is a significant opportunity for development in this field. By discussing potential methods that can be followed in providing English education to primary school students and identifying various practices that yield the most positive results, a benchmark can be established at this education level, thereby raising the level of English proficiency and the percentage of English learners in our country. It is claimed that at the critical age range for language acquisition, which is the primary school level, the target language can be taught more quickly and successfully by creating environments similar to natural language acquisition contexts, where the student is exposed to the language and through practices that prepare them for speaking, such as review exercises. In addition, conscious review exercises within the classroom and naturally occurring repetitions in English instruction are emphasized for their importance in language education. This study aims to examine the contribution of these practices to students' language learning, explore potential issues related to their implementation, and generate solutions. The results obtained by conducting in-depth discourse analysis of audio recordings collected throughout English lessons conducted with 20 students in the 2nd grade at Şehit Muharrem Erdoğan Primary School are presented in the relevant sections of the study.

Keywords: ELT, Discourse Analysis, Primary School, Repetition Exercises, Natural Repetition.

Öz

Küçük çocuklara yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğretimi şu anda tüm dünyada oldukça yaygın durumda. Ülkemizde özellikle İngilizce eğitiminin ilkokul seviyesine indirilmesiyle beraber bu alanda gelişim sağlanması için büyük bir fırsat doğmuş durumda. İlkokul seviyesindeki öğrencilere İngilizce eğitimi verilirken izlenebilecek muhtemel yöntemler tartışılarak en olumlu sonuçları verecek çeşitli uygulamalar belirlenerek bu eğitim seviyesinde bir çıta belirlenerek ülkemizdeki İngilizce öğrenme seviyesi ve oranını yukarı çıkarmak mümkün olacaktır. Dil öğreniminde kritik yaş aralığında olan ilkokul seviyesinde hedef dilin doğal yolla anadilin öğrenildiği ortamlar sağlanarak benzer şekilde yani maruz bırakarak öğretme yönteminin uygulanmasıyla, tekrar alıştırmaları gibi öğrenciyi konuşmaya hazırlamaya yönelik uygulamalarla daha hızlı ve başarılı şekilde öğretilebileceği iddiası sonucu bu çalışma gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bunun yanında İngilizcenin öğretiminde sınıf içerisindeki bilinçli tekrar alıştırmaları ve doğal şekilde gerçekleşen tekrarların da dil eğitimindeki önemi dikkat çekmektedir. Bu uygulamaların öğrencilerin dil öğrenimine katkısının ve uygulamayla ilgili muhtemel problemlerinde incelenmesi ve bunlara çözüm önerilerinin üretilmesi hedeflenmektedir. Şehit Muharrem Erdoğan İlkokulu 2. Sınıf öğrencilerinden 20 kişilik bir sınıfta gerçekleştirilen İngilizce dersleri süresince toplanan ses kayıtlarının dönem sonunda konuşma analizi yöntemi kullanılarak derinlemesine incelenmesiyle ulaşılan sonuçlar çalışmanın ilgili kısımlarında belirtilmiştir

Anahtar sözcükler: İngilizce Öğretimi, Konuşma Analizi, İlkokul, Tekrar alıştırmaları, Doğal tekrarlar.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my beloved spouse, Mahmut Toptaş, for his unwavering support, patience, and encouragement throughout this journey. My heartfelt thanks also go to my advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice Ergül, for her invaluable guidance, and constructive feedback, which greatly facilitated my work and helped me navigate this thesis process with clarity and confidence.

Table of Contents

Symbols and Abbreviations

EFL: English as Foreign Language

SLA: Second language acquisition

ELT: English Language Teaching

L2: Second/Foreign language

Chapter 1

Introduction

In Turkey, foreign language learning typically begins in formal schooling, with English introduced early and taught intensively across grades. Because so much learning happens inside classrooms, the texture of classroom talk—how teachers frame activities, how learners respond, and how texts and tasks are staged—matters for outcomes. Discourse Analysis (DA) offers a principled way to study this texture: it looks beyond isolated sentences to patterns of meaning-making in interaction and text, yielding practical insights for pedagogy in English Language Teaching (ELT). Foundational DA work oriented to ELT shows how discourse-level features (cohesion, staging, stance) shape comprehension, participation, and learning, and how teachers can use discourse evidence to refine practice (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2006a; McCarthy & Swan, 2012a).

Methodologically, DA provides several complementary lenses. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) models classroom language as choice in context, highlighting resources for building cohesive, purposeful texts (Halliday & Hasan, 1976a) and the grammar-for-meaning that underpins pedagogy (Gee, 2014). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) links classroom discourse to institutional power and ideology (Fairclough, 1993; T. A. van Dijk, 1993). And Gee's discourse-as-social-practice perspective directs attention to how learners take up identities and values through classroom talk and texts (Gee, 2014). Taken together, these strands let researchers describe what participants do with language and why it matters for learning.

Within ELT, DA has a long record of illuminating classroom organization and participation. The classic IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) model captures the default pedagogic sequence (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1978), while recent classroom discourse work shows how teachers' moves create or constrain opportunities for learning and how classroom interactional competence develops (Walsh, 2011). Corpus-informed discourse descriptions (Biber & Quirk, 2010) help teachers calibrate classroom input to the registers

learners must master. These perspectives reposition the classroom as a network of discourse events that can be redesigned once we see their patterns clearly.

This DA stance also reframes “repetition cycles” frequently observed in young-learner classrooms. Rather than dismissing repetition as rote, DA treats it as a cohesive and pedagogic resource: it can scaffold participation, stabilize newly introduced forms, and support fluency—especially when repetition is patterned and meaningful (Halliday & Hasan, 1976b). That said, if repetition remains purely echoic, it may not drive genuine acquisition, echoing long-standing critiques (Krashen, 1982). A DA lens therefore asks what repetition is doing in the local sequence (e.g., recycling lexis to build cohesion, rehearsing a move in a genre, or closing down opportunities for elaboration) and how teachers can re-design turns to move from repetition to uptake.

Another DA-relevant area is the use of discourse markers and metadiscourse, which guide participation, manage stance, and signal activity structure. Studies show systematic differences between expert and learner use of markers in classroom talk and writing, suggesting teachable targets for interactional competence and coherence (Fung & Carter, 2007; Hyland, 2004; Lahuerta Martínez, 2002).These findings align with SFL/genre pedagogy, where teachers explicitly model how phases of activities are signposted and how meanings are staged.

DA also engages with the affective side of classroom life by examining how participation frameworks and evaluative language (e.g., praise, hedging, alignment) mediate learners’ willingness to speak and their experience of anxiety/enjoyment. Large-scale studies link teacher discourse practices to foreign language enjoyment and classroom anxiety, reinforcing the value of discourse-aware feedback and task design (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014).

Finally, DA helps us look beyond teacher–student talk to peer interaction. Peer talk often invites more risk-taking and negotiation of meaning; DA describes how learners co-construct tasks, scaffold each other, and manage alignment/disalignment over time (Philp et al., 2013). For young learners in Turkey, where exposure outside school may be limited,

structured peer tasks with explicit discourse goals (e.g., rehearsed openings, prompts for elaboration, accountable “follow-ups”) can expand opportunities for meaningful L2 use.

In this study, naturally occurring classroom interactions among young learners of English in Turkey will be recorded and examined to reveal how language is used in real teaching contexts. The focus is not merely on grammatical accuracy but on how teachers and students co-construct meaning during lessons—how questions, responses, repetitions, and feedback shape the rhythm and purpose of classroom communication. As McCarthy (2012b) observes, examining discourse at this level allows educators to move beyond abstract theory and see language as social action. Similarly, Walsh (2011) emphasizes that classroom talk itself is a key pedagogical tool, one that reflects and shapes learning opportunities.

Ultimately, this research seeks to identify the patterns of discourse that either foster or hinder participation and engagement. By applying Discourse Analysis to classroom data, it becomes possible to understand what types of talk, interactional moves, and feedback sequences genuinely support young learners’ language development. As Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2006b) note, a discourse-based perspective helps teachers design activities that mirror real communication, making learning both meaningful and authentic. The overarching goal is to encourage more reflective, responsive teaching practices that empower learners to use English not only accurately but also confidently and purposefully in real-life interaction.

Statement of the Problem

Teachers who support and adopt the method of exposing students to the language as much as possible typically try to incorporate the target language consistently in their classes. One of the easiest ways to implement this approach is through repetition, as humans often learn through imitation and repetition (Vygotsky, 1978; Bandura, 1977). This method appears logical because repetition reinforces learning by making new information

more familiar and accessible. It is also seen that there are various reasons to use repetition in the class. Teachers follow this path for numerous situations, looking for different outcomes. Figuring out the tendencies of English teachers who are of Turkish national in repetition practices, coming up with possible ways to improve the efficiency of these methods is one of the important tasks at hand. Moreover, it is observed that sometimes these repetitional efforts seem ineffective when students fail to grasp the message, and the teacher is uncertain about how to break the cycle of seemingly meaningless repetition in a constructive or optimal way. In such cases, abruptly shifting the conversation to another student may seem like a solution, but there might be more effective ways to address the situation (Ellis, 2009; Swain, 2005).

Aim and Significance of the Study

This study aims to explore a repeating issue in the process of second language acquisition (SLA) among young learners in Turkey. One of the main focuses will be the repetition cycles that often appear in language classrooms. While repetition is generally seen as a helpful tool to strengthen language learning, in some cases it can also become a challenge. If not managed in an effective way, it may lead to learner fatigue, misunderstanding, or even loss of motivation. Repetition cycles, in this sense, are like a double-edged sword: they can support memorization and structure, but at the same time, when they are not handled properly, they can stop the learning process from moving forward.

This research will try to find out the main reasons behind these repetition-related problems in the classroom. Whether these issues come from the student's emotional or cognitive situation, or from the way the teacher is using repetition techniques, it is important to study them closely. The goal is to offer useful and practical suggestions that teachers can apply in their classrooms. By looking at these problems in a detailed way, the study

hopes to provide better understanding and possible solutions for teachers working with young learners.

It is already well known in the field of SLA that there is a critical period for children when it comes to language learning. Because of this, any difficulty that happens during this sensitive period should be taken seriously and solved as early as possible. That is why research on English Language Teaching (ELT) for young learners is especially important. In Turkey, some common problems like crowded classrooms, old-fashioned methods, lack of modern materials, and teachers without enough training make this subject even more urgent. The current study is motivated by these needs and tries to give detailed attention to the real situation in Turkish classrooms. There is not enough academic work focusing on the specific needs of young language learners in Turkey. Although ELT is discussed more in general terms, the young learner context is often overlooked. This study tries to contribute to this missing part by discussing real classroom examples and offering classroom-based solutions. It does not only focus on theory, but also on practice. Therefore, the aim is not just to understand the problem but to suggest ways to make improvements in day-to-day teaching.

Considering the challenges in Turkey's education system, especially in foreign language teaching at all levels, there is a strong need for research that deals with these real issues. This study emphasizes how repetition cycles reflect a larger problem in classroom interaction and teacher planning. If teachers and policy makers understand these patterns, they can take better decisions about how to prepare teachers, how to design school curriculums, and how to manage class time and materials in a more efficient way.

By examining student responses, teacher techniques, and classroom dynamics, this research will show both common difficulties and successful strategies related to repetition. It will contribute to the wider ELT literature and provide some guiding principles for educators, administrators, and even future researchers. With this approach, the study

hopes to support the improvement of English teaching in Turkey, not only in big cities but also in rural and underserved areas, where the problem is usually bigger and more visible.

Research Questions

What types of repetition practices are used in primary school EFL classrooms?

What interactional and pedagogical purposes does repetition serve in teacher–student discourse?

How do repetition practices support learner uptake, participation, and repair in classroom discourse?

Sub Research Questions

What multimodal resources (e.g., gestures, voice modulation, gaze) accompany repetition in classroom interaction, and how do they affect learner response?

In what ways do students engage with and respond to repetition sequences initiated by the teacher or peers?

Assumptions

By using the discourse analysis method, this study aims to observe and better understand the possible benefits in the language development of young learners. This method is based on analyzing real classroom interactions, where language is used naturally between teachers and students. The main idea behind choosing this approach is that students can improve their communication skills over time, especially when they are exposed to language in meaningful and repeated contexts. Instead of only focusing on grammar or memorization, this method allows researchers to look closely at how learning happens through dialogue and participation.

Of course, some difficulties may appear in the beginning. At first, both students and teachers may feel unsure about what is expected. Students might not feel confident to participate in open conversation, and teachers may need to change their usual way of teaching. Adjusting to a more interaction-based classroom may take some time. However, it is believed that these short-term challenges will be overcome as students start to enjoy

the process and get used to the classroom atmosphere. As the lessons continue, both the teacher and the students are expected to become more comfortable with the method.

One of the most important benefits of this method is the possibility of changing how students think about English. In many classrooms, English is seen only as a subject that must be passed in exams. But in this study, it is hoped that students will begin to see English as something useful and enjoyable. If students are given the chance to speak and use the language in real situations, they may start to feel more motivated. Creating a fun and curious learning environment can help to increase their interest. In this way, students do not only learn the language, but they also gain confidence and develop a more positive attitude toward using English in their daily lives.

Finally, this approach also supports a more active classroom. Instead of a teacher-centered style, the method supports interaction and shared responsibility in learning/teaching. This change is expected to help learners feel more involved in their education and to see English as a tool they can use, not just study. When students are encouraged to use the language regularly in different situations, they are more likely to remember and internalize what they learn. Through this, language development becomes a natural part of their classroom life rather than an isolated subject.

Limitations

Like many academic studies, this research has some limitations that may affect how the results are interpreted and how widely they can be applied. First of all, the study was conducted with a small group of students from a specific region in Turkey. Because of this, the results mainly reflect the conditions of that area, which may be different from other parts of the country. In Turkey, there are big differences between regions in terms of students' access to learning materials, classroom conditions, and chances to use English outside the school. Therefore, the findings of this research cannot be easily generalized to the whole country without further studies that include more diverse participants.

Secondly, the data collected in this research is based on the teaching practices of one single teacher. The teacher's own language level, classroom management skills, and teaching style have a big impact on the results. If another teacher had been part of the study, the outcomes might have been different. This means the results cannot fully represent what might happen in every classroom, especially where teachers have different training backgrounds or teaching experiences. To have a clearer picture, more teachers should be included in future research.

Another important limitation is related to the time and scope of the study. Language learning is something that takes place over a long period of time. Many factors affect how children learn a language—like how often they hear the language, whether they practice it at home, and what kinds of learning materials are used. This study, however, could not observe the students over a very long time or explore all these outside factors. Because of that, the long-term effects of the repetition activities are not fully known.

Lastly, although discourse analysis is a useful method to understand what happens during classroom interaction, it also has its own limits. This method mostly focuses on spoken exchanges and does not show what the learners are thinking inside or what kind of learning takes place outside the classroom. Also, because the study is based on qualitative data, it is not easy to measure exactly how much language improvement the students had or to compare it clearly with other similar studies.

Even with these limitations, the study still provides meaningful insight into how repetition and teacher talk affect language learning in young learners. By pointing out its limitations openly, the study also hopes to encourage future researchers to build on this work. Studies that include students from different parts of the country, various classroom settings, and more than one teacher would be very useful to understand the topic better and support more general conclusions.

Definitions

Discourse Analysis: DA is the systematic study of language as it is used in real contexts of communication. Rather than treating language as an abstract system of rules, DA focuses on how people use linguistic and other semiotic resources to construct meaning, establish relationships, and perform social actions.

SLA: Second Language Acquisition, which refers to the process through which individuals learn a second or foreign language in addition to their native language.

Young Learner: Refers to a child or an individual in the early stages of their language learning journey, usually ranging from preschool age to early adolescence (approximately 3 to 12 years old).

EFL: English as a Foreign Language, it refers to the teaching and learning of English in a non-English-speaking country where English is not the primary language of communication.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Basis of Research and Literature Review

This chapter reviews the relevant theoretical and empirical literature on repetition practices in primary EFL classrooms, with a focus on their interactional functions and pedagogical implications.

Teaching English to Young Learners (TEYL)

English has become a global language and this situation creates a high demand for learning and teaching English effectively. One of the most discussed topics in English Language Teaching (ELT) is teaching young learners. The main reason behind this focus is the belief in a good period for language learning. It is believed that children between the ages of 3 and 12 can acquire a new language more naturally and effectively compared to adults (Cameron, 2001). Therefore, both families and governments around the world are giving special attention and effort to teach English at earlier ages. The goal is to raise future generations with a strong English background so they can take part in the globalized world more easily.

The idea that children have a special capacity for language learning is not a new one. According to Lenneberg (1967), there is a biological window during which language learning happens more easily. This idea supports the view that young learners should be given opportunities to learn a second language as early as possible. Later, Krashen (1982) contributed to this idea with his input hypothesis. He explained that children do not learn language just by grammar rules. Instead, they learn better through meaningful communication and rich input in real contexts. This view also matches Vygotsky's theory of social constructivism. In particular, his concept of the Zone of Proximal Development emphasizes that learning takes place best when children are supported by adults or more capable peers in social interactions(Vygotsky, 1978).

Young learners in early education display a unique combination of cognitive, emotional, and social characteristics that make them different from older students. Cognitively, children in primary years learn more effectively through concrete experiences, visual support, and repetition, as they are still developing abstract thinking skills (Pinter, 2017). Emotionally, they are highly sensitive to encouragement, praise, and the creation of a safe environment, since confidence and motivation can strongly influence their willingness to use a new language. Socially, young learners tend to learn best in interaction with peers and teachers, where play, cooperation, and group tasks support both language development and social growth (Enever, 2018). These dimensions interact with one another: a child's emotional comfort can determine their cognitive engagement, and social interaction often provides the necessary space for both cognitive and emotional development.

In line with these theories, many methods have been developed in the field of ELT to meet the needs of young learners. One of the most popular approaches is Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). This method focuses on using language for real communication and practicing all four skills—reading, writing, listening, and speaking. In young learner classrooms, CLT can be applied in fun ways such as games, songs, and role-play activities which create a more natural and meaningful environment for students (Brewster, n.d.). In this context, interactional scaffolding plays a central role in early language learning. Scaffolding refers to the teacher's ability to provide structured yet flexible support that helps learners move from what they can do alone to what they can achieve with guidance (Copland & Garton, 2014) . This process is particularly important for young learners, who often need step-by-step modeling, reformulation of their utterances, and meaningful feedback in order to build confidence and fluency. Through scaffolding, teachers manage classroom discourse by balancing control and openness: they correct gently, encourage extended turns, and make children's contributions meaningful even when limited in form. Such scaffolding practices not only enhance linguistic competence but also sustain

motivation by validating the learner's effort, which is crucial in environments where affective factors are as important as cognitive ones.

Another effective method is Task-Based Learning (TBL), where students are encouraged to complete a task that requires the use of English. These tasks can include drawing, doing a group project, or participating in role-plays. The aim is to create real-life communication in the classroom that keeps learners motivated and focused on using language as a tool, not just a subject (Ellis, 2003). Additionally, play-based learning has been found to be very helpful for young learners because it reduces anxiety and supports learning in a natural way. Pinter (2017) explains that storytelling and games can increase motivation and help learners understand language in context.

Recent studies highlight that effective scaffolding must be adaptive and sensitive to the learners' developmental stage and socio-cultural background. For example, Enever (2018)stresses that the increasing global trend of introducing English at early ages requires pedagogical approaches that respect children's holistic needs, rather than treating language learning as a narrow academic subject. Similarly, Pinter (2017) points out that scaffolding strategies should integrate play, storytelling, and peer collaboration, since these align with children's natural modes of learning. Copland and Garton (2014), in their research on young learners' classrooms across diverse contexts, show how teachers talk, questioning techniques, and interactive patterns directly shape the quality of learning opportunities. Taken together, these findings suggest that interactional scaffolding is not only a teaching method but a framework for understanding how young learners think, feel, and interact within the language classroom.

Building on these points, recent work also underlines how classroom talk, and participation structures must fit children's developmental profile. In young-learner classrooms, teachers create space for meaning-making with short turns, clear visual reference, and simple participation rules; then they expand children's contributions with contingent questions, recasts, and gentle prompting. Such interactional moves help children

stay engaged emotionally while stretching their language in manageable steps, and they support motivation by showing that every small utterance matters. Current syntheses emphasize that engagement is not only an individual trait, but a relational climate produced by teacher care, peer collaboration, and task design that invites curiosity and play (Butler, 2019; Garton & Copland, 2018; Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020)

In practice, effective scaffolding with young learners is highly concrete and routine-based: story retelling with pictures, choral rehearsals before pair work, input-rich tasks with gestures and props, and short “try-and-see” cycles where the teacher models, the class practices, and then children personalize the language. Evidence shows that input-based tasks can be particularly powerful at beginner level because they reduce cognitive load while still promoting form–meaning mapping (Shintani, 2016). At the same time, teacher education studies in primary ELT stress that teachers need preparation to orchestrate such tasks responsively across diverse policy contexts (Zein & Butler, 2023). Research further indicates that motivational scaffolding, when embedded into daily routines, strengthens both linguistic and socio-emotional growth in the classroom (Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020).

However, even though these methods are very promising, there are also several challenges in teaching English to young learners. One of the biggest problems is the need for qualified teachers. A teacher should not only have a good command of English but also know how to deal with young children’s needs and developmental characteristics (Garton, Copland, & Burns, 2011). Managing a classroom with active children and keeping them engaged can be very difficult without proper training.

Another common issue is the lack of resources. In many schools, especially in rural areas, classrooms are crowded and there are not enough teaching materials like flashcards, games, or audio resources. Also, education policies may not always support the best practices. For example, in some countries like Turkey, formal exams are not allowed in early grades anymore. This creates a gap in assessment. Traditional paper-based exams do not fit young learners well, but alternative assessment methods are not always used in practice.

Moon (2000) suggests using more appropriate methods such as portfolios, project-based evaluations, or observation to assess children's progress in language learning.

In conclusion, the field of Teaching English to Young Learners is very important and requires serious attention from educators and policymakers. It offers many opportunities for helping children build strong language skills from an early age. But at the same time, it also requires experienced teachers, supportive policies, and enough resources to reach its full potential. With the right strategies and understanding, early language education can provide a strong foundation for lifelong learning and open new doors for children in the future.

Repetition in Language Learning

Repetition has long been recognized as a central mechanism in second language learning, particularly in early stages where learners require frequent exposure to new forms in order to establish memory traces and develop automaticity. Unlike mere rote memorization, repetition in communicative contexts serves multiple functions: it reinforces phonological patterns, supports lexical retention, and allows learners to notice grammatical structures across varying interactions. Scholars emphasize that repetition is not simply mechanical drilling, but a dynamic process that can take place through teacher talk, peer interaction, and task design, each shaping the quality of input and output in different ways (Bygate, 2018; I. S. P. Nation & Hunston, 2013a; Wong & Waring, 2009). When integrated into meaningful activities such as storytelling, role-play, or classroom routines, repetition enhances not only linguistic accuracy but also learner confidence, fluency, and participation.

Theoretical Perspectives on Repetition

Repetition in interaction goes far beyond the mechanical practice of forms; it operates as a bridge between exposure, attention, production, memory, and collaboration. Through repeated encounters, learners internalize language patterns, while the recurrence of particular features draws their focus to aspects of form that might otherwise go unnoticed. The act of repeating also gives learners space to adjust and refine their speech, turning

earlier attempts into more accurate or fluent versions. At the same time, repetition provides crucial short-term support for memory, allowing learners to hold and retrieve language as they navigate the pressures of real-time communication. On a social level, it becomes a collaborative tool: teachers and peers recycle each other's words, creating scaffolds that help extend participation and meaning. Taken together, these functions show repetition to be a flexible, multidimensional resource that serves both cognitive development and social interaction in the classroom.

From a traditional perspective, repetition was first explained as a way of forming habits, where frequent practice leads to automatic responses in language use (Skinner, 1957). Later research, however, shifted the focus from habit alone to the role of input. The Input Hypothesis suggests that repeated exposure to slightly challenging language helps learners to process meaning and internalize forms naturally (Ellis, 2015; Krashen, 1982). This means that repetition is not only a tool for practice but also a way for learners to gain access to understandable language over time.

Another important view highlights how repetition helps learners to pay attention to linguistic details. According to the Noticing Hypothesis, learners must notice specific forms in order to acquire them, and repetition is one condition that draws such attention (Godfroid, 2019; Schmidt, 1990). In a similar line, the Output Hypothesis shows that when learners repeat and reframe their own speech, they are pushed to test and refine their language, often discovering gaps in their knowledge (Swain, 1995; Swain & Lapkin, 1998).

From a cognitive angle, repetition is closely linked to working memory. Temporary storage and rehearsal allow learners to keep words and structures available long enough for deeper processing, which in turn supports long-term retention (Baddeley, 2000; Wen, 2016). In addition, repetition can be explained from a sociocultural perspective, where it becomes a scaffold in interaction. Within the Zone of Proximal Development, repeating each other's words creates opportunities for learners to participate in shared activity and gradually gain control of new forms (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978). In this way,

repetition is seen not only as practice but also as a collaborative and developmental process.

In conclusion, repetition in interaction should be understood as much more than mechanical drilling. The perspectives discussed show that repetition touches on many layers of language learning: it provides access to input, creates conditions for noticing, and gives learners chances to test their output and refine their speech. At the same time, it works with the limits of memory and supports retention through rehearsal, while in social contexts it acts as a scaffold that allows learners to participate more actively. In this sense, repetition is not a single process but a set of overlapping functions that serve both the cognitive and social sides of learning.

Taken together, these views suggest that repetition is a central tool for building language in real classrooms. It connects the inner processes of memory and attention with the outer realities of interaction, collaboration, and scaffolding. By seeing repetition as a dynamic resource rather than a static drill, teachers and researchers can better understand how young and adult learners alike move from simple practice to deeper language development.

Pedagogical Functions of Repetition in TEYL

It is safe to argue that repetition plays a very important role in how young learners develop language, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. It is seen that being exposed to the same words, phrases, or sentence patterns over and over again helps children remember them better. This is because repetition strengthens memory and improves vocabulary learning. Many studies in the field of language education support this idea. They show that repeating linguistic input helps learners build up their language skills step by step. Also, repetition helps to make language structures familiar to young learners, who may not always learn in a conscious way.

In language classrooms, especially for young learners in primary schools, repetition is not a single method but a group of techniques that teachers use in different ways. Each type of repetition practice serves a special purpose in the learning process and is usually connected to the cognitive and emotional development of the children. Since young learners have limited attention spans and are still building their memory and speaking skills, these repetition types are adapted to fit their needs and learning styles. Also, by using more than one method of repetition, teachers can keep the lessons more interesting and helpful for a variety of learners.

Choral Repetition

Choral repetition, where the whole class repeats after the teacher, can be understood as repetition for alignment. It allows learners to coordinate their voices with the teacher's model, building rhythm and pronunciation together. Because all students speak at once, it reduces anxiety and strengthens collective participation, in line with the idea that lowering the affective filter makes input more accessible (Krashen, 1982). In DA terms, choral repetition displays group orientation to the teacher's turn, showing shared attention and affiliation.

Echo Repetition and Recasting

When the teacher echoes or reformulates a learner's utterance, repetition takes the form of repair. This practice often provides a corrected version of the learner's speech without explicitly marking it as an error. For example, transforming "She go to school" into "Yes, she goes to school every day" is a recast, which gives feedback while keeping the conversation flowing (Lyster & Ranta, 1997a). Such reformulations represent other-initiated repair, allowing learners to notice and adjust their output while maintaining motivation and participation.

Drills and Pattern Practice

Drills, though sometimes viewed as mechanical, also function as rehearsal for turn-taking. When teachers use substitution or pattern drills, learners practice producing timely, well-formed responses to cues. This repetitive sequencing helps build automaticity, or the ability to use language quickly and naturally (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). From a DA perspective, such drills create structured opportunities for learners to manage turn entries and produce increasingly accurate utterances in coordinated interaction.

Songs, Rhymes, and Chants

Children love music and rhythm, so using songs, rhymes, and chants in the classroom is both effective and enjoyable. Musical activities such as songs, rhymes, and chants introduce natural repetition in a collective participation framework. Children repeat lines and phrases in rhythm, which supports prosody, intonation, and pronunciation (Murphey, 1992). The predictable structure and melody give learners clear turn-taking slots, while alignment with rhythm and movement makes the language memorable and enjoyable. Here, repetition creates engagement by synchronizing learners' contributions within the group.

Task-Based Repetition

Task-based repetition occurs when learners reuse similar structures while describing pictures, comparing objects, or presenting ideas. Each time the form is repeated, it appears in a new context, creating opportunities for expansion and refinement. Research shows that repeating tasks improves fluency and complexity of speech (Bygate, 2001). Interactionally, this form of repetition sustains alignment across tasks, allowing learners to build on earlier turns while experimenting with greater accuracy and flexibility.

Routine-Based Repetition

Daily routines, such as greetings or commands, rely on repetition that organizes classroom life. Exchanges like *"Good morning"* or instructions such as *"Open your book"* are repeated regularly, giving learners predictable scripts to use with confidence. These

recurrent turns show how repetition works as a participation framework that structures interaction. Over time, such routines become embedded in learners' repertoires as authentic and functional language use.

Storytelling and Reenactment

Storytelling and classroom dramatization use repetition for engagement and comprehension. When teachers repeat phrases in stories or learners reenact dialogues, key structures are recycled in meaningful contexts. This repetition supports memory and comprehension while encouraging participation through role-play and collective performance. In DA terms, the retelling and echoing of narrative lines display alignment with the story sequence, helping learners to co-construct meaning in interaction.

Across these practices, repetition is more than simple drilling: it is an interactional tool that manages alignment, repair, and turn-taking while also supporting vocabulary, grammar, and fluency development. Whether through choral repetition, recasting, drills, or storytelling, repetition serves both cognitive and social functions. By drawing on multiple techniques and framing repetition as a flexible resource, teachers can create classrooms where young learners not only remember language but also learn how to participate in interaction meaningfully and confidently.

Discourse Analysis Studies on Repetition

DA provides a powerful lens for understanding how repetition functions as a meaning-making and pedagogical resource in classroom discourse. Whereas Conversation Analysis traditionally focused on the sequential organization of talk, DA widens the scope to include how language, context, and social purpose interact to construct knowledge. From Halliday and Hasan's (1976a) view of cohesion as a fundamental property of discourse, repetition is recognized not as redundancy but as a cohesive device that creates texture, continuity, and emphasis within a text or interaction. Similarly, Halliday and Matthiessen (2013) emphasize that repetition helps maintain thematic progression and textual unity,

making it an important grammatical and semantic resource rather than a mere surface feature.

Beyond repair, repetition also works as a resource for alignment and stance marking. When students echo parts of a teacher's utterance, they display their orientation to the ongoing activity and show affiliation with the teacher's prior turn (Stivers, 2008). At times, repeating a word or phrase with altered prosody can mark stance, signaling agreement, doubt, or emphasis (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). In classrooms, teachers frequently use repetition as a way of acknowledging and validating student contributions, often reinforcing them with praise or intonation that encourages more talk (Wong & Waring, 2009). Repetition in this sense becomes not only a linguistic practice but also a social action that constructs alignment, affiliation, and shared participation (Sert, 2015). Taken together, these perspectives show that repetition is a versatile tool for organizing interaction, shaping learner identity, and supporting the co-construction of knowledge in the EFL classroom.

In classroom contexts, repetition has long been linked with learning and scaffolding. From a discourse perspective, repetition functions as a semiotic bridge between teacher talk and learner uptake—it signals focus, reinforces key forms, and facilitates participation. McCarthy (2012a) observes that teachers' repeated rewordings and paraphrases serve as discourse strategies that support comprehension and maintain lesson coherence. Likewise, Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2006a) argue that repetition, when analyzed within discourse, helps learners process and internalize the pragmatic functions of utterances, rather than just their grammatical form. Thus, DA allows researchers to study repetition as part of a communicative event, in which participants co-construct meaning and negotiate understanding across multiple turns and modes of discourse.

More recent work specifies the stances and scaffolding that repetition can enact. Waring shows how teachers' explicit positive assessments ("very good," "nice") and repetitions of learner contributions do more than evaluate; they publicly ratify alignment, set a local affective stance, and build a pathway for further learner talk within or beyond IRF

(Waring, 2008). Her single-case analysis of moving out of IRF documents how a learner, in close coordination with the teacher, reuses and rekeys prior items to renegotiate participation, demonstrating repetition as an interactional resource for reorganizing the activity (Waring, 2009).

Beyond its cohesive role, repetition in classroom discourse is deeply social. It often serves to construct alignment, stance, and interpersonal rapport between teachers and learners. Fairclough (1993) and van Dijk (1993) highlight that discourse is both shaped by and shapes social relations, a principle equally applicable to classroom communication. When teachers repeat learners' responses, they are not only providing feedback but also validating learners' identities as legitimate participants in the learning process. As Gee (2014) notes, such discursive moves help build "Discourses" patterns of language use that embody shared values, roles, and relationships. Through repetition, students align with these discursive norms, gaining entry into the social world of the classroom and its communicative routines.

DA-oriented studies on classroom talk further demonstrate that repetition is a flexible pedagogical act embedded in broader activity structures. Walsh (2011) shows that discourse features such as reformulation, echoing, and paraphrasing enable teachers to manage interactional space, signal transitions, and maintain topic coherence. Similarly, Waring (2012; 2013) illustrates how teachers' repetition and rephrasing in feedback moves invite elaboration and deeper learner engagement. In genre-based and systemic-functional studies, repetition has been analyzed as a resource that scaffolds learners' movement from spoken interaction to written production, enabling them to internalize recurring patterns of field-specific discourse (Hyland, 2004; Rose & Martin, 2012) .These findings reveal repetition as a discourse-level pedagogical strategy that bridges linguistic form and social meaning.

From a critical perspective, repetition also carries ideological and evaluative weight. CDA research (Fairclough, 1995; Wodak & Meyer, 2016) notes that repeated formulations

in textbooks or teacher talk can normalize particular worldviews and roles, subtly shaping learners' attitudes toward language and authority. In the Turkish EFL context, such patterns may reinforce hierarchical teacher–student relations or, conversely, be used deliberately to promote inclusion and empathy through shared discourse. Thus, repetition is not neutral—it is an act through which teachers and learners construct social identities, pedagogical relationships, and access to classroom power dynamics.

While international DA research has examined repetition in contexts ranging from academic writing to spoken classroom interaction (Walsh, 2011; Waring, 2013), studies focusing on young learners in Turkey remain limited. Existing research often addresses broader issues such as teacher talk, repair, or code-switching (Şimşek & Çapar, 2022), but few studies systematically investigate repetition as a cohesive and interpersonal resource in early EFL classrooms. Local research, such as Balaman's (2018) multimodal discourse study of preschool classrooms, acknowledges embodied forms of repetition (gesture, gaze, and prosody) but does not analyze how repetition structures participation or learning opportunities. This gap points to the need for DA-informed inquiry that examines repetition as a discourse practice shaping meaning, identity, and engagement among young learners.

Therefore, this study aims to explore repetition as a discourse phenomenon rather than a mechanical teaching tool. By focusing on naturally occurring interaction in Turkish primary EFL classrooms, it will investigate how repetition contributes to coherence, scaffolding, and learner participation. Understanding repetition through DA can help teachers recognize when and how repeated forms support comprehension, foster engagement, and co-construct meaningful learning experiences. In doing so, the study aspires to broaden our understanding of how everyday classroom discourse functions as a dynamic, context-bound process of meaning-making—one where repetition plays a quiet but pivotal role in shaping how English is learned, shared, and lived in the classroom.

Repetition in Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing Skills

Repetition is not only helpful for vocabulary or grammar learning but also very important for the development of all four language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Each skill benefits from repeated exposure and practice, especially in the case of young learners who are still developing basic literacy in their first language. At this stage, their cognitive and linguistic systems are still growing, so teachers must know how to adapt and use repetition carefully to support learning without causing boredom or confusion. When used in the right way, repetition gives learners more confidence and helps them remember what they learn for longer.

Listening Skills and Repetition

Listening is often the first skill to be developed in language learning, and repetition has a key role here. When young learners hear the same or similar sentences many times, they become more familiar with the sounds, rhythm, and structure of the language. Even if they don't understand everything at first, with each repetition, their understanding improves. For example, if a teacher plays an audio file several times, students can focus on different things each time—first on the general idea, then on specific words or phrases, and finally on grammar or pronunciation features. According to Field (2009), repeated listening supports bottom-up processing, where learners decode sounds and words step by step. Also, it helps students develop parsing strategies—that is, breaking down long sentences into understandable parts. In this way, learners begin to recognize sentence patterns and vocabulary more easily, especially if they hear the same words in different contexts. Repetition gives them time to process the meaning and become more confident listeners.

Speaking Skills and Repetition

For speaking, repetition is directly connected to fluency, accuracy, and building self-confidence. In speaking activities, learners are often asked to repeat short dialogues, questions, or expressions. Techniques like role-plays, storytelling, or speaking in pairs using the same sentence structures are very effective. These tasks allow learners to practice

pronunciation, sentence stress, and intonation patterns. Repetition helps them feel more natural when speaking and reduces hesitation. Research by Nation and Newton (2008) shows that students improve their oral fluency when they repeat the same speaking task more than once. When they practice the same structure, they start to produce it more automatically, which means their brain does not have to think too much during speech. This helps students speak faster and more accurately. For young learners, who are often shy or afraid of making mistakes, repeating simple and meaningful phrases builds their speaking skills in a secure way.

Reading Skills and Repetition

Repetition is also a strong support for reading development. One popular method in early education is repeated reading, where students read the same text several times. Each time they read, their speed and understanding usually improve. Samuels (1997) found that repeated reading helps learners become more fluent, recognize words faster, and better understand the meaning of the text. In classrooms, this method can be used with short stories, reading passages, or even simple poems. For primary students, reading aloud several times with the help of a teacher or in a group makes the activity more engaging and effective. Teachers can also focus on high-frequency words and sight vocabulary by choosing texts with repeating structures. Over time, this helps children build automatic recognition of common English words, which is an important step in becoming a fluent reader.

Writing Skills and Repetition

Although writing is not always associated with repetition at first, it also benefits from repeated practice. In writing lessons, learners are often asked to write drafts, revise them, or practice rewriting similar sentences using different words. One useful activity is called *dictogloss*, where the teacher reads a short text and students try to reconstruct it from memory. This task includes listening, remembering, and writing—all of which involve repetition. Wajnryb (1990) explains that dictogloss helps students become more aware of

grammar and vocabulary, because they must think carefully about how to build sentences again. Also, asking students to rewrite paragraphs using synonyms or different grammar forms promotes deeper understanding of language and encourages creativity. In this sense, repetition in writing is not only copying but revisiting the same idea in a new way. This kind of practice supports learners in improving both their accuracy and range of expression.

In conclusion, repetition is a multi-functional tool that supports each of the four language skills. It provides young learners with the extra time and exposure they need to understand, practice, and produce language. When teachers use repetition purposefully and creatively through listening tasks, speaking games, repeated reading, and writing exercises they help students gain confidence and competence in all areas of language use. Especially for children in the early years of language education, repeated input and output can make the learning process smoother and more effective.

Pedagogical Strategies for Effective Repetition

For repetition to be truly useful in language education, especially in teaching young learners, it must not happen randomly or mechanically. Repetition on its own is not always enough. For it to be effective, it must be meaningful, purposeful, and carefully planned by the teacher. If repetition is used in a way that is isolated from the lesson context or not interesting for the students, it may cause boredom or even fossilization of mistakes. This means that learners may repeat incorrect forms again and again without realizing the mistake, and then this mistake becomes permanent. Therefore, teachers need to make sure that repetition is not just frequent, but also meaningful and connected to the goals of the lesson.

Spaced Repetition for Long-Term Learning

One of the most powerful and proven ways to use repetition is through the strategy called spaced repetition. This involves repeating the same language items but with longer time gaps in between each time. Instead of repeating the same word many times in one

lesson (which is called massed practice), spaced repetition gives the brain time to forget and remember again, which actually helps the memory become stronger. According to a study by Cepeda et al. (2006), learners who are exposed to vocabulary or grammar items in spaced intervals tend to remember them better in the long run. Teachers can use this technique by designing spiral syllabuses, where certain words or grammar forms are revisited again in future lessons, but in new contexts. For example, a teacher can teach the word “apple” in a food unit, and then meet it again in a story or in a shopping role-play activity later.

Scaffolding Through Repetition

Vygotsky’s theory of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) explains that children learn best when they are supported by someone more knowledgeable, such as a teacher or a classmate. In this view, repetition becomes a part of scaffolding. A teacher might model a sentence like “This is a pencil,” and then repeat it several times with students, first together, then in pairs, and finally individually. By doing this, the teacher gives the students time to internalize the structure, and gradually pushes them to use it on their own. Another example is when learners work in pairs to repeat and use the phrases they first heard from the teacher. These scaffolded tasks allow repetition to support the student at every step of learning, while also giving them space to become more independent with the language.

Multi-modal Repetition to Engage the Senses

It is known that people learn better when more than one sense is involved. This is why multi-modal repetition is very important, especially for young learners who are still developing their cognitive skills. If students hear a word in a song, then see it on a flashcard, then write it in a worksheet, and finally act it out in a TPR (Total Physical Response) activity, they are more likely to remember it. This is because the brain is receiving the same information from different channels, and it becomes stronger each time. Using multi-modal repetition also supports different learning styles—some students learn better by seeing, some by hearing, and some by doing. In the classroom, combining audio, visual, written,

and physical activities ensures that all students benefit from repetition in a way that fits them.

Repetition in Games and Tasks

Repetition becomes more effective when students are having fun. Young learners especially enjoy playing games, and teachers can use this to their advantage. Simple games like “Simon Says,” “Bingo,” or “Memory Match” naturally include a lot of repetition, but in a way that students enjoy. Task-based learning is also a very useful method. In this approach, students do activities that require language use to complete a task. For example, they can describe pictures, act out stories, or play guessing games. Even though they are using the same sentence patterns, the content is different each time, which keeps the activity fresh and interesting. According to Willis (1996), repeating language through tasks like these increases fluency and helps students use language in real situations.

Personalized Repetition for Motivation

One of the most important things for young learners is that they feel connected to what they are learning. When repetition is connected to their own life, it becomes more meaningful. For example, instead of just repeating “I like apples,” students can be asked to say what they really like, such as “I like chocolate,” or “I like soccer.” This kind of personalized repetition helps students see the language as useful and real. It also increases their motivation because they are talking about things that matter to them.

Digital Tools and Repetition

Today, technology gives teachers many new ways to use repetition. There are apps such as Quizlet, Memrise, and Anki that use special systems to repeat words at the right time for each learner. These systems are based on spaced repetition and change the time between reviews depending on how well the student remembers the word. This means that students are not wasting time on words they already know well, and they get more practice

on the ones they forget. These apps are especially useful for vocabulary learning and can be used in class or at home.

To make repetition truly effective, teachers need to use different strategies that focus on meaning, context, and learner engagement. When used creatively and deliberately, repetition supports learning in deep ways. It is not just about saying the same thing over and over, but about helping learners process language at different levels, in different forms, and in ways that are meaningful to them. When repetition is used with purpose and variety, it becomes one of the most powerful tools for language learning.

Empirical Studies on the Impact of Repetition on Language Development

A considerable number of studies and observations from language education researchers have shown that repetition is a key element in second language acquisition, especially for young learners. These empirical findings highlight how different types and uses of repetition—such as in vocabulary activities, speaking tasks, reading aloud, and storytelling—can support students in gaining language skills more effectively. The studies do not only focus on theoretical opinions but also provide real examples from classroom contexts where learners benefited clearly from repetition-based practices.

One of the earliest and widely respected works on this matter comes from Lightbown and Spada (1999), who studied French immersion classes. In their study, they found that children who were given focused repetition, especially through reading activities, grammar drills, and feedback from their teachers, improved more than others in using correct language forms. Their research also stresses that repetition must not be boring or isolated. When repetition happens together with meaningful language input—like in a story or useful classroom dialogue—it helps the learner understand both the grammar rules and the overall meaning. Their long-term research proved that such integrated repetition makes a positive impact on both language accuracy and understanding.

Another important contribution came from Bygate (2001), who focused on how repeating the same speaking tasks over time can improve spoken language. In his experimental study, learners were asked to perform speaking tasks more than once. After repeating the tasks, learners spoke more fluently and started to use more complex and natural language. These findings support the idea that task-based repetition is an effective way to help students become better in their speaking skills. The learners also showed more confidence in using the language when they had already practiced the same or similar expressions before.

Pinter (2017) also worked with young learners, especially in primary schools in Hungary, and found that story-based repetition made a strong difference in language learning. She introduced activities like retelling familiar stories and using puppets to perform dialogues from the stories. These activities naturally included a lot of repetition, but in a way that felt fun and engaging to children. The results showed that students who did these types of tasks were better at remembering new words and using correct sentence structures. Since young children enjoy stories and games, using such contexts makes repetition less tiring and more effective.

Another interesting research was carried out by Taguchi (2004), who worked on timed oral reading with Japanese EFL learners. Even though this study was done with older students, the results still offer valuable lessons for younger learners. Taguchi's findings showed that when students read the same passages multiple times with a focus on timing, they became both faster and more accurate. Their pronunciation, word recognition, and reading fluency improved. If similar practices are adapted to fit the needs of younger students, this method can also be useful in primary schools, especially in helping students read confidently.

Nation (2013b), a well-known expert on vocabulary learning, has emphasized that repetition is essential for remembering new words. He suggests that students usually need to meet a new word between six and twelve times in different situations before they really

learn it. These exposures should happen during listening, speaking, reading, and writing tasks, not just memorizing from lists. In his work, Nation recommends that teachers provide rich and meaningful input that includes the same words used in different classroom tasks. This helps young learners build strong word associations and recall the words when they need to use them later.

In addition to all these, classroom-based studies by Nunan (2003) and Cameron (2001) showed that repeated classroom routines help a lot with children’s confidence and ability to communicate in the second language. Simple classroom routines like starting each day with a morning greeting, giving daily instructions in English, or repeating certain game rules in the target language helped learners become more comfortable with English. Over time, they not only understood better but also became more willing to speak. These repeated patterns also reduced the students' anxiety and created a safer learning environment.

To sum up, there is strong evidence from different studies showing that repetition plays a central and positive role in helping young learners acquire a second language. It helps improve accuracy, fluency, vocabulary memory, and overall communication skills. However, repetition must be meaningful, connected to a context, and used creatively. Teachers who understand the different types of repetition and apply them in the right ways can make language learning more effective and more enjoyable for their students. Instead of being seen as boring or old-fashioned, repetition should be understood as a powerful teaching tool when applied with strategy and purpose.

Repetition as a Precursor to Output

Just repetition itself cannot bring about fluency or communicative competence; however, it forms the necessary background upon which productive language use is built. According to Swain (1985), the Output Hypothesis suggests that producing language, especially in meaningful and communicative contexts, forces learners to process language

at a deeper level. Repetition gives the learners the confidence needed for using the language in actual communication.

Similarly, Nation and Newton (2008) emphasize that repeated use of language structures in different but comparable tasks leads to an improvement in fluency. Learners begin to gain automaticity in their tasks and also gain familiarity when they practice the same structure multiple times using different words. This automaticity is a prerequisite for communicative flexibility, especially in classroom interaction, where learners must retrieve and manipulate linguistic elements spontaneously.

Classroom Interaction and Language Use

Classroom interaction plays an essential role in foreign language development. In-class conversations such as greetings and question-answer exchanges help students engage with common linguistic structures again and again. Repetition in these contexts is dynamic and responsive rather than mechanical.

Walsh (2006) describes classroom discourse as a context where both teachers and learners co-construct meaning. This means autonomy and freedom in language use. In primary school settings, this co-construction often involves repeating key phrases while adjusting them to new contexts. Since their language skills are not so developed, autonomy comes later when they have enough meaningful input and contexts in which they can use what they learned. For instance, a teacher might give the class a sentence like "What's your name?" and instruct students to ask each other the same question. These interactive sequences promote not only syntactic practice but also pragmatic development because they are used in meaningful conversation.

Repetition through interaction also aligns with sociocultural theories of learning. Vygotsky’s (1978) ZPD suggests that when supported by a teacher or friend who is better at the language than themselves students internalize language more effectively. Observing someone who is better at the language we are learning than us gives us the opportunity to

learn more complex forms and structures. In interactive classroom scenarios, repetition supports learners as they transition from dependent to independent use of language. As learners mimic and modify repeated forms, they move through the ZPD toward autonomous language use.

Strategies That Link Repetition and Active Use

There are numerous strategies that are employed to facilitate the transtition from repetition to creative communication. These strategies emphasize meaning-making, personalization, and real-life application.

***Dialogic Practice*:** Structured dialogues provide an initial model for language use. Through repetition and substitution, learners gain familiarity with grammatical structures and vocabulary. For example, in a structured practice a conversation would take place as follows:

Teacher: What's your favorite food?

Student A: My favorite food is pizza.

Student B: My favorite food is pasta.

This not only encourages repetition but also personalization, a factor shown to enhance retention (Ellis, 2005). When students add their personal contributions to their sentences they improve their confidence.

***Role Plays and Drama*:** Role-playing allows learners to recycle familiar structures in new contexts. If they are equipped with sufficient structures and vocabulary, they might start engaging in real life conversations after practicing it in the class with their peers. In a restaurant simulation for example, students might repeatedly use phrases such as "Can I have...?" or "I'd like...". According to Maley and Duff (2005), drama-based activities integrate repetition with emotion and context, making the experience more memorable and

meaningful so the next time when they need to use it in an actual restaurant, they'll have less hesitation.

***Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)*:** Repetition is inherent in task cycles where students must complete similar tasks with varied input. In Bygate's (2001) work on oral repetition tasks, it is seen that learners who repeated speaking tasks with different partners showed improvement in fluency and grammatical accuracy. TBLT promotes repetition through goal-oriented communication, enabling learners to apply repeated forms functionally.

***Information Gap and Jigsaw Activities*:** Activities of this kind are different than regular repetition activities. They require learners to use repeated language structures to complete a communicative objective. There is a specific goal that students try to achieve. For instance, in a "Find Someone Who..." activity, students ask questions like "Do you have a pet?" over and over again until they gather all the required information. Since students are actually using the information they gathered from their repetition activities before this repetition occurs in an authentic, information-seeking context, which enhances both form and function.

***Interactive Games*:** Language games such as "Guess Who?", "Simon Says", or board games with instructions allow for repetitive use of forms in enjoyable settings. As Cameron (2001) notes, play-based repetition is particularly effective with young learners due to its motivational appeal.

Transitioning from Repetition to Fluency

Fluency is achieved when learners can produce language with ease, accuracy, and appropriate rhythm. Repetition helps reduce the cognitive load associated with language production, enabling learners to allocate more mental resources to meaning rather than form (DeKeyser, 2007). However, for repetition to result in fluency, it must be varied, meaning-focused, and increasingly autonomous. The repeated structures or words need to

be expanded periodically, the students need to be given more space to use what they learned, and the context must be wider.

Research by Gass and Mackey's research (2014) suggests that if output practice accompanied by feedback, it leads to better restructuring of interlanguage. In classroom interaction, repetition becomes more effective when learners receive immediate feedback that encourages them to reformulate and try again.

Hence, we might say that the key to this transition is scaffolding, feedback, and increasing complexity. For instance, a learner might first repeat a model sentence ("She has a cat"), then vary it ("He has a dog"), and finally produce an original sentence in a communicative task ("My friend has a hamster"). Each step builds on repetition but moves closer to creative use adding more to the student's part gradually.

Additionally, learner differences such as motivation, cognitive style, and prior exposure also affect how repetition transitions into language use. Assessment also plays a role. Teachers should look beyond repetition quantity and evaluate how learners use repeated language in novel contexts. Can they implement the repeated structures into new and different conversations, meaning the internalized meaning of what was repeated. Tools like performance-based rubrics or observation checklists can document progress from repetition to active, functional language use.

Repetition cycles lay the cognitive and linguistic foundation for language acquisition, but their true value emerges when learners move from repetition to active use. In primary classrooms, this transition is best supported through interactive, scaffolded, and communicative practices. By designing classroom experiences that blend repetition with meaningful use, educators can foster both accuracy and fluency in young language learners. To achieve a certain success in this matter is also dependent on different variables. All the techniques and strategies would not end in the same results all around the world even though it is made sure that they are all implemented at the same level.

The integration of repetition into active classroom interaction ensures that language forms are not just practiced but lived—spoken, adapted, and owned by learners. This dynamic use of repetition enhances not only linguistic development but also learner confidence, engagement, and long-term retention.

Multimodality in Interactional Repetition

When we look at repetition in classroom interaction, it is important to see that it does not happen only through spoken words. Repetition is almost always combined with other communicative resources such as gesture, gaze, prosody, and body orientation. This is what is usually called *multimodality*. Multimodality means that meaning is built through the interplay of many modes at the same time, and not only by verbal language (Kress, 2010). In language classrooms, especially with young learners, teachers and students rely heavily on embodied actions to support repetition. For this reason, repetition is not just a cognitive device for remembering forms, but also a multimodal practice that makes participation possible and learning more meaningful.

Research in interactional studies has clearly shown that repetition is deeply tied to multimodal resources. Goodwin (2007) explained that gesture, gaze, and body movement often create the environment in which repetition can be recognized and interpreted. For instance, when a student repeats a word while pointing or looking at an object, the repetition gains a clear referent in the shared space. Similarly, Mondada (2018a) demonstrated that speakers coordinate their gaze and body orientation to manage turns and to align with each other during repetition. In classrooms, this means that when learners echo a teacher's word, they may also look at the board, raise their hands, or shift their body to show readiness. These embodied signals are as important as the spoken form because they display alignment and understanding.

In primary language classrooms, multimodality becomes even more central. Young learners have limited linguistic resources, so they rely on gestures, intonation, and shared

attention to interpret repetition. Studies on multimodal scaffolding highlight how teachers combine verbal repetition with embodied actions to guide learners step by step. For example, a teacher may repeat a student's answer with rising intonation while at the same time nodding, pointing, or drawing attention to a picture. This creates a scaffold where the learner sees and hears the correct form while also experiencing the teacher's embodied support. Such scaffolding practices give learners more than one channel to process meaning, which is especially valuable in early stages of foreign language learning (Sert, 2015).

Classroom-based research provides rich examples of embodied correction through repetition. Sert (2015) shows how teachers often use repetition as a corrective strategy while coordinating multimodal resources. For example, when a child produces a grammatical error, the teacher repeats the utterance with the corrected form, while also using gaze or gesture to highlight the change. This softens the corrective move and keeps the interaction flowing. In this way, repetition is not presented as mechanical drilling but as a multimodal practice that integrates spoken and embodied actions. The learner not only hears the corrected form but also sees the embodied cues that make the correction noticeable. Such practices encourage learners to notice and adopt the new form without losing confidence.

Prosody also plays a significant role in multimodal repetition. The rhythm, stress, and intonation of repeated words often show whether the teacher is confirming, correcting, or encouraging. For example, repeating a learner's word with falling intonation may signal confirmation, while repeating it with stress on the corrected part may signal repair. This prosodic design works together with gaze and gesture to make the teacher's stance clear. Learners can then interpret the repetition not only by the words but also by how they are said and performed. In this sense, multimodality allows repetition to carry affective, pragmatic, and instructional functions simultaneously.

The implication for pedagogy is that teachers should be aware that repetition in classrooms is never purely verbal. It is a multimodal practice where spoken words, embodied conduct, and prosodic cues come together. Recognizing this fact can help teachers design classroom interactions that support young learners more effectively. By combining repetition with gesture, gaze, and prosody, teachers can scaffold understanding, highlight key forms, and maintain learner engagement. Multimodal repetition is especially powerful for young learners because it gives them multiple ways to access meaning, reduces anxiety, and creates opportunities for participation even when their verbal skills are still developing.

Gaps in the Literature

Although repetition has long been recognized as a key mechanism in second language acquisition, most existing studies approach it from a general SLA or applied linguistics perspective rather than from the everyday realities of primary school classrooms. Theoretical frameworks such as the Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982), the Noticing Hypothesis (SCHMIDT, 1990), and the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1995) all assign an important role to repetition in shaping learning. However, very few studies focus directly on repetition as it appears in young learner EFL contexts, where children's cognitive, emotional, and social needs make classroom interaction fundamentally different from adult or adolescent learning environments (Enever, 2018; Pinter, 2017). This leaves a gap in understanding how repetition works in the language development of children in early stages of foreign language education.

A second gap in the literature concerns methodology. While many studies examine repetition in terms of drills, corrective feedback, or vocabulary retention (Bygate, 2001; Lyster & Ranta, 1997a), far fewer employ Discourse Analysis (DA) to investigate how repetition is actually organized in interaction. DA studies on classroom discourse have shown how teachers and learners use repetition for repair, alignment, and stance-taking

(Hellermann, 2003; Sert, 2015; Waring, 2009). Yet these studies are mostly based on secondary or higher education contexts and often outside of Turkey. This means that the detailed interactional practices of repetition in primary EFL classrooms remain underexplored.

A final gap lies in the multimodal dimension of repetition. Recent research emphasizes that classroom interaction is always multimodal, involving gesture, gaze, prosody, and body orientation (Goodwin, 2007; Mondada, 2018a). While multimodality has been explored in applied linguistics and social interaction studies, its role in the repetition practices of young learner classrooms—especially in Teaching English to Young Learners (TEYL) in Turkey—has not been sufficiently investigated. Considering that young learners rely heavily on embodied cues alongside verbal repetition, the absence of such research leaves an important theoretical and pedagogical gap.

For these reasons, this thesis makes an original contribution by addressing the intersection of repetition, DA methodology, and multimodal analysis in the specific context of Turkish primary school EFL classrooms. It seeks to show how repetition emerges in real-time interaction, what functions it serves for both teachers and learners, and how embodied practices support children’s language development.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the methodological choices made in the present study. It describes the research design, the context where the study was carried out, the participants, the data collection procedures, and the analytical steps. By giving these details, the chapter makes clear how the study was planned and how the data were generated and analyzed to answer the research questions. Transparency of methods is important in qualitative studies, since readers need to see how the findings are grounded in the actual data (Silverman, 2013).

This study is based on Discourse Analysis (DA), which is a method that investigates how participants organize their actions in real-time talk (Sacks et al., 1974; Sidnell, 2010). DA allows the researcher to look very closely at moment-by-moment details of classroom interaction, including the timing, and prosody. This makes it highly suitable for the study of repetition, since repetition is not only a linguistic form but also an interactional resource that appears in particular sequential positions (Hellermann, 2003; Waring, 2009). Using DA makes it possible to describe how repetition is produced, how it is combined with gaze, gesture, or body orientation, and what functions it performs for teachers and learners in the EFL classroom (Mondada, 2018a; Sert, 2015). In this way, DA provides the appropriate framework for understanding the role of repetition in language development and participation in Turkish primary school contexts

Research Design

This thesis is located within the wider tradition of qualitative research. Qualitative research is concerned with describing and understanding human actions in natural settings, rather than measuring them under controlled conditions. As Denzin and Lincoln(2017) explain, qualitative research seeks to study phenomena in their natural context, trying to interpret meanings that people bring to them. In the field of education, especially in language

classrooms, qualitative approaches are very common because they allow researchers to see the complexity of interaction between teachers and students (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

The present study is interested in repetition as it occurs in real classroom interaction. Repetition is not only a linguistic form, but also a social practice that has different functions, such as confirming, correcting, scaffolding, or aligning. These functions can only be seen when repetition is studied in detail within actual interaction. For this reason, a qualitative approach is the most suitable. Unlike quantitative research, which often reduces repetition to counts or frequencies, qualitative research gives attention to how repetition works in context and how it contributes to participation and learning.

Qualitative inquiry emphasizes thick description (Geertz, 1973). This means that the researcher does not only record what is observable but also describes the social and cultural meanings connected to the actions. For example, if a teacher repeats a student's word with different intonation, this is not simply "teacher repetition." In a thick description, the intonation, gaze, timing, and the student's response are all part of the analysis. In this way, qualitative research provides insights into how repetition is used by participants to manage the flow of classroom discourse.

Another important principle of qualitative research is that it is interpretive and naturalistic (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The data are collected in natural settings, not created in artificial experiments. This is important for this thesis, because the aim is to study repetition as it happens spontaneously in primary EFL classrooms. By collecting video recordings of real lessons, I could capture the talk and actions as they naturally occur, without controlling or influencing them too much. This allows the analysis to stay close to the reality of classroom life.

The role of the researcher in qualitative research is also different from quantitative traditions. Instead of testing a hypothesis, the researcher works inductively, letting patterns and categories emerge from the data (Silverman, 2013). In this study, my role is to identify instances of repetition in classroom interaction and then analyze them in terms of their

sequential environment. The analysis is not based on pre-fixed categories but on what participants display as meaningful in the interaction. This orientation fits very well with Discourse Analysis (DA), which is the methodological approach chosen for this study.

In sum, the qualitative framework provides the foundation for the study of repetition in classrooms. It allows me to focus on naturally occurring interaction, to describe actions in detail, and to interpret their meanings in context. The next sections explain why Discourse Analysis was chosen as the main methodology and how it was applied.

Discourse Analysis

Discourse Analysis (DA) has its intellectual roots in linguistics and social theory, drawing especially on the functional model of language developed by Halliday (1979) and on the study of language as social practice emphasized by Foucault (1972). The central idea underlying DA is that language is not merely a vehicle for conveying information but a form of social action—a means through which people construct meaning, relationships, and identities. Building on this view, scholars such as Fairclough (1993) and van Dijk (1997) developed frameworks for analyzing how discourse reflects and reproduces social structures, ideologies, and power relations. In educational contexts, these perspectives allow researchers to explore how classroom language both shapes and is shaped by institutional goals, pedagogical aims, and learner participation.

Unlike methods that isolate language from its context, DA is grounded in the study of authentic discourse—language used in real-life settings such as classrooms, workplaces, or everyday conversation. McCarthy (2012a) and Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2006a) argue that DA enables teachers and researchers to examine the language of teaching and learning as it naturally unfolds, revealing patterns of interaction, feedback, and negotiation that might otherwise go unnoticed. This makes DA particularly suited for investigating classroom repetition, where meaning depends heavily on context, tone, and interpersonal relations rather

than on form alone. For instance, a teacher's repetition can signal correction, encouragement, or alignment, depending on its pragmatic function within the unfolding discourse (Walsh, 2011).

Another reason DA is appropriate for this study is that it treats **context** not as an external variable but as an integral part of meaning. As Halliday and Hasan (1976a) explain, the context of situation—the participants, their roles, and the activity type—shapes what is said and how it is interpreted. This view aligns closely with classroom realities, where pedagogical focus constantly shifts between accuracy, fluency, and social interaction. By examining repetition through DA, it becomes possible to see how teachers create micro-contexts of meaning through their choices of wording, emphasis, and feedback. When a teacher repeats a student's utterance softly, it may build solidarity; when the same utterance is repeated with stress on a form, it can mark correction. DA allows these subtleties to be described systematically.

Furthermore, DA encompasses a multimodal perspective on communication. As scholars such as Kress and van Leeuwen (2011) and Norris (2004) have shown, meaning is constructed not only through words but also through gesture, gaze, intonation, and other semiotic resources. This is especially relevant in young-learner classrooms, where teachers frequently combine speech with visual cues and body language to scaffold understanding. A discourse-analytic approach captures these multimodal patterns and explains how repetition interacts with prosody, gesture, and visual focus to support learning.

DA was also selected because of its ecological validity. It analyzes data drawn from natural classroom events rather than from interviews or tests. As Gee (2014) notes, studying real discourse provides insights into how people actually use language to achieve goals, not just how they describe their language use. This is essential for the present study, since repetition often arises spontaneously as teachers and learners co-construct meaning. Examining naturally occurring classroom discourse ensures that findings reflect genuine communicative behavior rather than artificial elicitation.

Another major strength of DA lies in its attention to cohesion and coherence, which are fundamental to how repetition works in classroom interaction. Halliday and Matthiessen (2013) describe repetition as a cohesive tie that maintains continuity and thematic development within discourse. In classroom talk, repeated forms connect ideas across turns and tasks, allowing teachers and students to sustain focus, emphasize meaning, and reinforce learning. By investigating these patterns through DA, the analysis can uncover how repetition contributes to both linguistic and interpersonal coherence.

Finally, DA bridges linguistic form and pedagogical function. As Hyland (2004) and Rose and Martin (2012) demonstrate, genre-based and functional approaches to discourse provide tools for understanding how language simultaneously constructs knowledge and social relationships. In language classrooms, repetition often serves this dual purpose: it reinforces linguistic accuracy while also building a sense of shared participation. DA therefore offers an interpretive.

In summary, Discourse Analysis was chosen as the principal methodology because it aligns with the goals of this study: to explore repetition as a discourse practice that reflects teaching strategies, learning processes, and social interaction. DA's focus on authentic data, contextual meaning, and multimodality allows a rich examination of how repetition supports understanding, engagement, and identity formation in young-learner English classrooms. Through this approach, the study seeks to illuminate repetition not merely as a linguistic device but as a powerful communicative and pedagogical tool.

Participants and Focus Group

The participants of this study were a group of twenty second-grade pupils from Şehit Muharrem Erdoğan Primary School, which is located in Eski Misis, in the Yüreğir district of Adana. The class was selected because it represents a typical example of a Turkish state primary school in a semi-rural area, where English is taught as a foreign language from the

early grades but where learners usually have very limited exposure to the language outside school. The pupils were around seven to eight years old at the time of data collection.

In terms of socio-demographic background, most families of the children are involved in agriculture and animal husbandry as the main source of income. The general level of education and economic resources in the community is relatively modest, and this is reflected in the way English is valued in the local context. Interviews with school staff and informal talks with parents suggested that English is often considered less important than subjects like mathematics or science. In addition, there are no private language courses or extracurricular support for English in this region, which means that the classroom is the only context where these children are exposed to English. As a result, the pupils entered the second grade with no prior knowledge of English. For many of them, even the alphabet and basic words were unfamiliar, so repetition and multimodal support became essential parts of the learning process.

The focus group of this research was therefore this single second-grade classroom, consisting of 20 pupils. The small number of students made it possible to collect detailed interactional data, while at the same time reflecting a realistic class size in the Turkish primary school context. All lessons of English during the data collection period were video-recorded, which created a natural corpus of classroom interaction. The process of obtaining official and parental permission for recording was quite lengthy, reflecting both ethical and administrative considerations. School authorities, parents, and the local education office all needed to give approval, and consent letters were collected before the recordings started. This procedure ensured that the study respected both ethical standards and the sensitivities of the local community.

A significant part of the participant profile is the teacher-researcher. The researcher is also the class's English teacher, which created a dual role during the study. The teacher had a special language learning background. She acquired English mainly in ESL classrooms in the United States, where she lived for four years. During that period, English became the

dominant language in daily life, to the extent that when she returned to Turkey, her native Turkish skills had been weakened and almost forgotten for a while. This unusual language biography provided the teacher with a very personal understanding of what it means to acquire a second language intensively and to struggle with language maintenance. It also shaped the teaching philosophy, making the teacher more sensitive to the role of repetition, scaffolding, and multimodality in the early stages of learning.

The teacher's international experience, combined with her return to the Turkish educational context, created a unique perspective. On the one hand, there was the awareness of communicative and student-centered practices observed in the United States. On the other hand, there was the reality of a rural Turkish school, where students' motivation for English was relatively low and the socio-economic background did not provide strong support for language learning. In this sense, the teacher-researcher was not only guiding the pupils through their first steps in English but also navigating the cultural and institutional gap between different educational traditions. This profile adds depth to the interpretation of the data, since the teacher's practices and choices are informed by both local constraints and international exposure.

Setting

The school represents a typical public primary school in Turkey, where resources are modest and educational facilities are functional rather than advanced. The classroom chosen for the research was a second-grade group of 20 students. The room itself was arranged in a traditional style, with students sitting in rows facing the blackboard and the teacher's desk at the front. The classroom was equipped with basic teaching materials, such as a blackboard, chalk, wall charts, and a few simple visual aids. There was no access to advanced technological equipment like interactive whiteboards or projectors, which meant that lessons relied mainly on teacher-led instruction, verbal explanation, and physical materials.

For the purpose of data collection, the classroom was prepared with recording equipment in a way that did not interfere with the flow of lessons. Two video cameras were placed at different angles in the classroom. This arrangement made it possible to capture both the teacher's actions and the students' responses, including gestures, gaze, and body orientation. The use of two cameras also ensured that the data would provide a multimodal perspective, allowing the analysis to go beyond verbal language and to include embodied interaction. Care was taken to position the cameras discreetly, so that students could become used to their presence and behave as naturally as possible.

The English lessons in this class were held twice a week, each lasting 40 minutes. Recordings were conducted continuously from the beginning of the school year until the winter break, resulting in a total of 12 lessons recorded. This provided a sufficient amount of data for a micro-analytic study of repetition in classroom interaction. The recordings captured naturally occurring lessons, meaning that no special activities were introduced for the purpose of research. The aim was to collect data that reflected the ordinary routines and practices of English instruction in this school context.

The classroom environment was therefore both ordinary and unique. It was ordinary in the sense that it reflected many characteristics of rural and semi-rural Turkish schools: limited resources, modest facilities, and a curriculum that introduced English in the early grades. At the same time, it was unique because of the presence of the teacher-researcher, whose background included several years of living and studying in the United States. This shaped the teaching style and created a bridge between communicative approaches experienced abroad and the realities of a Turkish primary school.

Data Collection Process and Tools

The data for this study were collected through classroom video recordings, supported by field notes and researcher observations. The main aim was to capture naturally occurring interaction between the teacher and pupils in order to study how repetition emerges and

functions in real classroom discourse. Since the study focuses not only on language but also on embodied resources, video recording was chosen as the most suitable method of data collection.

A total of 12 lessons were recorded, covering the period from the beginning of the school year until the winter break. Each lesson lasted approximately 40 minutes, which is the standard length of English lessons in Turkish primary schools. In total, this provided around 8 hours of classroom data. The lessons were part of the normal curriculum and were not modified for the purposes of the study. In this way, the recordings represent authentic classroom interaction rather than artificially created tasks.

To ensure high-quality data, two video cameras were placed in the classroom. One camera was positioned at the front, close to the teacher's desk, to record the teacher's actions, speech, and use of the blackboard. The other camera was set up at the back of the classroom, facing the pupils, in order to capture their responses, gestures, and peer interactions. This dual-camera placement made it possible to observe both verbal and non-verbal aspects of repetition, including gaze direction, body orientation, and use of teaching materials. The cameras were placed in fixed positions and operated unobtrusively, so that pupils could become accustomed to their presence and continue lessons in a natural way.

The data were transcribed using Mondada's multimodal transcription criteria, which capture not only spoken language but also gestures, gaze, posture, and timing (Mondada, 2018b). This approach was crucial for highlighting embodied actions alongside verbal interaction. The transcriptions were processed and coded using CLAN software, which supports the detailed analysis of classroom talk (MacWhinney, 2000).

Ethical Considerations

Special attention was paid to ethical considerations, given that the participants were young children. Before the recordings started, written parental consent was obtained for all 20 pupils. Meetings were held with parents to explain the purpose of the study, the procedures of

video recording, and the rights of the participants. Parents were assured that their children's participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time without any negative consequences. The researcher ensured that students were aware of the study in age-appropriate terms and that their participation posed no risk to their academic experience (BERA, 2018).

Approval was also obtained from the school administration and the local education authority. The permission process took time, reflecting the importance of gaining trust and ensuring that the research respected local regulations and cultural sensitivities.

Confidentiality was guaranteed by anonymizing the data. Pupils' names were not used in the transcripts or in the thesis. Instead, pseudonyms or codes were assigned to each participant. Video files were stored securely on password-protected devices, and only the researcher had access to them. The recordings were used exclusively for research purposes and were not shared beyond the scope of the study.

Data Analysis Procedures

The analysis of the data in this study was guided by the methodological principles of DA. A key principle of DA is to look for spesicif patterns. This means that the researcher begins the analysis with a preconceived idea and look for instances that reflects it. In line with this principle, the classroom recordings were reviewed repeatedly, and transcripts were examined carefully to identify naturally occurring cases of repetition in interaction.

At the first stage, the researcher transcribed the lessons using a simplified version of the Jeffersonian transcription system (Jefferson, 2004). This included details such as pauses, overlaps, intonation, and emphasis, as well as multimodal features like gaze, pointing, and gestures when relevant. Since the aim of the study was to examine repetition not only as linguistic form but also as multimodal action, the transcripts integrated both verbal and embodied resources (Mondada, 2018b). This step ensured that the analysis did not treat words in isolation but as part of the sequential and multimodal organization of classroom talk.

Once the transcripts were prepared, instances of repetition were identified and categorized. For clarity and comparability with earlier research, the study used a coding system informed by prior studies on repetition and corrective feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997b; P. Nation & Newton, 2008). The main types of repetition coded were:

- Exact Repetition: when a word or phrase is repeated exactly as it was first produced.
- Prompted Repetition: when the teacher explicitly asks or signals a learner to repeat a form.
- Self-Repetition: when the same speaker repeats their own prior utterance.
- Peer Repetition: when a student repeats something produced by another student.
- Modified Repetition: when a word or phrase is repeated but with some modification, such as change in tense, number, or prosody.
- Corrective Repetition: when the teacher repeats a learner's utterance but reformulates it to provide the correct form.

These categories provided a useful structure for organizing the data, but the analysis was not limited to them. While the researcher expected to find familiar practices, such as repetition drills or corrective feedback (Bygate, 2001; Cameron, 2001), the analysis also looked carefully for new or unusual uses of repetition that might emerge in the local classroom context. For example, repetition sometimes appeared as a resource for humor or classroom management, which are not always emphasized in prior studies.

The actual analysis followed the sequential logic of DA. Each instance of repetition was examined in its immediate conversational environment: what came before it, how it was produced, and how other participants responded afterwards. This step-by-step examination made it possible to understand the interactional functions of repetition. For instance, the same type of repetition could serve different purposes depending on whether it occurred after a correct answer, an error, or a teacher's prompt. This is why DA's attention to sequentiality was central to the analysis.

The analysis also paid attention to multimodality, since repetition in the classroom is often supported by embodied conduct. For example, a teacher's corrective repetition could be accompanied by pointing to the board, stressing the correct form, or nodding to encourage the student. Similarly, a student's peer repetition might be produced with laughter or eye contact with classmates, showing alignment or solidarity. Including these multimodal aspects enriched the analysis and made it possible to capture how repetition functions as both a linguistic and social resource.

In practice, the analysis moved through several iterative cycles. First, potential cases of repetition were marked in the transcripts. Second, these cases were grouped under the coding categories mentioned above. Third, detailed sequential analysis was conducted on selected extracts to demonstrate how repetition worked in the interaction. Finally, the findings were analyzed. Through this process, the study aimed to balance systematic coding with the openness and detail of DA.

In sum, the data analysis combined structured coding of repetition types with the fine-grained sequential analysis of DA. This approach made it possible to describe both the frequency and the functions of repetition, while remaining faithful to the principles of DA. It also ensured that the analysis was flexible enough to include unexpected uses of repetition, thus providing a more complete picture of how repetition supports learning and participation in the EFL classroom.

Reliability and Validity

In DA, validity is mainly connected to the rigorous grounding of analysis in the data rather than in numerical measurements. To ensure validity, this study followed established DA principles. First, all interactional sequences relevant to repetition were transcribed in detail, using Jeffersonian conventions(Jefferson, 2004), and enriched with multimodal annotations following practices suggested by Mondada (2018b). This attention to fine detail made it

possible to capture pauses, overlaps, prosody, gaze, gestures, and other embodied resources that shaped the meaning of repetition in the classroom.

Second, every analytical claim was directly supported by transcript evidence. Extracts from the video recordings were presented and re-examined repeatedly to check if the interpretation was indeed visible in the participants' conduct. In this way, the analysis was not based on subjective impressions but on the sequential and multimodal organization displayed by the participants themselves.

Third, the study avoided imposing pre-set categories on the data before analysis. While initial coding of repetition types was useful for organizing the corpus, the actual interpretation always remained data-driven, with openness to unexpected uses of repetition.

Reflexivity of the Researcher

A reflexive stance was also important for ensuring validity, since the researcher was also the classroom teacher. This dual role carries both advantages and challenges. On the one hand, being the teacher meant that the researcher was already familiar with the pupils, the routines of the classroom, and the local culture. This familiarity helped to interpret the interaction in context and to recognize subtle meanings that an outsider might miss. On the other hand, there was also a risk of bias, because the teacher-researcher could interpret the data through personal expectations or pedagogical goals.

To address this, the researcher consciously reflected on her position throughout the study. Reflexive notes were kept after each lesson and during transcription to record personal impressions, doubts, or assumptions. By doing this, the researcher acknowledged the possible influence of her dual role and tried to separate personal teaching experience from analytic claims. Importantly, the focus of DA is on what is visible in the interaction itself, not on what the researcher feels or thinks. This methodological orientation helped to reduce the impact of personal bias and strengthened the credibility of the analysis.

Reliability: Peer Checking and Data Sessions

Reliability in DA does not depend on statistical measures but on the demonstrability of analysis to other researchers. To enhance reliability, parts of the data were presented in mini-data sessions with peers in the field of applied linguistics and ELT. During these sessions, selected transcript extracts were discussed in small groups, and interpretations were compared. Feedback from these peer discussions was used to refine the analysis and to check whether alternative readings of the data were possible. This process served as a form of inter-rater discussion, not by coding frequencies but by evaluating the interactional evidence collaboratively.

In addition, the researcher revisited the same extracts several times over the course of the analysis. This recursive process made it possible to check whether the interpretations remained consistent and grounded in the data, even after some time had passed.

Reliability was strengthened through reflexivity, peer discussion in mini-data sessions, and repeated re-checking of transcripts. By combining these measures, the study sought to maintain both transparency and trustworthiness, ensuring that its findings are credible and consistent with the methodological principles of Discourse Analysis.

Summary

This study adopted a qualitative research framework and used DA as the main methodology. DA was chosen because it makes it possible to study classroom interaction in real time, with special attention to sequentiality, context, and multimodality. Data were collected through 12 video-recorded English lessons in a second-grade class at a state primary school in Adana. The recordings captured both verbal and non-verbal resources, supported by field notes taken by the researcher. Detailed transcription was carried out following Jeffersonian conventions and multimodal annotations. Instances of repetition were identified and coded, but the analysis always remained data-driven. Reliability and validity were ensured

by grounding claims in data, maintaining reflexivity as the teacher-researcher, and presenting extracts in peer data sessions.

Chapter 4

Findings

This chapter presents the findings of the qualitative case study. The analysis is based on 12 recorded lessons with 2nd-grade students over a six-week period. Using the tools of DA, the study identifies recurring types of repetition and their pedagogical and interactional roles. The research questions guiding this chapter are:

1. What types of repetition emerge in classroom discourse when the target language is actively used?
2. How do these repetitions function in supporting language development among young learners?

Overview of the Data

The dataset comprises 12 video-recorded sessions (each approximately 40 minutes long) with a total of 480 minutes of classroom interaction. A total of 89 instances of repetition were identified and categorized. Repetition occurred both as a pedagogical strategy by the teacher and as a responsive behavior from students. The types of repetition were classified as follows:

- Exact Repetition
- Prompted Repetition
- Self-Repetition
- Peer Repetition
- Modified Repetition
- Corrective Repetition

Each type is described below with transcript excerpts, contextual interpretation, and their implications for language learning process.

Exact Repetition

Exact repetition means saying again the same word or phrase without any change. In classrooms it is usually seen when the teacher gives a model and the student repeats it exactly, or when the whole class repeats together in choral practice. It can also happen when the teacher repeats a student's word to make it more visible for the group.

This type of repetition is used a lot in the early stages of language learning. For young learners, exact repetition is a simple way to take part in the lesson, because they do not need to create new language but only echo what they hear. Research in language classrooms shows that repetition supports pronunciation practice and memorization (Cameron, 2001; P. Nation & Newton, 2008). It also gives children a low-risk way to join in classroom talk, which is especially important when they are not yet confident (Pinter, 2017). Teachers often use exact repetition during correction, when the learner first says something wrong and then repeats the correct form, a process that has been described as part of uptake after feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997b).

In EFL primary classrooms, exact repetition is very common because children usually start with no prior exposure to English. By repeating exactly, they get used to the sound and rhythm of the language, they show participation, and they slowly begin to connect spoken form with meaning. Studies on young learner interaction highlight that repetition helps children both to notice language features and to practice them until they become more natural (Bygate, 2001; Waring, 2009).

Excerpt 1

01	[T]:	Dokuz yaşında mısın sen? (0.4) Var mı sekiz olan?
		Are you nine years old? Is there someone who is eight?
02		((pointing at the student)) ((showing eight with her hand))
03		((students showing hands))
03		(0.5)
04	[T]:	O zaman ne diyeceksin?
		What will you say then?

05		((still showing eight with her hand))
06		(0.7)
07	[T]:	I a::m ↑
08	[T]:	I a::m ↑
09	[T]:	Eight.
10	[T]:	I am
11		(1.3)
12	[T]:	I am eight
13	[Ç]:	I am eight
14	[T]:	Very good Ç.

The teacher first asks in L1: *“Are you nine years old? Is there someone who is eight?”* followed by *“What will you say then?”*. This sequence is a pre-expansion that prepares the student for the target answer. The pauses in lines 02 and 04 show that the student does not immediately provide a response, which triggers further teacher action.

Line 05–06: The teacher produces *“I a::m ↑”* twice, with elongation and rising intonation. This is a clear case of teacher self-repetition combined with designedly incomplete utterance. By repeating only the first part of the target construction, the teacher leaves a slot for the learner to complete.

Line 07–08: The teacher then supplies the missing lexical item (*“Eight”*) and immediately reconstructs the full phrase (*“I am”* → *“I am eight”*). The multiple re-entries into the construction (fragment → word → full sentence) show how the teacher builds a stepwise scaffold.

Line 09–11: After a long pause (1.3s), the teacher again provides the full model (*“I am eight”*), which the learner then repeats exactly (*“I am eight”*). This is prompted exact repetition—the learner takes up the teacher’s model without modification.

Line 12: The closing (*“Very good Ç.”*) is a third-turn evaluation that ratifies the student’s uptake and signals successful completion of the repair sequence.

The repetition here works as a scaffolded correction strategy. Instead of simply giving the answer, the teacher gradually guides the learner toward producing the correct structure. The fragmented repetitions (*"I a::m"*) highlight the grammatical frame, while inserting *"Eight"* supplies the missing content. This segmented repetition reduces the cognitive load for the child: first, they only need to echo part of the sentence, then later they can combine both frame and number.

From a pedagogical angle, this repetition type serves several purposes:

- Form–function mapping: It helps the learner connect the English phrase "I am" with the meaning of age in response to the question "How old are you?".
- Pronunciation practice: The elongated a::m and rising intonation direct the child's attention to stress and rhythm.
- Confidence building: Exact repetition lowers risk for young learners, because they are not forced to generate new forms on their own but can safely echo the model.

In this excerpt, repetition is not just mechanical drilling. It is an interactional tool for repairing silence, focusing attention on the target form, and gradually scaffolding the learner's participation. DA shows how the teacher's repeated modeling and the learner's exact repetition co-construct a successful language moment. And this supports both accuracy and participation.

Excerpt 2

01	[T]:	Yes. (0.3) How many scissors?
02		((points at the activity in her hand))
03	[Ss]:	Three.
04	[T]:	How many? How MANY?
05		(emphasize "many" the second time)
06		((Making two with her hand))
07	[Ss]:	Three
08		Three
09	[T]:	Three! Yes. ↓
10		Three.
11		O::ne-
12	[Ss and T]:	two:, three.
13		((teracher's showing the scissors on the page))

14	[T]:	How many? ↑
15	[Ss]:	Three.
16		(0.5)
17	[T]:	three (.) yes, three scissors. Ok.

Line 01-03: The teacher initiates with “how many scissors?”, accompanied by a pointing gesture. The students respond promptly with “three”. This is a preferred response and shows they understood both the referent and the structure.

Line 04-05: The teacher, however, repeats the question “how many? (.) how MANY?”. The prosodic emphasis on “MANY” works as a repair initiation, not because the answer was wrong, but to push students to pay attention to the form of the question and to stress the quantifier.

Line 06-07: The students repeat “three, three”, which is an exact repetition of their earlier answer, now given more firmly. The teacher’s prompt here functions as other-initiated self-repair, the children align by confirming the same response.

Line 07-09: The teacher repeats “three! yes. ↓ three”, which is a confirmation and reinforcement move. It ratifies the answer but also places the target word back into circulation.

Line 10-11: The teacher starts counting “one–” and the whole class joins in “two, three”. This creates a choral sequence, where counting together binds teacher and learners in a shared turn. It also links the numerical form “three” with the activity of counting.

Line 12-15: The teacher asks again “how many?”, prompting the students to produce “three”. Finally, the teacher gives the full modeled phrase “three (.) yes, three scissors. okay”. This closes the sequence by re-embedding the numeral in full (number + noun).

The repetition here is not corrective but reinforcing and aligning. The students’ first answer was already correct, yet the teacher chooses to recycle the question–answer sequence several times. This serves multiple pedagogical functions:

Form focus through prosody: By stressing “MANY”, the teacher draws attention to the quantifier word itself, helping learners notice its role in the phrase.

Repetition as rehearsal: The learners produce “three” multiple times, which strengthens both vocabulary recall and pronunciation.

Choral participation: The brief counting together creates collective involvement. Choral repetition is important for young learners because it lowers individual anxiety and provides rhythm and fun.

Expansion of structure: The final teacher turn (*“three scissors”*) models how the numeral combines with the noun, pushing the students beyond a single-word answer.

Interactional alignment: The repeated questioning and repeated answering keep the class in synchrony, ensuring that attention remains on the task and that all students share the same focus.

Prompted Repetition

Prompted repetition can be described as a type of repetition where the learner produces an utterance only after the teacher provides a model or partial model that needs to be repeated. It is not spontaneous; rather, it is clearly initiated and guided by the teacher. This practice is especially common in beginner and young learner classrooms, where children often lack the linguistic resources to construct full sentences independently. By breaking down and modeling the target language, teachers create a safe and structured way for learners to practice. For example, a teacher might say *“I am eight”* and then pause, expecting the learner to echo the phrase. This kind of repetition is usually used after an incorrect answer, hesitation, or silence, because it allows the learner to participate successfully while also reinforcing accuracy.

In the literature, prompted repetition is closely linked to scaffolding and corrective feedback. Lyster and Ranta (1997b) identify repetition and recasts as central feedback moves that encourage uptake and repair. Cameron (2001) also notes that younger learners often rely on teacher prompts to extend their speech beyond single words. Seedhouse (2004) shows how such repetition fits within the organization of classroom interaction, where teachers guide learners toward preferred forms. More recent work by Sert (2015) highlights the multimodal

nature of these prompts, including gaze, gesture, and prosody, which all help learners to notice and reproduce the model more effectively. In this sense, prompted repetition is not just mechanical drilling but a carefully timed pedagogical tool that supports noticing, accuracy, and confidence.

Excerpt 3

01	[T]:	Three.
		(0.5)
		How many blue pencils? ↑ ((holding up three fingers))
02	[Ss]:	Three.
03	[T]:	A… bak buraya
		A… look here ((Showing the pencils in the book to the student))
		(3)
04	[T]:	How many blue pencils?
05		((pointing at the pencils in the book while walking towards the student))
06		(5)
07	[T]:	Let's count↓ One (.) two (2) Otur (0.4) otur
		Sit down sit down
08	[T]:	How many blue pencils? ↑
09	[S3]:	Three
10	[T]:	Three ((holding up three fingers))
11		Okay.
12	[S4]:	Three

In this sequence the teacher and learners co-construct the answer *"Three"* through a series of prompts and repetitions.

Line 01-02: The teacher first says *"Three"*, followed by a short pause and then repeats the question *"How many blue pencils?"* while showing three fingers. This multimodal combination – verbal model plus gesture – is a clear prompt for the students. The class answers together *"Three"* (line 02), which shows that the teacher's modeling directly triggered their production.

Line 3-12: After a short pause, the teacher addresses one student by name (*"A… bak buraya"*) and repeats the question again (line 04). The embodied action of pointing at the books while walking closer to the student (line 05) makes the prompt even more explicit. The long pause (line 06) indicates hesitation or difficulty from the student. At this point, the teacher introduces a counting routine (*"Let's count, one, two…"*) to scaffold the task and then repeats

the question once more (line 08). This repeated prompting leads to an individual response: *"Three"* (line 09). The teacher echoes the answer *"Three"* again with finger gesture (line 10), and then another student repeats it once more (line 12).

From a DA perspective, this is a clear case of prompted repetition. The teacher repeatedly designs the interaction so that the expected form is provided and then taken up by the learners. The combination of verbal models, gestures, pointing, and naming creates multiple opportunities for learners to align with the target answer. The learners' exact repetitions of "Three" are not self-initiated but are produced in response to the teacher's prompts.

Scaffolding comprehension: By showing fingers and pointing at the book, the teacher lowers the cognitive demand and links the English word *"three"* with the actual referent.

Encouraging participation: The whole class first answers together, and then individual students are prompted. This balances group support with individual responsibility.

Reinforcement through repetition: Each time "three" is repeated, the pronunciation and form are reinforced, which supports memory and automaticity.

Repair and alignment: The sequence shows how prompted repetition works as a gentle repair strategy when the learner hesitates. Instead of telling the student the answer, the teacher recycles the model until the learner produces it.

Affective support: Through multimodal cues and a friendly style, the teacher reduces pressure. Students can echo the teacher safely without fear of making mistakes.

This excerpt illustrates how prompted repetition is used not only to check knowledge but also to build accuracy, confidence, and engagement in a primary EFL classroom. The DA analysis shows that the teacher's repeated prompts guide the learners step by step, making the production of the target form possible and meaningful.

Excerpt 4

01 [T]: Okay let's see. Look here

		((putting the book in her hand to her torso and pointing at color blue in the book))
02		(0.4)
03		Blue::
04	[Ss]:	Blue
05	[T]:	Blu:e
06	[Ss]:	Blue:
07	[T]:	Blue:
08	[Ss]:	Blue

Line 01-03: The teacher starts with an attention-getting move. She uses body orientation, holding the book to her torso and pointing at color in the book. This works as a pre-sequence to shift students' focus to the upcoming vocabulary item. A short pause allows time for the class to direct attention. Silence here is not trouble but part of the transition. The teacher produces the target color with elongated vowel and falling intonation. This is the first model, clearly designed for imitation.

Line 04-06: The students repeat the teacher's model immediately. This is a case of prompted exact repetition: the teacher provides the form, and the students echo it. The teacher repeats the word again, this time with a slightly different intonation. This functions as a repair-like emphasis to draw attention to pronunciation. Students echo the teacher again, showing alignment with her stress pattern.

Line 07-08: The teacher produces the same form one more time. This is not correction but reinforcement. The students echo for the third time, closing the sequence.

This repetition type serves mainly vocabulary introduction and pronunciation practice. The teacher uses multiple cycles of modeling and prompting to ensure that all learners can produce the new word *"Blue."* The elongated vowel and intonation variation help the children notice the sound structure, which is important for very young learners still developing phonological awareness in English.

From a pedagogical perspective, the function is to:

- Support memorization through multiple immediate repetitions.

- Reinforce correct pronunciation by highlighting stress and vowel length.
- Engage the whole class with choral response, lowering anxiety and allowing every child to participate.
- Create multimodal focus by combining gesture (pointing to the book), verbal modeling, and prosody.

In short, this excerpt shows how prompted repetition works as a scaffolding tool: the teacher introduces a lexical item in small steps, and the students echo it until the pronunciation and form become stable. It is not only practice, but also a way to secure attention, confirm understanding, and build confidence in producing new vocabulary.

Self Repetition

Self-repetition refers to moments when a speaker, often the teacher, repeats their own words or phrases within the same turn or across turns. Unlike prompted repetition, where the learner echoes the teacher, here the teacher recycles their own utterance to achieve a specific interactional or pedagogical goal. In classroom discourse, teachers frequently use self-repetition to gain students' attention, to highlight important parts of the input, or to repair a breakdown in understanding. For example, repeating a question such as *"How many? How many?"* not only gives learners more processing time but also draws attention to the key element of the utterance. Studies in classroom interaction show that self-repetition works as a tool for scaffolding, emphasizing meaning, and keeping the interaction flowing (Seedhouse, 2004; Walsh, 2006). In this way, self-repetition is not a sign of redundancy, but an important resource for ensuring that learners notice, understand, and engage with the target language.

Excerpt 5

01	[T]:	How↑ many::? (0.5) How many (.) stu:dents are there?
02		How many? ((pointing at the book in her hand))
03		(2)
04		How many: (.) st(u)dents (0.5) are there? ↓ Students?
05		(1)

06	Student (0.8) Student (0.5) student ((pointing at a different student each time))
07	Teacher ((pointing at herself))
08	Student (0.4) student ((pointing at two more students))
09	(2)
10	What? ((pointing at one of the students who's about to answer))

Line 01–02: The teacher asks *"How many students are there?"* with rising intonation and then repeats *"How many?"* while pointing at the book. This is an instance of self-repetition, serving both as emphasis and as repair initiation. By repeating the question, the teacher gives more time for the students to process the task. The gesture of pointing at the book adds a multimodal scaffold, directing attention to the visual material.

Line 03: A long pause shows that the students are not ready to answer. In DA terms, this is a trouble source, because the expected second part (the answer) does not come.

Line 04: The teacher reformulates the question again: *"How many students are there? Students?"*. This is another self-repetition with a slight change in intonation. The teacher's strategy is to reduce the difficulty by isolating the keyword "students" to make the meaning clearer.

Line 05: Another silence suggests that the learners are still hesitant. This confirms that the teacher needs to offer more support.

Line 06–08: The teacher now shifts strategy: pointing at different children and saying *"Student. Student. Student"*, then pointing at herself *"Teacher"*, and back again to *"Student"*. This is a contrastive repetition sequence. It does not ask for an immediate response but instead clarifies the concept of "student" versus "teacher" in the here-and-now. The pointing gestures align the English word with visible referents.

Line 09: Another pause indicates space for the students to take up the teacher's modeling, but again no immediate response comes.

Line 10: Finally, the teacher prompts a particular student with *"What?"* while pointing. This is an allocation of next turn, showing that the teacher expects the student to produce an answer.

This repetition sequence has several important functions for young learners:

- Scaffolding comprehension: Repeating the question and then breaking it into parts helps learners process the meaning.
- Clarifying vocabulary: By pointing to herself as "teacher" and to children as "student," the teacher makes the abstract English word concrete.
- Managing silence: Repetition fills the gaps when learners hesitate, keeping the interaction alive and maintaining engagement.
- Encouraging participation: By shifting from whole-class questioning to singling out one learner, the teacher balances collective learning with individual responsibility.
- Multimodal support: Gestures, pointing, and intonation work together with verbal repetition to ensure that the meaning of "student" is understood.

This excerpt shows how self-repetition is not redundant but a vital tool in classroom interaction. The teacher uses it to manage silence, scaffold understanding, and draw students into participation. Pedagogically, this kind of repetition strengthens vocabulary learning, supports comprehension, and ensures that hesitant learners remain engaged in the task

Excerpt 6

01	[T]:	Look. Look here ((pointing at the book in her hand))
02	[Ss]:	Look
03	[T]:	Look here. Follow here. ((pointing at the book))
04		(0.7)
05		Don't look at me ((pointing at herself))
06		Don't look at me. (0.3) Don't look at me ((signaling not to look at her with her fingers))
07		(0.6)
08		Look at the (.) book. Look at the book ((pointing at the book twice))

Line 01: The teacher begins with a directive, repeating "Look" while pointing at the book. This is self-repetition for emphasis. The multimodal action of pointing works as an

embodied resource to guide attention. Goodwin (2000) explains that gaze and pointing often co-occur with verbal repetition to manage joint attention in interaction.

Line 02: The students echo the teacher's utterance. This is exact repetition, but the echo alone does not guarantee compliance with the intended action. Walsh (2006) shows that learners sometimes repeat words as participation tokens without fully processing the pedagogical aim.

Line 03: The teacher strengthens the directive by reformulating it with "Follow here." Seedhouse(2004) notes that such reformulations are part of the "interactional architecture" of classrooms, where teachers adapt their language to guide learners through tasks.

Line 04: The silence is a trouble source. Students do not respond with the expected action. In DA terms, this absence of an appropriate second pair part prompts repair (Schegloff et al., 1977).

Line 05–06: Here, the teacher initiates other-repair by switching to negative directives. The repeated "Don't look at me" is both verbal and gestural. Mondada (2018b) stresses that repair often involves multimodal resources, not just words, especially when the aim is to redirect bodily orientation.

Line 07: The pause suggests that students are reorienting physically. Streeck, Goodwin, and LeBaron (2014) argue that pauses in multimodal interaction often accompany visible embodied adjustments, such as shifting gaze or posture.

Line 08: The sequence is finished by restating the positive directive. Repetition with pointing ensures that the intended action (looking at the book) is finally clear . Sert (2015) describes such teacher repetition as multimodal scaffolding, where gesture and prosody combine to support learner uptake.

This excerpt illustrates how self-repetition, combined with gesture and prosody, becomes a powerful tool for classroom management and meaning-making. The teacher not only repeats for emphasis but also for repair, guiding the learners to shift their attention from

her body to the learning material. Pedagogically, this type of repetition ensures that vocabulary instruction takes place in the right focus space — the book with the colors — and that learners learn to follow both verbal and non-verbal cues.

Peer Repetition

Peer repetition happens when one student repeats the words of another student during classroom interaction. Unlike teacher-prompted or self-repetition, here the source of the model is a classmate's contribution rather than the teacher's. In many cases, peer repetition emerges right after a learner produces a correct answer, and other students echo it to join in or to show alignment. This type of repetition can also occur when students pick up each other's errors and reformulate them, but most often in beginner EFL classrooms it functions as reinforcement of correct responses. Research has shown that peer repetition helps create a collaborative learning environment, where learners support each other and reduce the pressure of speaking alone (Storch, 2002; Waring, 2008). It also strengthens attention, since hearing the same answer from a peer makes the input more salient. In this sense, peer repetition is both a social and pedagogical tool: it builds solidarity in the group and contributes to vocabulary expansion and confidence in oral practice.

Excerpt 7

01	[T]:	No. What is this? N…?
02		(2)
03	[N]:	Desk
04	[T]:	Not the desk. ((shaking her head to side while looking at the book))
05		(1)
06	[Y]:	Boo:k↓
07		(0.5)
08	[T]:	Book↑ These are (0.5) books. ↑
09	[Ss]:	Book. ↑
10	[T]:	What color↑ (0.4) are these books?
11		(2)
12	[T]:	C..?
13	[C]:	Red.
14	[T]:	Re:d. What color are these boks?
15	[Ss]:	Re::d↑

Line 01-03: The teacher rejects a previous wrong answer and re-initiates the question. The partial address *"N…?"* shows that she is allocating the next turn to N…. This is a teacher repair initiation combined with turn-allocation. A two-second silence indicates hesitation from the student. In DA terms this is a trouble source, since the expected answer does not come immediately. N… produces an incorrect answer. It shows that she tries to participate, but the lexical choice is wrong.

Line 04-06: The teacher provides explicit negative feedback, both verbally and with head movement. This is other-repair, closing down the wrong candidate answer. A short pause follows. It creates a slot for another learner to attempt an answer. Another student, Y…, self-selects and gives the correct word with falling intonation. This is peer contribution that resolves the trouble. It is important because the repair comes from a classmate, not the teacher.

Line 07-09: A brief silence leaves room for teacher confirmation. The teacher confirms the answer and expands it into a plural form. This is teacher repetition plus modeling. The upward intonation makes it sound slightly didactic, calling for attention. The whole class echoes the teacher's word. This is peer repetition in chorus, prompted by the teacher's model. It shows that the correct form is now shared by all.

Line 10-13: The teacher moves to the next step, extending the task to a color question. The rising intonation and short pause before "are" emphasize the key word. Another long pause occurs, showing that learners need time to process the new question. This is prompted repair and a scaffolding technique. Ç.. completes the answer correctly.

Line 14-15: The teacher repeats the answer with elongated vowel and then restates the question. This is reinforcement plus prosodic modeling. The students echo the correct answer together. This is again peer repetition, consolidating the color vocabulary as a shared response.

These interactional moves are not random; they serve specific teaching purposes in the classroom. By repeating, prompting, and confirming, the teacher organizes the

activity in ways that both support comprehension and keep students actively engaged. The main pedagogical functions observed in this excerpt can be summarized as follows:

Repair management: The teacher uses rejection, prompts, and modeling to handle wrong or missing answers.

Peer support: When one learner fails, another steps in with the correct answer, showing collaborative improvement.

Scaffolding: Teacher repetition, prosodic emphasis, and first-sound prompts lower the difficulty level.

Reinforcement through repetition: Both teacher repetition and peer repetition guarantee that the target words (book, red) are heard and produced multiple times.

Form–meaning connection: By linking the lexical item with objects in the book and then adding color adjectives, the teacher creates meaningful context for vocabulary learning.

This excerpt demonstrates how repair, prompted repetition, and peer repetition are combined in real classroom interaction. Pedagogically, the sequence shows how errors can become opportunities: the teacher and peers together guide learners from incorrect guesses (*desk*) to correct, confident answers (*book, red*).

Excerpt 8

01	[T]:	Re:d. Okay (.) how many↑ (0.5) red books (0.3) are there? N..?
02	[N]:	Two:
03	[T]:	Two. How many red books are there?
04	[Ss]:	Two::
05	[T]:	Two (.) One::-
06	[Ss]:	One two:

Line 01-02: The teacher first repeats the color word *“Red”* with elongated intonation, reinforcing the correct answer from a previous turn. Then she produces a full question *“How many red books are there?”* with rising intonation, and allocates the turn to N… with the initial “N...?” This shows how teachers often combine repetition, expansion, and nomination to scaffold learner production. N… responds correctly with the number “Two,” though the

elongated vowel suggests hesitation or uncertainty. The answer provides the expected second pair part, but it is not yet ratified by the group.

Line 03-04: The teacher repeats the learner's answer, confirming it as correct. Then she restates the question for the whole class. This is self-repetition plus prompting, moving from individual response to collective participation. The class echoes the answer in chorus, producing a peer repetition of N…'s original response. The elongated vowel mirrors N…'s intonation, showing that peers not only copy the word but also align prosodically. This collective repetition transforms one learner's answer into shared knowledge.

Line 05-06: The teacher again repeats *"Two"* but then shifts to start a counting sequence with *"One::–"*. This introduces a new action, moving from simple question-answer into counting practice. The extended vowel indicates the teacher is holding the floor and projecting continuation. The students pick up the teacher's cue and continue the counting sequence. This is student uptake of teacher initiation, where the teacher's partial production (*"One::–"*) is completed by the learners.

The line-by-line analysis makes clear how the teacher and students together construct the sequence through repetition, confirmation, and expansion. What begins as a single learner's hesitant response is taken up, echoed, and extended by both the teacher and the class. These moves are not random; they carry important teaching purposes and show how repetition is shaped into a learning tool during interaction. The main pedagogical functions observed in this excerpt are as follows:

- Confirmation and reinforcement: The teacher repeats the learner's correct answer, strengthening its validity (Walsh, 2006).
- Collective learning through peer repetition: One student's answer is echoed by the whole class, making knowledge socially shared (Waring, 2008).
- Transition to extended practice: By starting *"One::–"*, the teacher turns a single response into a counting activity, providing more exposure and practice.
- Reducing uncertainty: The hesitation in the learner's answer is smoothed out by collective repetition, which builds confidence.

- Multimodal scaffolding: Though not transcribed here, in such activities teachers usually use gestures (e.g., showing fingers), aligning with findings in Sert (2015) and Mondada (2018b).

Modified Repetition

Excerpt 9

01	[T]:	What i::::s (.) his name?
02	[Ss]:	((indistinct sounds))
03		(0.4)
04	[T]:	What is his name?
05	[Ss]:	Antonio. Antonio.
06	[T]:	Antonio. Yes, Antonio. How o:ld (0.4) is Antonio? How old?
07	[T]:	How old? A::ge.
08		(.)
09	[S1]:	Nine.
10	[T]:	How old is he? ↑
11	[T]:	M…?
12	[T]:	How old is he ↑
13	[S2]:	Nine.
14	[T]:	Ni::ne. He is (0.4) ni::ne years old. Ni:ne. He is nine, yes? Nine, okay. ((makes nine with her fingers))

Line 01-03: elongated vowel and micro-pause emphasize the importance of the question and invite a collective student response. This is a first pair part (FPP) in a question–answer adjacency pair. Students produce indistinct sounds, which indicates a trouble source—the teacher does not get a clear answer. A short silence follows. In DA terms, this lapse signals non-completion of the expected second pair part, so the teacher needs to repair.

Line 04-06: The teacher repeats the question *"What is his name?"*. This is self-repetition and functions as other-initiated repair because she reopens the floor for a clearer answer. Students give the correct answer "Antonio" in chorus. This is the expected second pair part, now successfully completed. The teacher confirms with *"Antonio. Yes, Antonio"* and immediately moves to the next task: *"How o:ld (0.4) is Antonio? How old?"*. This shows topic expansion and pedagogical chaining (linking one question to the next).

Line 07-09: The teacher repeats *"How old? A::ge"*. Here she adds the synonym "Age" as a scaffold, which is a form of modified repetition. It supports learners by connecting the question to a single key lexical item. A micro-pause gives space for the students to answer. One student finally answers "Nine." This is the preferred second pair part.

Line 10–12: The teacher pursues further confirmation: *"How old is he? ↑ Muhammet? How old is he ↑"*. She repeats the question and nominates another student, reallocating the next turn. This is a prompted repetition sequence that both checks comprehension and ensures wider participation.

Line 13-14: The nominated student responds with the same answer "Nine." This is peer repetition of the correct response, showing uptake by multiple learners. The teacher expands the answer into a full sentence: *"Ni::ne. He is (0.4) ni::ne years old. Ni:ne. He is nine, yes? Nine, okay."* This is modified repetition (moving from "Nine" to "He is nine years old"), functioning as a recast and a model for correct syntax. The embodied gesture (showing nine with fingers) adds multimodal support.

The unfolding of this sequence shows how repetition, repair, and expansion are carefully managed by the teacher to keep the interaction moving and to support learner participation. Each turn contributes not only to producing the correct answer but also to building a shared understanding of how the target structure should be used. In this way, the interaction highlights several pedagogical functions that are central to young learner classrooms and they are as follows:

- Repair and clarification: Self-repetition and synonym prompts ("Age") help students overcome initial difficulty in producing the answer.
- Scaffolding: The teacher expands minimal answers ("Nine") into full sentences ("He is nine years old"), modeling correct form and structure.
- Peer learning: When one student answers correctly, others repeat it, showing that repetition spreads knowledge across the group.
- Participation management: By nominating different students, the teacher ensures that learning is not limited to a single speaker.

Multimodal reinforcement: Gestures (fingers showing nine) complement verbal repetition, helping young learners connect the word with a visible referent.

Excerpt 10

01 [T]: Not seven. Ş…. Bakın burada görüyor musun? İki tane var.
Not seven. Ş…. Look here, do you see? There are two.
02 [T]: Görüyor musun?
Do you see it?

03	[Ss]:	Eve::t
		Ye::s
04	[T]:	Yellow (0.2) pencil neymiş
		What is yellow pencil?
05	[S9]:	Blue:
06	[T]:	Yellow pencil neymiş?
		What is yellow pencil?
07	[S3]:	yeşil kalem
		green pencil
08	[T]:	Ne kalem?
		Which pencil?
09	[S3]:	Yeşil kalem
		Green pencil
10	[T]:	Yellow
11	[Ss]:	((indistinct sounds))
12	[Ss]:	Sarı kalem
		Yellow pencil
13	[T]:	Sarı kalem. How many yellow pencils? ↑ ((making two with her fingers))
		Yellow pencil.
14	[Ss]:	Tw::o. ↑

Line 01–03: The teacher first rejects the incorrect answer *"seven"* and points physically at the book: *"Look here, do you see? There are two."* The students respond in Turkish *"Eve::t" (Yes)*, showing alignment. Already here, the teacher is modeling correct content through a repair sequence.

Line 04-06: The teacher asks *"Yellow (0.2) pencil neymiş?"*. This is a bilingual scaffolding move: using Turkish *"neymiş"* together with the English word. She repeats the item but modifies it with a Turkish frame, trying to secure meaning. A student incorrectly answers *"Blue."* This introduces a trouble source. The teacher repeats the question *"Yellow pencil neymiş?"* This is modified repetition, stressing the correct color adjective "yellow" while keeping the bilingual format. It highlights the key contrast between *yellow* and the mistaken *blue*.

Line 07–09: Another student says *"yeşil kalem" (green pencil).* The teacher responds with *"Ne kalem?" (Which pencil?)*. This is reformulated repetition, narrowing the focus to push the learner toward the correct form. The student repeats the wrong answer, but the teacher isolates and repeats *"Yellow"* (Line 10). This is a crucial case of modified repetition functioning as recast: the teacher takes the learner's wrong answer and replaces it with the correct target form.

Line 11–12: Students collectively produce indistinct sounds, and then finally *“Sarı kalem” (yellow pencil).* Here the class takes up the teacher’s corrected form and repeats it. This shows how modified repetition by the teacher creates space for peer repetition and collaborative repair.

Line 13–14: The teacher confirms with *“Sarı kalem”* and extends the task: *“How many yellow pencils?”* (with fingers showing two). This is another case of modified repetition, moving from single-word correction to a full phrase and then embedding it into a new question frame. Students respond *“Two.”*

This excerpt is a strong example of how modified repetition works as an interactional repair and scaffolding device. The teacher does not simply repeat but actively reshapes the learner’s contributions into the correct target form, guiding the class step by step until everyone is able to produce it. And the pedagogical functions can be named as follows:

- Error correction through recast: The teacher’s modified repetitions replace incorrect answers (*blue, green*) with the correct target form (*yellow*), without direct negative evaluation.
- Scaffolding with bilingual frames: By using Turkish *“neymiş”*, the teacher lowers the difficulty and connects L2 input with L1 meaning, a common strategy in early EFL classrooms (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sert, 2015).
- Focus on form: Modified repetition highlights the problematic element (“yellow”), making it salient for learners and drawing attention to the mismatch between their response and the expected answer (Long, 1996; Ellis, 2009).
- Collaborative uptake: Learners eventually align and repeat *“Sarı kalem”*, showing that teacher modification successfully channels them toward the correct response.
- Extension of learning opportunity: The move from *“yellow pencil”* to *“How many yellow pencils?”* broadens the activity, giving learners more chances to reuse the corrected form in a meaningful context.

Corrective Repetition

Excerpt 11

01	[T]:	What color diyor değil mi? ↑ Ne renk ↑ diyor yani. Hangi renk miş kek? ↑ *He says "what color," right? He says "what color," so what color is the cake?*
02	[T]:	It is brow:n.
03	[Ss]:	Bro:wn
04	[T]:	What color?
05	[Ss]:	Brown.
06	[T]:	Okay (.) In Turkish.
07	[Ss]:	Beyaz *White*
08	[T]:	No, brown in Turkish. (2) Bro:wn (.) In Turkish. (2)
09	[Ss]:	Bro::wn.
10	[T]:	Okay. In English brow:n, in Turkish ↑.
11	[Y]:	Kahverengi *Brown*

Line 01: The teacher frames the question bilingually: *“What color diyor değil mi? Ne renk diyor yani. Hangi renkmiş kek?”* By mixing English and Turkish, the teacher checks comprehension and makes the task accessible. This bilingual reformulation is a type of other-initiated repair, showing the teacher anticipates possible misunderstanding.

Line 02–03: The teacher models the answer: *“It is brow:n.”* The students repeat *“Bro:wn.”* This is an instance of prompted repetition where the learners follow the teacher’s model. The teacher’s elongated pronunciation (“brow:n”) draws attention to the word’s phonology.

Line 04–05: The teacher repeats the question *“What color?”* and the students again produce *“Brown.”* This sequence works as confirmation check, making sure the learners can recall and pronounce the target item without the full model.

Line 06–07: When the teacher asks *“In Turkish”*, the students incorrectly answer *“Beyaz” (white)*. This creates a trouble source because the L1 translation does not match the intended form.

Line 08–09: The teacher initiates correction with *“No, brown in Turkish. (2) Bro:wn. In Turkish.”* The repetition here is corrective repetition because the teacher repeats the English form while explicitly rejecting the wrong Turkish answer. After a short pause, students echo *“Bro::wn”*, which shows alignment but still in L2.

Line 10–11: Finally, the teacher explicitly contrasts languages: *“In English brow:n, in Turkish ↑”*. This sets up a code-switching scaffold, and one student provides the correct Turkish equivalent *“Kahverengi.”* The correction is completed, showing how repetition and bilingual prompts converge to close the repair sequence.

The excerpt shows corrective repetition at its clearest: the teacher transforms a wrong answer into a learning opportunity by repeating, reshaping, and contextualizing the word until learners can align both in English and Turkish. The main pedagogical functions observed in this excerpt are as follows:

- Corrective repetition as repair: The teacher repeats the word “brown” several times to correct the mistaken translation and guide learners back to the right meaning.
- Focus on form and meaning: By switching between English and Turkish, the teacher makes both the L2 item and its L1 equivalent salient, ensuring conceptual understanding.
- Scaffolding pronunciation: Elongated forms (*brow::n*) emphasize phonological accuracy, helping young learners notice stress and vowel length.
- Encouraging learner uptake: The final student answer *“Kahverengi”* shows how teacher’s modified and corrective repetitions eventually lead to correct comprehension and production.
- Multimodal support: Though not explicit in the transcript, such sequences usually include intonation, gestures, and gaze (Mondada, 2018b; Sert, 2015), reinforcing repetition as a multimodal teaching tool.

Chapter 5

Conclusion and Suggestions

The analysis of extracts from the English classes of this primary school indicated us various things. This chapter brings together the main findings of the study and connects them with the broader literature on language learning and teaching. The focus of this research has been the role of repetition practices in young learners' English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, examined through a DA approach. In the previous chapters, different repetition types were identified and analyzed. Each type was shown to serve both cognitive and pedagogical purposes, creating opportunities for noticing, practice, alignment, and scaffolding.

The analysis has also underlined that repetition is not simply a mechanical activity, but a dynamic process that connects exposure, attention, memory, and interaction. It is through repetition that children are able to engage in meaningful participation, build accuracy and fluency, and develop confidence in speaking. The present chapter therefore draws conclusions from the findings and makes suggestions for pedagogy, teacher training, and future research.

Main Findings

One important finding of this study is that repetition emerges naturally in classroom interaction rather than being only a planned exercise. Teachers use repetition to manage turn-taking, to repair communication breakdowns, and to highlight important forms or vocabulary. For example, corrective repetitions were used when learners produced incorrect answers, and the teacher reformulated them in the correct way. This is consistent with research showing that repetition often functions as a recast or a soft corrective feedback strategy(Ellis, 2003; Lyster & Ranta, 1997b).

Another finding is that repetition has both cognitive and social dimensions. Cognitively, it helps learners store items in working memory and then move them to long-term memory through repeated exposure (Baddeley, 2000; I. S. P. Nation & Hunston, 2013b). Socially, repetition allows learners to participate in shared classroom routines, to align with peers, and

to demonstrate understanding. This aligns with sociocultural views of learning, where repetition is seen as a form of scaffolding within the Zone of Proximal Development (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978).

The use of multimodal resources was also observed. Teachers did not only repeat verbally but combined repetition with gestures, gaze, prosody, and pointing. This is consistent with findings from multimodal studies which emphasize that embodied resources are integral to how teaching and learning unfold (Goodwin, 2007; Mondada, 2018b; Sert, 2015). Such practices made repetition more salient for children and connected verbal forms to visual and physical cues.

Finally, this study found that in the Turkish primary school context, repetition plays a particularly important role because learners often have little prior exposure to English outside of school. Their families may not value English as highly as other subjects, and resources for learning can be limited. In this situation, classroom repetition provides the main channel of exposure and practice.

The Role of Repetition in Young Learners' Language Development

In this study, it has been clearly observed that the teacher made use of various techniques to implement repetition as a teaching strategy in her English classes. These techniques were not limited to only one type but included prompted repetition, choral repetition, exact repetition, and self-repetition, all of which were used with different purposes throughout the classroom discourse. The students in the classroom were around 8 to 9 years old, and their young age made repetition even more essential because children at this stage are still in the process of developing their cognitive and linguistic abilities. According to Cameron (2001), repetition in young learners' language classrooms helps build confidence and fluency, especially when learners are exposed to a second language for the first time. Also, Murphey (1992) argued that repetition, especially when done in a musical or rhythmic way, helps learners internalize language patterns and pronunciation.

The demographic structure of the participants also played a role in how repetition influenced the learning process. The children involved in this study were from a rural area in Turkey, and most of them had limited exposure to English outside the classroom. In such settings, where external language input is very restricted, the teacher becomes the main and sometimes the only source of input. Therefore, the teacher's repetition of key words and phrases throughout the lessons served as a strong reinforcement for learners who had minimal contact with English in their daily lives. This finding is in line with Nation and Newton (2008), who state that in low-input environments, frequent repetition of meaningful phrases supports vocabulary retention and language acquisition.

Overall, the repetition strategies observed in the classroom had a noticeable positive effect on the students' participation and output. Even in a small, remote school in a less privileged part of the country, the careful use of repetition helped to improve student responses, pronunciation, and overall confidence in using English. This proves that when repetition is used intentionally and consistently, it can lead to meaningful progress in language learning regardless of the location or background of the students.

Teacher Talk and Interactional Scaffolding

In this part of the research, it becomes more visible that repetition is not just a technique for repeating words or structures. It also plays a very important role in the social side of classroom communication. The teacher does not only use repetition to make students memorize language forms, but also uses it as a kind of support during interaction. In the recorded lessons, the teacher was often seen repeating the same question, phrase, or even a student's answer to help guide the conversation in the right direction. These repetitions helped students understand when to speak, how to answer, and what was expected from them in many of the instances. The opposite was seen too.

Especially in classrooms with young learners, like in this study, it is very common for children to hesitate or forget how to say something in the target language. Here, the teacher

steps in with repetition, which helps students repair their answers or feel more confident about giving one. For example, if a student gave a wrong or incomplete answer, the teacher repeated the question in a slower way or with clearer intonation. Sometimes she added small clues or used her hands to point or gesture. This kind of interaction is important not only for language learning but also for building a good classroom atmosphere since it creates a sense of activeness.

Teachers are expected to use repetition in meaningful ways not just to drill grammar, but also to organize turn-taking and keep the flow of the conversation. This was very visible in the data from this study. When students became quiet or unsure, the teacher used repetition to bring their focus back or help them try again. This shows how repetition can be both a language tool and a social strategy. As researchers like Seedhouse (2004) and Lyster and Ranta (1997b) have said, repetition can manage participation and create interactional opportunities. This study supports those findings and shows how teacher talk full of repeated phrases can be an effective way to scaffold for young language learners.

In addition, the teacher's tone of voice and intonation during repeated phrases appeared to influence how students responded. When repetition was combined with a rising or falling tone, it often served as a signal for students to prepare their answer or repeat the suggested answer after the teacher. In some cases, the teacher repeated a student's correct answer in a louder or more enthusiastic voice. This kind of echoic repetition worked as a form of praise, which helped to increase student motivation. In contrast, when the teacher repeated a sentence in a slower or more segmented manner, it served more as a repair strategy, helping students to focus on smaller language units such as subject-verb structure or word order. These subtle shifts show that repetition is not static; it changes according to the classroom need and learner response.

Another important point is that teacher repetition also helps to regulate classroom behavior. When young students became distracted or off-task, the teacher used repetition to re-engage them. For example, repeating a simple instruction like "Open your book" or "Look

at me” was enough to restore order without needing to change to the first language or raise her voice. This shows that repetition has a role beyond language development it also helps with classroom management. This is especially important in classrooms where learners have limited exposure to the target language outside of school. The familiar and repeated phrases create a sense of routine and comfort, which can reduce anxiety and support a positive learning environment.

Finally, repetition in teacher talk contributes to a larger system of classroom interaction where each repeated phrase connects with previous ones and helps to build learner understanding over time. In this study, many of the repeated structures like “How old are you?” or “What color is it?” were used again and again across different lessons. This type of repetition across time helps young learners gradually notice patterns in the language and become more confident in producing them. Repeated phrases become anchors of learning that students begin to use independently. This supports the view of repetition not only as immediate support but also as a long-term developmental tool in second language acquisition. It shows how repetition functions as a bridge between teacher input and student output in an interactive, social learning space.

Multimodality and Meaning-Making

In language teaching, especially with young learners, communication does not happen only through words. Teachers often use their facial expressions, hand movements, gaze, and body posture along with verbal language. This way of combining different modes of communication is called multimodality. In the classroom recordings analyzed for this thesis, the teacher frequently used these embodied actions while repeating instructions or vocabulary items. This practice helped learners understand better, especially when they were not able to catch the meaning through words alone. Multimodality works as an additional support system for young students who are still developing both cognitive and linguistic abilities.

Research has shown that gestures and other non-verbal cues can enhance the effectiveness of language instruction. For example, Tellier (2008) found that the use of hand gestures during vocabulary teaching helped children remember new words more easily. In the current study, similar results were observed. When the teacher pointed at objects or used her fingers to represent numbers, students were more likely to respond correctly. This suggests that gestures help students focus on the correct answer and reduce confusion during repetition cycles. Sometimes, students did not understand what was being asked even though the teacher repeated the same question several times. But when she combined her words with visual gestures, students were able to grasp the meaning. This shows how important multimodal input is in early language education.

Another important aspect is the emotional impact of multimodality. When a teacher smiles or nods while speaking, it encourages students and builds a more relaxed classroom environment. These emotional signals, although not directly linguistic, play a significant role in student motivation. Mondada (2018b) discusses how bodily orientation and gaze direction organize turn-taking and show who is being addressed. In this study, the teacher's gaze and body posture often served as subtle instructions for students to prepare to speak. For instance, the teacher would look directly at a student while repeating a question, signaling that it was their turn to answer. Such cues helped the flow of interaction and made classroom participation clearer.

Sometimes repetition alone is not enough, especially when students do not respond or respond incorrectly despite multiple attempts. In these cases, teachers need another method to help students notice the correct form or meaning. Multimodality offers this additional layer. By pointing at a picture, mimicking an action, or using exaggerated intonation, the teacher provides more context to the repeated language. Macedonia and von Kriegstein (2012) argue that when visual and verbal information are presented together, they form stronger memory connections. This is particularly useful for students in rural schools or schools with limited

language exposure, as it increases the chances of understanding through different learning channels.

Moreover, multimodality allows for form-meaning mapping in more natural ways. When the teacher says, “This is a pencil,” and points to an actual pencil, students are more likely to understand and remember the vocabulary item. This aligns with Nation and Newton’s (2008) suggestion that combining meaning-focused input with form-focused attention helps learners process language more effectively. In the classroom data, many instances showed that pointing, facial expressions, or touching the relevant object helped clarify the meaning of repeated questions or statements. These physical actions worked together with repetition to make the class more interactive and less frustrating.

Another benefit is that gestures can help prevent repetition fatigue. Young learners often become tired or bored when they hear the same sentence many times without any change in tone or delivery. But when the teacher uses her hands, voice, or face in creative ways, the repetition becomes more engaging. Students are not only listening; they are also watching, interpreting, and sometimes even copying the gestures themselves. This imitation process adds a kinesthetic dimension to language classes, which benefits learners with different learning styles. Gullberg (2006) explains that learners often internalize gestures along with the speech they accompany, forming what she calls “gesture-speech packages” that support recall and production.

In some situations observed during the classroom sessions, the teacher successfully ended a confusing repetition cycle by changing her strategy. Instead of continuing to repeat the same question verbally, she paused, gestured, or rephrased the sentence while pointing at the related item. This often led to a quick realization among students, followed by correct answers or choral repetition. Such shifts show the value of flexible teaching, where the teacher adapts her approach according to the learner’s needs. Multimodal scaffolding, in this sense, is not only supportive but also efficient—it helps avoid wasted time and keeps the learning process moving.

To conclude, the combination of verbal repetition and multimodal support proves highly effective in early foreign language classrooms. It provides multiple ways for students to access and process information, supports learner confidence, and maintains engagement even during long or repetitive tasks. By using facial expressions, gestures, gaze, and body movement along with spoken language, teachers can create a rich and supportive learning environment that meets the diverse needs of young learners. This approach not only improves comprehension and memory but also enhances the social dynamics of the classroom, making it a more interactive and inclusive space.

Repetition as a Bridge Between L1 and L2

In many classrooms where students are taught a second language, especially at a young age, teachers sometimes use both the L1 and the target language (L2) during their lessons. It is often used with repetition to support the learning process. In the recorded lessons examined in this thesis, it was observed that the teacher occasionally switched between English and Turkish when students had difficulty understanding a word or a question. When this switch happened during repetition cycles, it helped students make connections between the two languages more clearly.

Repetition in this context acted like a bridge between students' native language and the new language they are trying to learn. Teacher gives the first meaning in L2 and when they did not understand what was being said she started using L1 to make them see. For example, when the teacher said, "What is this?" and then repeated the question using Turkish "Bu neydi?" students could better guess what the teacher was asking and answer more confidently. This kind of bilingual repetition gave learners more chances to focus on meaning and supported vocabulary development. Swain and Lapkin (2000) have suggested that using both L1 and L2 can help learners build form-meaning associations more effectively. In this way, students were not just memorizing English words but understanding them in relation to their native language.

In some parts of the classroom interaction, the teacher repeated new vocabulary items in English first and then used their Turkish equivalents. For instance, after introducing the word “scissors,” the teacher asked, “What is scissor in Turkish?” and then said “makas” while pointing at the object. This type of cross-linguistic repetition helped students connect the sound and meaning of English words with words they already knew in Turkish. According to Nation (2013b), such lexical mapping is especially useful at the early stages of learning a foreign language, as it provides a foundation for building a richer mental lexicon over time.

The students in this study were around 7-8 years old and came from rural areas in Turkey, where exposure to English was quite limited outside the school setting. Therefore, the teacher’s use of L1 during repetition cycles was not only acceptable but also pedagogically necessary. Research by Lightbown and Spada (1999) supports the idea that well-timed L1 support can improve understanding and classroom management, particularly in contexts where learners are beginners and the classroom is their primary source of L2 exposure. The combination of L1 and L2 in repeated structures gives young learners both security and clarity, which encourages them to participate more actively.

Also important is the psychological effect of this approach. When students hear their first language used alongside the target language, it creates a sense of familiarity and inclusion. This emotional comfort can reduce anxiety and make learners more open to taking risks in speaking. In this study, the repetition of vocabulary or questions in both languages often led to more student engagement. For example, when the teacher said “Yellow pencil ne demek?” students showed more willingness to answer, even if they were not sure about the vocabulary. This kind of bilingual questioning and repeating fosters passive engagement that may turn into active participation later in the lesson.

Code-switching during repetition also helped students reflect on language forms. When the teacher asked “What is this?” and then said “Kitap neydi?” the students were able to understand that “kitap” and “book” mean the same thing. This awareness of language equivalence supports metalinguistic development, where learners not only use language but

think about it and compare it across different systems. Garcia and Wei (2014) describe this as translanguaging, a practice where learners move between languages in flexible ways that enhance meaning-making. In this classroom, translanguaging through repetition allowed learners to process input at a deeper level.

It was also found that this bilingual repetition helped reduce misunderstandings. In a few examples, students gave incorrect responses after a repeated English question. But when the teacher repeated the same phrase and added its Turkish version, students corrected their answers. This supports Long's (1996) view on negotiation of meaning, where learners are guided through clarification and modified input to arrive at more accurate language use. Here, the repetition cycle is not just mechanical; it includes interactive repair strategies that help young learners refine their language.

Finally, the use of repetition across both L1 and L2 also helped prepare students for gradual immersion into English. Instead of staying in Turkish or switching completely to English, the teacher created a middle ground where both languages co-existed during the process. Over time, as students gained more confidence and vocabulary, the teacher increased the use of L2 while reducing L1. This shows a scaffolded approach where bilingual repetition acts as a temporary support, to be removed as learners become more independent.

In summary, repetition served not only as a linguistic tool but also as a cultural and psychological one. By using repetition in both English and Turkish, the teacher created a classroom environment where students could relate new knowledge to what they already knew. This method allowed repetition to function as a bridge between two languages, helping young learners move step by step toward English fluency while maintaining a sense of security and connection with their native language.

Suggestions and Future Research

Future studies could expand on this work in several directions:

1. Different contexts: Repetition should be studied in other Turkish schools as well as in different countries, to see how cultural and institutional factors shape its use.
2. Comparative studies: Research could compare repetition practices across age groups, for example between primary and secondary students, to understand developmental differences.
3. Multimodal analysis: More research is needed on how gestures, gaze, and intonation combine with repetition to create scaffolding.
4. Learner perspectives: Interviews or stimulated recall could be used to see how children themselves perceive repetition and whether they find it helpful or boring.
5. Longitudinal studies: It would be valuable to trace how repeated exposure and practice through interactional repetition contributes to long-term vocabulary growth and fluency.

In conclusion, this thesis has shown that repetition in young learner EFL classrooms is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon. Far from being a mechanical activity, repetition operates as a resource that links exposure, attention, memory, and social interaction. Through repetition, teachers scaffold learners' participation, correct their errors in a supportive way, and provide multiple opportunities for practice. Learners, in turn, use repetition to align with peers, confirm understanding, and build confidence.

Ultimately, this research highlights that repetition is not a minor or old-fashioned technique, but a central tool in the teaching of young learners. When used strategically, it can support both cognitive development and social participation, making English learning more effective and enjoyable for children.

Bibliography

Baddeley, A. (2000). The episodic buffer: a new component of working memory? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *4*(11), 417–423. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01538-2

Balaman, C. U. (2018). *Embodied Resources in a Repetition Activity in a Preschool L2 Classroom* (Vol. 12, Issue 1).

BERA. (2018). *ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH* (4th ed.). British Educational Research Association.

Biber, Douglas., & Quirk, Randolph. (2010). *Longman grammar of spoken and written english*. Longman.

Brewster, J. (n.d.). *The Primary English Teacher's Guide*.

Butler, Y. G. (2019). 2. How Teachers of Young Learners of English are Educated in East and Southeast Asia: Research-based Lessons. In S. Zein & S. Garton (Eds.), *Early Language Learning and Teacher Education* (pp. 17–38). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788922661-003

Bygate, M. (2001). Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language. In M. Baygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks Second Language Learning, Teaching, and Testing* (pp. 23–48). Routledge.

Bygate, M. (Ed.). (2018). *Learning Language through Task Repetition* (Vol. 11). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.11

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge University Press.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne., & Olshtain, Elite. (2006a). *Discourse and context in language teaching : a guide for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne., & Olshtain, Elite. (2006b). *Discourse and context in language teaching : a guide for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Copland, F., & Garton, S. (2014). Key themes and future directions in teaching English to young learners: introduction to the Special Issue. *ELT Journal*, *68*(3), 223–230. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu030

Creswell, J. W. ., & Poth, C. N. . (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. SAGE.

DeKeyser, R. (2007). *Practice in a Second Language*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667275

Denzin, N. K. (2017). *The Research Act*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315134543

Dewaele, J.-M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2014). The two faces of Janus? Anxiety and enjoyment in the foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *4*(2), 237–274. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.5

Dijk, T. A. van. (1997). *Discourse studies : a multidisciplinary introduction*. Sage Publications.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Second Language Acquisition* (9th ed.). OxfordUniversityPress.

Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review*. Ministiry of Education.

Ellis, Rod. (2015). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Enever, Janet. (2018). *Policy and politics in global primary English*. Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, N. . (1993). *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity.

Field, J. (2009). *Listening in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511575945

Foucault, Michel. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Tavistock.

Fung, L., & Carter, R. (2007). Discourse Markers and Spoken English: Native and Learner Use in Pedagogic Settings. *Applied Linguistics*, *28*(3), 410–439. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm030

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Garton, S., & Copland, F. (Eds.). (2018). *The Routledge Handbook of Teaching English to Young Learners*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315623672

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315819679

Geertz, Clifford. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures : selected essays*. Basic Books.

Godfroid, A. (2019). *Eye Tracking in Second Language Acquisition and Bilingualism*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315775616

Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *32*(10), 1489–1522. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00096-X

Goodwin, C. (2007). Environmentally Coupled Gestures. In S. D. Duncan, J. Cassell, & E. T. Levy (Eds.), *Gesture and the Dynamic Dimension of Language* (Vol. 1). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/gs.1

Gullberg, M. (2006). Some reasons for studying gesture and second language acquisition (Hommage à Adam Kendon). *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *44*(2). https://doi.org/10.1515/IRAL.2006.004

Halliday, M. A. K. . (1979). *Language as social semiotic : the social interpretation of language and meaning*. Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. ., & Hasan, Ruqaiya. (1976a). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K. ., & Hasan, Ruqaiya. (1976b). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2013). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203431269

Hellermann, J. (2003). The interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: Teacher repetition in feedback moves. *Language in Society*, *32*(1), 79–104. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503321049

Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-Interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *68*(1), 15–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250506800103

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and Second Language Writing*. University of Michigan Press/ELT. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.23927

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

Kress, G. R. . (2010). *Multimodality : a social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. Routledge.

Kress, G. R. ., & Van Leeuwen, Theo. (2011). *Multimodal discourse : the modes and media of contemporary communication*. Arnold ; Oxford University Press.

Lahuerta Martínez, A. C. (2002). The use of discourse markers in E.F.L. learners' writing. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, *15*, 123. https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2002.15.08

Lantolf, J. P. ., & Thorne, S. L. . (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How Languages Are Learned* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997a). CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND LEARNER UPTAKE. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997b). CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND LEARNER UPTAKE. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

M. Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2014). Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learner. In *Theories in Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Macedonia, M., & Von Kriegstein, K. (2012). Gestures Enhance Foreign Language Learning. *Biolinguistics*, *6*(3–4), 393–416. https://doi.org/10.5964/bioling.8931

MacWhinney, B. (2000). *The CHILDES project: Tools for analyzing talk: Transcription format and programs* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Maley, A., & Duff, A. (2005). *Drama Techniques*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733079

McCarthy, Michael., & Swan, Michael. (2012a). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, Michael., & Swan, Michael. (2012b). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Mercer, S., & Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Engaging Language Learners in Contemporary Classrooms*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024563

Merriam, S. B. ., & Tisdell, E. J. . (2016). *Qualitative research : a guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.

Mondada, L. (2018a). Multiple Temporalities of Language and Body in Interaction: Challenges for Transcribing Multimodality. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *51*(1), 85–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2018.1413878

Mondada, L. (2018b). Multiple Temporalities of Language and Body in Interaction: Challenges for Transcribing Multimodality. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *51*(1), 85–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2018.1413878

Moon, J. (2000). *Children Learning English*. Macmillan.

Murphey, T. (1992). *Music and Song*. Oxford University Press.

Nation, I. S. P., & Hunston, S. (2013a). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858656

Nation, I. S. P., & Hunston, S. (2013b). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858656

Nation, P., & Newton, J. (2008). *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203891704

Norris, Sigrid. (2004). *Analyzing multimodal interaction : a methodological framework*. Routledge.

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. McGraw-Hill.

Philp, J., Adams, R., & Iwashita, N. (2013). *Peer Interaction and Second Language Learning*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203551349

Pinter, Annamaria. (2017). *Teaching young language learners*. Oxford University Press.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation Analysis*. SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412983792

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Rose, David., & Martin, J. R. . (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn : genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney school*. Equinox Pub.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, *50*(4), 696. https://doi.org/10.2307/412243

Samuels, S. J. (1997). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher*, *50*(5), 376–381.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language*, *53*(2), 361. https://doi.org/10.2307/413107

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning1. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129–158. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129

SCHMIDT, R. W. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning1. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129–158. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129

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

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

Sidnell, Jack. (2010). *Conversation analysis : an introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Silverman, David. (2013). *Doing qualitative research : a practical handbook*. SAGE.

Şimşek, G., & Çapar, M. (2022). ELT Classroom Interaction in Turkey: A Systematic Review. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *6*(2), 203–216. https://doi.org/10.34056/aujef.994908

Sinclair, J. McHardy., & Coulthard, Malcolm. (1978). *Towards an analysis of discourse : the English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.

Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior.* Appleton-Century-Crofts. https://doi.org/10.1037/11256-000

Stivers, T. (2008). Stance, Alignment, and Affiliation During Storytelling: When Nodding Is a Token of Affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *41*(1), 31–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810701691123

Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of Interaction in ESL Pair Work. *Language Learning*, *52*(1), 119–158. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00179

Streeck, J., Goodwin, Charles., & LeBaron, C. D. . (2014). *Embodied interaction : language and body in the material world*. Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and Second Language Learning: Two Adolescent French Immersion Students Working Together. *The Modern Language Journal*, *82*(3), 320–337. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01209.x

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: the uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, *4*(3), 251–274. https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880000400304

Taguchi, E. T.-M. M. G. G. J. (2004). Developing reading fluency in EFL: How assisted repeated reading and extensive reading affect fluency development. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *16*(2), 70–96.

Tellier, M. (2008). The effect of gestures on second language memorisation by young children. *Gesture*, *8*(2), 219–235. https://doi.org/10.1075/gest.8.2.06tel

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, *4*(2), 249–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Lev S. Vygotsky - Mind in Society_ The Development of Higher Psychological Processes (1978)*. Harvard University Press.

Wajnryb, R. (1990). *Grammar Dictation*. Oxford University Press.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. Routledge.

Walsh, Steve. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse : language in action*. Routledge.

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. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00788.x

Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback): A Single Case Analysis. *Language Learning*, *59*(4), 796–824. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00526.x

Waring, H. Z. (2013). Doing Being Playful in the Second Language Classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, *34*(2), 191–210. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams047

Wen, Z. (Edward). (2016). *Working Memory and Second Language Learning*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783095735

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2009). “Very good” as a teacher response. *ELT Journal*, *63*(3), 195–203. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn042

PPENDIX-A: Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Araştırma Etik Kurulu Onay Bildirimi

T.C.
HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Araştırma Etik Kurulu

Sayı : E-51944218-050-00003839517 24/10/2024
Konu : Etik Kurul (Sümeyye Merve TOPTAŞ ve Hatice ERGÜL)

YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞINA

İlgi : 14.10.2024 tarihli ve E-48490341-300-00003824352 sayılı yazı.

Ana Bilim Dalınız İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencilerinden **Sümeyye Merve TOPTAŞ'ın, Doç. Dr. Hatice ERGÜL** danışmanlığında yürüttüğü "***The Contribution of Active Use of The Target Language And Repetition Exercies in Foreıgn Language Education to The Language Development of Primary School Students (İlkokul Öğrencilerinin Yabancı Dil Eğitiminde Hedef Dilin Aktif Kullanımı ve Tekrar Alıştırmalarının Dil Gelişimine Katkısı)***" başlıklı tez çalışması Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Araştırma Etik Kurulunun **16.10.2024** tarihinde yapmış olduğu toplantıda incelenmiş olup, etik açıdan uygun bulunmuştur.

Bilgilerinizi ve ilgiliye tebliğini rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. İsmail Hakkı MİRİCİ
Kurul Başkanı

APPENDIX-B: 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.

(29.09.2025)

Signature

Sümeyye Merve TOPTAŞ

APPENDIX-C: Thesis/Dissertation Originality Report

19/10/2025

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
Graduate School of Educational Sciences
To The Department of Foreign Language Education
English Language Teaching Program

Thesis Title: The Contribution of Repetition Exercises In Foreign Language Education To The Language Development of Primary School Students

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 Defense	Similarity Index	Submission ID
16/10/2025	113	175.564	29/09 /2025	%8	2782840820

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: Sümeyye Merve TOPTAŞ

Student No.: N22139493 Signature

Department: Foreign Language Education

Program: English Language Teaching

Status: ☒ Masters ☐ Ph.D. ☐ Integrated Ph.D.

ADVISOR APPROVAL
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice ERGÜL

APPROVED
(Title, Name Lastname, Signature)

APPENDIX-D: 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 haklan 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.

- Enstitü/ Fakülte yönetim kurulu kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihinden itibaren 2 yıl ertelenmiştir. (1)
- Enstitü/Fakülte yönetim kurulunun gerekçeli kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihimden itibaren … ay ertelenmiştir. (2)
- Tezimle ilgili gizlilik kararı verilmiştir. (3)

16/10 /2025

(imza)

Sümeyye Merve TOPTAŞ

"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.*