HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Department of Foreign Language Education

English Language Teaching Program

ORIENTATION TO TEACHER IDENTITY AS AN INTERACTIONAL RESOURCE IN L2 TESTING AND EVALUATION CLASSROOM INTERACTION IN A TEACHER EDUCATION CONTEXT

Nakşidil DÜZÜN

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2022

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

ORIENTATION TO TEACHER IDENTITY AS AN INTERACTIONAL RESOURCE IN L2 TESTING AND EVALUATION CLASSROOM INTERACTION IN A TEACHER EDUCATION CONTEXT

ÖĞRETMEN EĞİTİMİ BAĞLAMINDA YABANCI DİLDE ÖLÇME VE DEĞERLENDİRME SINIF-İÇİ ETKİLEŞİMİNDE BİR ETKİLEŞİMSEL KAYNAK OLARAK ÖĞRETMEN KİMLİĞİNE YÖNELİM

Nakşidil DÜZÜN

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2022

Acceptance and Approval

To the Graduate School of Educational Sciences,

This thesis / dissertation, prepared by **NAKŞİDİL DÜZÜN** and entitled "The Interactional Organization of Teacher Trainer Talk in Classroom Feedback Sessions" has been approved as a thesis for the Degree of **Master** in the **Program of English Language Teaching** in the **Department of Foreign Language Education** by the members of the Examining Committee.

Chair	Prof. Dr. Belgin ELMAS
Member (Supervisor)	Assist. Prof. Dr. Nilüfer CAN DAŞKIN
Member	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ufuk BALAMAN

Decision of the Board of Directors of the Graduate School, issued on ..../..../....
with the number of ......

This is to certify that this thesis/dissertation has been approved by the aforementioned examining committee members on 27/12/2022 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 Foreign Language Teaching** by the Board of Directors of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences from ...../...../........

Prof. Dr. Selahattin GELBAL

Director of Graduate School of Educational Sciences

Abstract

Studies of interaction-based reflective practices in training pre-service English teachers have been gaining momentum; however, the micro-analysis of classroom interactional processes emerging in teacher education programs have not been adequately investigated. Besides, interaction studies conducted with L2 pre-service teachers mostly focus on "how to teach?" question and "how to test?" remains scarce. Drawing on multimodal Conversation Analysis (CA), this study investigates an English Language Testing and Evaluation (ELTE) course in an undergraduate program and presents a micro-analysis of language test item reviewing (IR) sessions in this course. The analysis reveals an interactional practice of the L2 teacher educator, Orientation to Teacher Identity (OTI), emerging in test item problematization (TIP) sequences to either problematize the test items or to elaborate on the problems. In both cases, the L2 teacher educator positions the L2 teacher trainees as actual English teachers in interaction, assigns a set of responsibilities relating to English teaching and testing, and charges them with displaying these responsibilities when writing language test items. These findings implicate that teacher educators may exploit pre-service teachers' identities for enacting professional actions. Also, L2 teacher trainees can benefit from dialogic reflection sessions to improve their practice of language test item writing. Lastly, problems in the trainees' test items highlight the importance of developing their language awareness necessary for pedagogical and/or professional activities. Overall, classroom interaction research exploring ELTE course context may unveil the interactional and pedagogical processes that contribute to the development of pre-service English teachers' L2 testing and evaluation knowledge and skills.

Keywords: conversation analysis, L2 teacher education, language testing, teacher identity, positioning

Öz

Hizmet öncesi İngilizce öğretmenlerinin yetiştirilmesinde etkileşime dayalı yansıtıcı uygulamalara yönelik çalışmalar ivme kazanmaktadır; ancak, öğretmen eğitimi programlarında ortaya çıkan sınıf içi etkileşim süreçleri yeterince araştırılmamıştır. Ayrıca, ikinci/yabancı/ek dil (YD) öğretmeni adaylarıyla yürütülen etkileşim çalışmaları çoğunlukla "nasıl öğretilir?" sorusu üzerine yoğunlaşırken "nasıl test edilir?" sorusuna yönelik etkileşim tabanlı araştırmalar yetersiz kalmaktadır. Çok modlu Konuşma Çözümlemesinden (KÇ) yararlanan bu çalışma, YD öğretmen adaylarının lisans programlarında aldıkları Yabancı Dil Öğretiminde Ölçme ve Değerlendirme derslerindeki doğal oluşumlu sınıf etkileşimini araştırmakta ve bu derslerdeki dil testi maddesi inceleme oturumlarının mikro analizini sunmaktadır. Yapılan çalışma ya test maddelerini sorunsallaştırmak ya da sorunları detaylandırmak için test maddesi sorunsallaştırma dizilerinde ortaya çıkan Öğretmen Kimliğine Yönelim (ÖKY) etkileşim kaynağını ortaya koymaktadır. Her iki durumda da YD öğretmen eğitmeni, YD öğretmen adaylarını etkileşim içinde gerçek İngilizce öğretmenleri olarak konumlandırır, İngilizce öğretme ve test etmeyle ilgili bir dizi sorumluluk atar ve onları dil testi öğeleri yazarken bu sorumlulukları sergilemekle görevlendirir. Bu bulgular, öğretmen eğitmenlerinin, mesleki eylemleri hayata geçirmek için öğretmen adaylarının kimliklerini kullanabileceklerini göstermektedir. Ayrıca, YD öğretmeni adayları, dil testi öğesi yazma uygulamalarını geliştirmek için diyalojik yansıtma oturumlarından yararlanabilirler. Son olarak, kursiyerlerin test maddelerindeki hatalar, onların dil farkındalıklarını geliştiren pedagojik ve/veya mesleki etkinliklere katılma gerekliliklerini vurgulamaktadır. Sonuç olarak, bir İngilizce ölçme ve değerlendirme dersi bağlamında yürütülen sınıf içi etkileşim araştırması, YD öğretmen adaylarının Yabancı Dil Öğretiminde Ölçme ve Değerlendirme bilgi ve becerilerinin gelişimine katkıda bulunan etkileşimli ve pedagojik süreçleri ortaya çıkarabilir.

Anahtar sözcükler: konuşma çözümlemesi, yabancı dil öğretmeni eğitimi, yabancı dilde ölçme, öğretmen kimliği, konumlandırma

Acknowledgements

It would not have been possible to complete this thesis without the support of many people. Therefore, I would like to thank all those people who are there for me through this long and challenging journey.

First and foremost, I am deeply grateful to my advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Nilüfer CAN DAŞKIN for her invaluable guidance and support throughout the process. Whenever I got lost in my thesis, she enlightened my way with her answers to my questions and feedback. Without her expertise and encouragement, I would not be able to complete this work. I also would like to express my gratitude to dear jury members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ufuk BALAMAN who has been inspiring me since my undergraduate years in Hacettepe University and Prof. Dr. Belgin ELMAS for their valuable feedback and contribution to this study. Lastly, I would like to express my thanks for Prof. Dr. Çiler HATİPOĞLU and Assist. Prof. Dr. Nilüfer CAN DAŞKIN for their permission to use their data for this study.

I also would like to express my deepest gratitude to Emir Ertunç HAVADAR for his never-ending emotional and academic support. Emir, you were always there whenever I felt devastated. Thank you for cheering me up in my down moments and believing in me.

Son olarak, kendi ayaklarım üzerinde durmam ve hiçbir zaman zorluklara boyun eğmemem için beni en güzel şekilde yetiştiren, iyi bir eğitim almam için çabalayan, beni koşulsuz seven annem Rabia DÜZÜN ve babam Mehmet Ali DÜZÜN'e; akademik hayatımda rol model aldığım, birlikteyken her zaman çok eğlendiğim ve ne zaman zorlansam benim için orada olduğunu bildiğim abim Emre DÜZÜN'e çok teşekkür ederim.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Symbols and Abbreviations

L2: Second/Foreign/Additional Language

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

EM: Ethnomethodology

CA: Conversation Analysis

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ESL: English as a Second Language

ELT: English Language Teaching

EMI: English as a medium of interaction

ELTE: English Language Testing and Evaluation

LTA: Language Testing and Assessment

LAL: Language Assessment Literacy

CIC: Classroom Interactional Competence

IR: Item Reviewing

TIP: Test Item Problematization

OTI: Orientation to Teacher Identity

SETT: Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk

TESOL: Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

TCU: Turn Constructional Unit

TRP: Transition-Relevance Place

DIU: Designedly Incomplete Utterance

TLA: Teacher Language Awareness

Chapter 1

Introduction

The role of social interaction in second/foreign/additional language (henceforth L2) teachers' professional development is a burgeoning research focus in L2 teacher education literature. These interactional studies conducted within a number of settings (e.g., post-observation feedback sessions, L2 classrooms) aim at contributing to the L2 teachers' professional learning; particularly, their L2 teaching (Li & Walsh, 2011) and dialogic reflection practices (Mann & Walsh, 2013, 2017).

Despite the growing body of research on dialogic encounters in post-observation feedback sessions, classroom interaction studies in L2 teacher education contexts remain scarce. Moreover, social interaction research on L2 teacher education mainly focuses on L2 teachers' teaching practices and development of their L2 teaching competencies (Bozbıyık et al., 2021). However, L2 teacher competencies other than teaching are scarcely examined. Recently, Can (2020) and Yöney (2021) investigated interactions in L2 testing settings and provide implications for L2 teachers professional development regarding L2 testing and evaluation. Therefore, broadening the interactional perspectives in L2 teacher education can enable educators to train prospective teachers effectively.

Considering these gaps, this study investigates classroom interaction in an English Language Testing and Evaluation (ELTE) course in Turkey. In the course the teacher educator and pre-service L2 teachers review language tests prepared by groups of L2 teacher trainees (i.e., pre-service L2 teachers) taking the course. Adopting a multimodal conversation analytic perspective, this study aims to explore interactional resources deployed by the teacher educator for training L2 teacher trainees for testing and evaluation practices.

Statement of the Problem

Following Firth and Wagner's (1997) call for a reconceptualization of second language acquisition (henceforth SLA) research, social-interactional paradigms have come into prominence in second/foreign language (henceforth L2) learning. To this end, Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA) has secured its position in the investigation of naturally occurring interactional practices both in SLA (Hellermann, 2013; Markee & Kunitz, 2015; Pekarek Doehler, 2010, 2013) and English as a Foreign Language (henceforth EFL) classroom interaction research (Can Daşkın, 2015, 2017; Sert, 2015; Walsh, 2011, 2013).

The impact of L2 teachers' management of classroom interaction has been discussed in several studies with different foci. For instance, L2 teachers' use of language was found to foster or inhibit learners' participation in classroom interaction in Walsh's (2002) and Fagan's (2014) studies. Similarly, the effect of multilingual (Malabarba, 2019) and multimodal (Evnitskaya & Berger, 2017) resources on learner participation in L2 classrooms has been explored. On top of that, L2 teachers' ability to use classroom interaction to assist learning, named as classroom interactional competence (CIC, Walsh, 2011), is shown to play a key role in shaping L2 teaching and learning processes. L2 classroom interaction studies paved the way for classroom interaction-based teacher training models such as Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) (SETT, Walsh, 2006, 2011), IMDAT (Sert, 2015).

Another domain of social-interactional perspectives in L2 teacher education is dialogic reflection practices. These practices also socially occur and they are co-constructed with the interactional contributions of trainees and experts (Kim & Silver, 2016; Waring 2013a). Much of the attention was given to the investigation of dialogic reflective practices in post-observation feedback sessions (Harris, 2013). These studies have contributed to the understanding of how L2 teachers engage in critical reflection regarding their own teaching practices. However, classroom interaction studies coming from L2 teacher education courses (e.g., TESOL classrooms, undergraduate courses) are not fully

discovered. In other words, there is limited research on interactions between L2 teacher educators and trainees. This hinders our understanding of how L2 teacher training socially occurs and teacher educators and trainees co-construct professional learning moments in and through classroom interaction.

From a socially situated perspective, the understanding of how L2 teachers acquire the knowledge of language teaching requires close investigation of the social contexts in which language teachers' knowledge is formed (Johnson, 2009). Although the undergraduate courses offered in L2 teacher education programs are significant in shaping L2 teachers' knowledge of L2 teaching (Freeman & Johnson, 1998), the research interest on these contexts is fairly limited (Yöney, 2021). However, a micro-analytic investigation of certain undergraduate courses can provide insights into the interactional resources conducive to the development of L2 teacher trainee knowledge of L2 teaching. Observable details in such micro-analytic examinations can imply interactional practices for L2 teacher training.

Pedagogical content knowledge of L2 teachers covers not only the issues related to L2 teaching but L2 testing and assessment (Shulman, 1987). However, much of the attention was given to the improvement of L2 teaching skills through dialogic reflections, post-observation feedback, and teacher training models contributing to L2 teachers' CIC. This research pathway cannot build a holistic L2 teacher competency since teaching and testing are interrelated (Hughes, 2003). Therefore, it is necessary for social-interactional research to focus on how L2 teacher educators teach and candidates learn to test and assess. On this account, Can (2020) examined the language test item reviewing session interactions between colleagues and Yöney (2021) investigated interactional practices occurring in an undergraduate English Language Testing and Evaluation (henceforth ELTE) course. More interactional research on this setting can bring pedagogical implications for developing L2 teacher trainees' ELTE knowledge.

Aim and Significance of the Study

The study investigates the classroom interactional practices of a teacher educator and L2 teacher trainees in an undergraduate ELTE course offered in an English Language Teaching (ELT) program in Turkey. This study aims to reveal interactional practices used for language test item writing and reviewing and learning opportunities related to L2 teacher trainees' testing knowledge. For this purpose, this study adopts Conversation Analysis (CA) as the research methodology to examine teacher educator – trainee interaction from their perspectives (i.e., emic perspective) in detail.

CA is a data-driven and qualitative research methodology used for the analysis of naturally occurring interactions. It enables to examine the minute details of social interaction in language classrooms and to explore a wide range of strategies that L2 teachers deploy in and through interaction. CA studies on L2 language teaching/learning have displayed observable evidence which can be addressed as indicators of learning in language classrooms (Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Seedhouse, 2005a). Therefore, utilizing CA to investigate classroom interaction of an ELTE course in a Turkish higher education setting can bring new insights into the literature of L2 teacher education and it may provide implications for the ELT programs in different higher education contexts.

The study analyzes the classroom interaction in language test item reviewing (IR) sessions. In these sessions, the teacher educator and L2 teacher trainees provide feedback to the tests prepared by their peers. In this sense, the study provides insights into educator and peer feedback interactions emerging in the ELTE courses. Previous feedback studies on L2 teacher education settings have mostly focused on post-observation feedback conferences in which L2 teachers and teacher educators evaluate the strengths and weakness of teaching practices of in-service L2 teachers. These post-observation feedback encounters were found to facilitate dialogic reflections of L2 teachers (Waring, 2017) and contribute to their professional learning/development. Despite the growing body of research on dialogic reflections between teacher educators and in-service L2 teachers in post-

observation feedback sessions, the teacher educator - trainee interactions in classroom-feedback sessions have remained under researched. Therefore, further studies exploring L2 teacher trainees' professional development are needed. To this end, this study can display the micro moments that facilitate or inhibit L2 teacher trainees' professional learning with specific reference to their L2 testing and evaluation skills.

Despite the attention given to the development of L2 teaching skills in and through social interaction, how the knowledge of L2 testing and evaluation evolves in interaction is less explored area. This study can fill this gap by uncovering the potential interactional resources that L2 teacher educators deploy for enhancing pre-service teachers' L2 testing and evaluation knowledge and skills. Unfolding of these resources can show how L2 teacher educators can create learning opportunities for L2 testing and contribute to L2 teacher trainees' professional competencies.

More specifically, this study focuses on a particular interactional resource, namely Orientation to Teacher Identity (OTI), which is deployed by the teacher educator after problematic test items are noticed. The practice of OTI is the teacher educator's use of teacher identity as an interactional resource/strategy to position the L2 teacher trainees as actual English teachers, assign epistemic responsibilities, and thus ground her language test item problematization acts on these non-displayed responsibilities. It should be noted that OTIs emerge only when there is a grammatical problem in the test items. The problematization of these items is initiated by both the teacher educator and L2 teacher trainees. The problems other than grammar are also problematized using other resources rather than OTIs but these problematizations are not in the scope of this study. In the problematization sequences with OTIs, the teacher educator refers to the trainees' teacher identities with such utterances as 'ah, English language teachers' and 'you are going to become English language teachers' or 'why are you teaching incorrect English to your students'. Drawing on such OTI sequences, the teacher educator asks the trainees to revise the problematic test items.

Research Questions

The study mainly focuses on a teacher educator's interactional resource (i.e., Orientation to Teacher Identity) in test item problematization (TIP) sequences. For this purpose, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How is OTI sequentially employed as an interactional resource by the teacher educator?

2. What social and institutional actions are achieved by the use of OTI in test item problematization sequences?

Assumptions

Using CA, the study investigates classroom interactional practices of a teacher educator and L2 teacher trainees in an ELTE course. CA is a qualitative research methodology utilized to explore the micro-moments of social interaction through detailed transcribed data. Therefore, it is assumed that the research methodology is appropriate to the aim of the study. Another assumption is that the flow of the lectures was not affected by the presence of recording cameras in the data collection process and the data contain naturally occurring talk.

Limitations

The participants of the study are limited to a group of L2 teacher trainees (in total 23 teacher candidates) and a teacher educator in an ELT program in a Turkish state university. Therefore, the interaction practices revealed in the findings of the study cannot be generalized to the other teacher education contexts. The recurrent phenomenon and the representative cases are based on 9 hours and 20 minutes of teacher educator - trainee interactions. In consideration of CA framework, the study aims to display the micro-moments of these interactions and reveal potentials of classroom interactions for professional knowledge awareness. The findings will be presented not as a description of

what other educators and trainees do in classroom feedback sessions but as what other teacher educators and trainees can do in such feedback encounters.

Definitions

The study adopted Conversation Analysis (CA) as the research methodology. CA is an approach to the study of social interaction. Kasper and Wagner (2014) state "CA is interested in a robust description of practices that participants use in regular ways in any interaction and that are expected to be recognized as what they are by other speakers" (p. 174). Using CA, the study revealed a teacher educator's context-specific interactional practice, namely Orientation to Teacher Identity (OTI), described as the teacher educator's use of teacher identity as an interactional resource to ground her language test item problematization acts. By the use of OTIs, the teacher educator positioned the L2 teacher trainees as actual L2 teachers and assigned epistemic responsibilities to the teacher trainees. According to Kayi-Aydar and Miller (2018), positioning is a social act and includes "moves that people assign certain positions to themselves and others, and along with each position comes a set of rights, duties and/or obligations" (p. 3). These OTI practices occurred in test item problematization (TIP) sequences. A TIP sequence include the teacher educator's critical feedback regarding the mistakes in the test items. These sequences were initiated by both the L2 teacher educator and L2 teacher trainees. Since these TIP sequences occurred in language test item reviewing (IR) sessions, it can be said that the L2 teacher educator and L2 teacher trainees reflect on the language tests prepared by the teacher trainees. Reflection in education settings is defined as "ability to analyze an action systematically and to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the action in order to improve practice" (Copland, Ma & Mann, 2009, p.15). The items were problematized mostly due to grammar mistakes. In chapter 5, a section is devoted to the discussion of L2 teacher trainees' lack of L2 knowledge and their lack of language awareness. Therefore, it is necessary to define Teacher Language Awareness (TLA). Thornbury (1997:x) defines it as

"the knowledge that teachers have of the underlying systems of the language that enables them to teach effectively."

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The current study investigates an English Testing and Evaluation course (ELTE) within a micro-analytic, interactional perspective from an L2 teacher education context. Accordingly, the first section will present the review of interaction-based studies in L2 teacher education, and the following sections will review testing and evaluation studies carried out within the L2 teacher education settings and teacher and student identity in social interaction.

Social Interaction and L2 Teacher Education

With the rise of social perspectives in human sciences, interaction has become a significant part of language learning and teaching studies. In line with the paradigm shift, researchers have been drawing on micro-analytic methods to investigate social interaction among language learners and teachers. By the same token, Conversation Analytic (CA) studies on second language acquisition (SLA) (Pekarek Doehler, 2010, 2013; Hellermann, 2013; Markee & Kunitz, 2015, Seedhouse, 2005a), and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom interaction (Walsh, 2011, 2013; Sert, 2015, Can Daşkın, 2015, 2017) have gained ground in the literature. Teacher education research has also witnessed the paradigm shift; and social, contextual, and interactional factors in teacher education come into prominence. For instance, Li (2020) re-conceptualizes teacher cognition, referred to as "cognition-in-interaction", as a discursive and more dialogic paradigm. According to Li (2020), cognition is not a fixed or stable state of mind but is rather an evolving concept that is constructed, demonstrated, and developed in and through social interaction. Previous research on teacher cognition has mostly been shaped around the cognitivist perspective which perceives teacher cognition as a "static mental entity" (Li, 2020, p. 26) that teachers have in their minds, and ignores the social and contextual factors that may also shape teacher cognition. The studies investigating teachers' cognition from a cognitivist

perspective have centered around topics such as the relationship between teachers'
teaching beliefs and their actual teaching practices (Basturkmen et al., 2004; Breen et al.,
2001; Gaitas & Alves Martins, 2015; Li, 2013) and teachers' beliefs with respect to the
teaching of subject matters or language skills (Andrews, 2003a; Çapan, 2014). A part of the
studies which explore the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their classroom
practices displays correspondence between their stated beliefs and classroom activities
(e.g., Richards & Lockhart, 1994) whereas some of them find a divergence between these
two and demonstrate that teachers may behave differently from what they believe (e.g.,
Basturkmen et al., 2004; Phipps & Borg, 2009).

From a socio-cultural perspective, teacher cognition is not a determined state of
mind, but it is a socially constructed and demonstrated phenomenon which is originated
and developed in and through the social activities that teachers take place in (Johnson,
2009). In Li (2020), teacher cognition is referred to as "[o]ne outcome of the interaction with
the context, which is highly shaped by and defined in situ" (p. 43). The social turn in teacher
cognition emphasizes the contextual factors that play a crucial role in shaping teachers'
beliefs about teaching and learning. It is argued that what teachers' stated beliefs and what
actually happens in the classroom can be quite different and these discrepancies between
teachers' beliefs and their classroom practices can be rooted in these social or contextual
factors such as the classroom interaction (Tsui, 2008) or institutional factors. With
increasing attention paid to social perspectives in L2 teacher education, the role of
interaction in shaping teachers' professional understandings and knowledge has come into
focus. The new standpoint has also paved the way for more systematic and empirical
interactional research on teacher education. For instance, the studies investigating
teachers' dialogic reflection practices constitute one part of research on interaction in
teacher education research. Teacher reflection, according to Copland et al. (2009), is "the
ability to analyze an action systematically and to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of

the action in order to improve practice" (p.15). In line with this definition, it can be argued that engaging in the reflective talk is a crucial part of teachers' professional development.

The studies focusing on teachers' reflective practices have been conducted in pre-service and in-service teacher education contexts by adopting different research methodologies. These studies draw on different research methodologies such as action research (e.g., Dinkelman, 2000), grounded theory (e.g., Rodman, 2010), narratives (Bayat, 2010), and conversation analysis (e.g., Lazaraton & Ishihara, 2005). An action research study conducted by Dinkelman (2000) examines to what extent pre-service teachers' critical self-reflections correspond to their teaching practices and the factors hindering or facilitating pre-service teachers' reflections about their teaching practices. The data consist of semi-structured interviews with the participants and the field notes taken by the researcher in classroom observation sessions and the written works competed by the participants such as reflective journals and lesson/unit plans. Although the study portrays an informative picture of the reflective practices of pre-service teachers, it does not provide any perspective of the emerging interactional practices through which pre-service teachers display their self-reflections about their teaching. Another reflection study conducted by Rodman (2010) uses structured reflection questions and grounded theory as the research methodology. Some studies utilize video-recorded teaching episodes to facilitate reflective practices of pre-service teachers in the early childhood education context. Bayat (2010) combines online journals and video-recorded teaching sessions to investigate how video-recordings of teaching episodes help teachers to reflect on their teaching practices. Although these studies inform us how RP can be fostered through several written tasks, they cannot genuinely display the interactional work teachers engage in their reflective practices.

In their illuminating paper, Mann and Walsh (2013) discuss the display of reflective practices in interaction and they highlight three key problems of the reflection studies. First of all, most of the studies rely on written formats of reflection that cannot display any concrete, linguistic elements of reflective practices. They argue that many reflection studies

have been conducted with an individualistic approach which relies on teachers completing the written reflective tasks such as checklists or reflective journals throughout the research process. It is even discussed that such written formats of reflection cause inauthentic reflection as the participants focus on completing the task rather than their real experiences. They suggest a data-led approach to reflective practices with particular attention to collaborative actions constituted in and through social interaction with other colleagues or mentors/educators. In other words, the key issue in reflection research should be investigating the interactional practices through which reflection is facilitated and achieved among participants rather than only focusing on the individuals' tasks. Such collaborative professional events are dialogic practices, and therefore their investigations may bring further implications concerning professional training. For instance, a qualitative study, conducted by Cherrington and Loveridge (2014) utilizes group stimulated-recall interviews to investigate early childhood teachers' reflections about their own teaching. The research emphasizes the advantages of video recordings and dialogic practices in facilitating teachers' self-reflection and negotiated understandings of their own and other teachers' teaching practices. It discusses the combination of video-recorded teaching sessions and retrospective dialogic processes in improving reflective practices of early childhood education (ECE) teachers. The study displays that ECE teachers' involvement in joint dialogue with other teachers after observing their own and their colleagues' teaching practices through video recordings facilitate their reflective practices and provide new insights into their own and other teachers' classroom practices as well as new insights into the content knowledge. Cherrington and Loveridge (2014) also suggest that engaging in collaborative dialogue with their colleagues helps teacher candidates construct a mutual understanding of teacher roles specific to the ECE context. There are also studies in language teacher education contexts that suggest video-based reflective practices and spoken forms of reflection facilitate genuine reflective practices of pre-service teachers (e.g., Yuan et al., 2020). These studies display that dialogic processes are remarkably influential in promoting authentic self-reflection practices of teachers/teacher candidates.

However, Lazaraton and Ishihara (2005) suggest that the type of research which relies on teachers' narrative inquiry as the only data source may be limited in displaying the actual classroom practices. In other words, teachers' stated understandings about their teaching practices may not truly display what actually happens in the classroom. In their case study, Lazaraton and Ishihara (2005) argue that a combining analysis of classroom interaction and teachers' self-reflections after the teaching episodes may better illustrate the correlation between the stated beliefs of teachers and their actual classroom practices. Utilizing Conversation Analysis as the research methodology, the study investigates video-recorded classroom interactions, focusing on an ESL teacher's non-verbal behaviors. After investigating the classroom talk, the researcher and the teacher engage in collaborative dialogue to figure out whether or to what extent the teacher's perceptions about her teaching practices coincide with her actual classroom practices. The collaborative dialogue between the researcher and the teacher display that the researcher's micro-analysis of the hand gestures and the teacher's main intention in using the gestures do not coincide. Using semi-structured interviews and video-recorded classroom interactions, Li and Walsh (2011) conducted a similar case study investigating the correspondence between two English language teachers' perceptions about teaching and learning and their actual classroom activities. They argue that teachers' beliefs both shape and shaped by the classroom interaction, and the key issue here is not to display a coherence or divergence between teachers' stated beliefs and their classroom practices but is to display the interdependent relationship between teachers' beliefs, perceptions, knowledge, and their classroom interactions. The aforementioned studies suggest that a blending analysis of classroom interaction and teachers' dialogic post reflections creates space for professional development as teachers have a chance to observe their actual classroom practices and make connections with their beliefs, understandings, or knowledge about teaching and learning through engaging a dialogic process.

The discursive paradigm in teacher reflection studies has paved the way for classroom interaction-based teacher training models such as Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) (Walsh, 2006, 2011), and IMDAT (Sert, 2015), which includes steps of "Introduction of classroom interactional competence (CIC) to teachers, Micro/initial-teaching experiences, Dialogic reflection on video-recorded teaching practices with the help of a mentor/supervisor/educator, Another round of teaching observed by a peer and Teacher collaboration for peer-feedback" (Sert, 2019, p.221),. SETT framework is based on Walsh's (2011) classroom modes known as managerial mode, materials mode, skills and system mode, and classroom context mode. He argues that every classroom mode has its distinctive features distinguished by its pedagogic focus and specific interactional resources. SETT framework aims to develop teachers' language teaching practices through self-reflection tasks about their classroom interactions in these specific classroom contexts. SETT has been adopted to observe and facilitate language teachers' L2 classroom interactional competence (CIC) which is the use of interaction in assisting language learning opportunities of learners. IMDAT has also been adopted in improving the CIC of teachers through the introduction of CIC to teachers, video-mediated dialogic reflections about their classroom talk, and feedback sessions with mentors and peers. SWEAR is another framework that entails a micro-analytic focus on the classroom talk between teachers and students to locate and resolve the interactional troubles between teachers and students. The joint focus of these frameworks is to facilitate in-service and/or pre-service teachers' critical self-reflections about their classroom practices and improve their classroom interactional competence, which eventually leads to professional development in language teaching and learning. One of the features offered by these models is the promotion of a dialogic reflection process between educators and trainees for professional development in post-observation feedback sessions. Therefore, a micro-analytic focus on the real-time interactions of teachers and teacher educators in these feedback encounters is particularly needed to unearth the specific interactional resources facilitating teacher reflection.

To fill this gap, post-observation feedback sessions that bring teacher educators and teachers together have been investigated with a particular focus on interaction in many studies. Based on analysis of four video-recorded post-observation, feedback interactions in a graduate TESOL program, Waring's (2013a) study reveals that teachers may engage in reflective talk without an explicit invitation from the mentors. This study explores two mentor practices that facilitate teacher reflection without the specific act of request and it is one of the preliminary studies which apply CA methodology to investigate the nature of post-observation feedback encounters. In another CA study, Harris (2013) uncovers the interactional organization of post-observation feedback meetings of a TESOL program to bring an empirical point of view into the understanding of teacher reflection in interaction. Similarly, Kim and Silver (2016) explore the sequential organization of a post-observation feedback interaction to uncover the specific mentor and teacher practices that facilitate teacher reflection. In line with the previous research, they argue that reflection is constructed and maintained through collaborative work, and even the minor details of mentor-teacher talk (e.g., who initiate the interaction) can influence the emergence of reflective thinking. Sert (2019) argues that post-observation feedback encounters create space for teachers' professional development by ensuing teachers to negotiate their competencies through dialogic reflection and critical feedback. Aside from the importance of reflective practices in teachers' professional development, both promoting teacher reflection, and engaging in reflection requires interactional work. Although post-observation feedback encounters aim at demonstrating the strengths and weaknesses of particular teaching practices, such encounters can become face-threatening for teachers as their professional competencies are challenged (Copland et al., 2009; Copland, 2010). Waring (2017) argues that post-observation feedback sessions require sensitive use of language. Using video-recorded post-observation conversations, she shows that mentors deploy an interactional resource (i.e., going general) when criticizing and proposing solutions in feedback sessions. Delivering and receiving feedback is an integral part of teacher education settings since it mirrors individuals' performance of a task, and thus it is viewed

by many practitioners as a sine qua non for improvement of teaching and learning cycle. In another study, Vehviläinen (2009) presents two cases of delivering critical feedback and trainees' resistance to the mentor's feedback in an academic supervision encounter. Despite the growing body of research on dialogic reflections of L2 teachers in post-observation feedback sessions, classroom interaction studies that examine the naturally occurring practices of teacher educators and teacher trainees in different teacher education contexts are fairly limited in the literature.

Regarding classroom interaction research in teacher education, studies that bring remarkable insights into the learning experiences of pre-service teachers emerging within the classroom interaction are limited in the literature (Duran, 2017; Duran & Sert, 2019; Duran et al., 2019; Duran & Jacknick, 2020; Jacknick & Duran; 2021). They investigate the interactional organization of the "Guidance" course offered in a Turkish university that uses English as a medium of interaction (EMI). The participants include a teacher educator and pre-service teachers from several educational departments including the English Language Teaching department. Considering the findings uncovering the interactional practices that create classroom learning opportunities for pre-service teachers, these studies are noteworthy in displaying the promises of classroom interaction in teacher education. However, the scope of these studies did not involve the role of classroom interaction with specific reference to L2 teacher education. In other words, professional-related learning opportunities of pre-service L2 teachers in classroom interaction remain to be explored.

The role of classroom interaction in hindering or facilitating language learning opportunities for EFL learners is portrayed in several conversation analytic classroom interaction studies. For instance, Seedhouse (2004) introduced the concept of classroom contexts (e.g., form and accuracy, meaning and fluency), and documented that there is a reflexive relationship between the pedagogical agenda and the organization of classroom interaction. In other words, each classroom context has its own distinctive interactional fingerprints which shape and are shaped by the pedagogical goals of the context. For

instance, by demonstrating the interactional organization of a form and accuracy context, the study brings remarkable insights into the understanding of error correction, error treatment, and corrective feedback types from a classroom interactional perspective. Therefore, the study provides practical implications for language teachers to align their pedagogical agenda with the interactional actions they deployed, and thus create language learning opportunities. Similarly, Sert (2015) investigates L2 classrooms discourse from the perspective of social interaction. By utilizing video recordings of two EFL classrooms in Luxembourg, this book provides remarkable insights into the understanding of classroom interaction and language learning opportunities generated by this interaction. Each chapter of the book reveals different interactional resources/strategies employed in the EFL classroom and displays how these resources create space for language learning. The book contributes to the understanding of multilingual and multimodal resources in creating language learning opportunities in L2 classrooms. Sert (2015) also provides implications for English language teachers in relation to the development of classroom interactional competence. Many other studies investigate the importance of classroom interaction for creating language learning opportunities with different research foci. Walsh (2002) suggested that EFL teachers' use of language may hinder or facilitate learner participation in the language classroom. Fagan (2014) also revealed the role of teacher talk by displaying the organization of positive feedback turns in English as a Second Language (ESL) classrooms. Turn management and management of competitive voices in L2 classrooms have been investigated in Mortensen's (2008) study. The use of multilingual (Sert, 2015; Malabarba, 2019; aus der Wieschen & Sert, 2018) and multimodal (Sert, 2015; Evnitskaya & Berger, 2017; Eskildsen & Wagner, 2013) resources in language classrooms and their potential in hindering or facilitating learner participation have also been investigated. The aforementioned studies display that investigating classroom interaction brings new insights into EFL teacher education regarding the role of teacher talk in creating learning opportunities.

However, these interactional studies have mainly focused on the issue of "how to teach" within the literature, and research on interaction in L2 teacher education has mostly examined the development of L2 teachers' teaching abilities through dialogic reflection and classroom interaction-based teacher training models (e.g., SETT, IMDAT, SWEAR) which aim at contributing to classroom interactional competences of L2 teachers. While L2 pre-service teachers' teaching strategies have been uncovered and modeled through classroom interactional frameworks, their testing abilities have not gathered similar attention even though teachers' pedagogical content knowledge also includes testing as a significant part (Shulman, 1987). Teaching and testing are intertwined since tests are mainly designed for assessing whether the learning objectives have been met by the learners (Dochy, 2009), indicating that testing is conducted for assessing the degree teaching has been achieved. Given that teaching and testing are interrelated, a similar classroom interactional focus previously paid to L2 pre-service teachers' teaching skills is necessary for exploring and understanding the development of teacher candidates' testing knowledge and skills.

Testing and Evaluation in L2 Teacher Education

The concepts related to testing and evaluation in pre-service and/or in-service language teacher education have been investigated within several research foci. For instance, language teachers' assessment beliefs and practices have been investigated in both international (Jannati, 2015) and national EFL contexts (Büyükkarcı 2014). Using introspective data such as questionnaires and interviews, these studies aim at displaying the relationship between language teachers' perceptions of language assessment and their actual assessment practices in classrooms. Some of these studies have reported pre-service (Kavaklı & Arslan, 2019) and in-service L2 teachers' (Ölmezer-Öztürk, Aydın, 2019) inadequate assessment knowledge and negative perceptions about their language testing abilities. Others have suggested that although language teachers have positive opinions about formative assessment practices as they are effective in facilitating students' learning processes, they do not apply such assessment techniques in their classrooms (Büyükkarcı,

2014; İnan Karagül et al., 2017). Language teachers reportedly face challenges in applying their assessment beliefs in their classrooms, and these include crowded classrooms and a high degree of workload (Büyükkarcı, 2014), assessment systems of institutions, intensive syllabi, students' educational backgrounds (Gonen & Akbarov, 2015), and insufficient class hours (İnan Karagül et al., 2017). There are also studies that find out an alignment between teachers' assessment beliefs and their assessment practices (Chan, 2008; Han & Kaya, 2014; Kirkgoz et al., 2017; Öz 2014). Although these studies portray an informative picture of language teachers' assessment beliefs and practices through introspective data, a micro-analytic investigation into the EFL contexts may uncover the actual problems language teachers face while applying their assessment beliefs into their classrooms. Similarly, an interactional focus into teacher education contexts, especially the language testing and assessment courses where the teacher trainees learn the fundamentals of language testing, may display the strengths and/or weaknesses of teacher education programs in improving teacher candidates' testing and assessment practices.

Language Assessment Literacy (LAL) and assessment training needs of EFL teachers are increasingly studied using different methodologies. Hasselgreen et al.' survey study (2004) has uncovered further training needs for language teachers in Europe in different points of language testing and assessment. Similarly, Fulcher (2012) has designed a questionnaire to investigate the assessment training needs of language teachers and has proposed implications for language testing courses and designing new teaching materials in language testing and assessment. Tavassoli and Farhady's study (2018) has applied Fulcher's (2012) questionnaire together with some open-ended questions to 246 language teachers and has obtained parallel findings with the previous research. There are also studies focusing on the assessment training needs of English instructors in higher education contexts in Turkey (Ölmezer-Öztürk & Aydın, 2019) and China (Gan & Lam, 2020). One shared finding of these studies suggests inadequate LAL and further training needs of language teachers. LAL of in-service EFL teachers were also investigated in many other

international (Guerin, 2010; Hakim, 2015; Jannati, 2015; Tsagari & Vogt, 2017; Vogt & Tsagari, 2014; Xu, 2019), and national L2 teacher education studies (Büyükkarcı, 2016; Ölmezer-Öztürk & Aydın, 2018, 2019; Yeşilçınar & Kartal, 2020). These studies reported parallel findings which are inadequate LAL of in-service EFL teachers and their further training needs in language testing and assessment. One of the notable suggestions of these studies is that even though EFL teachers had language assessment knowledge or they were aware of the fundamentals of language assessment, they were not able to put their knowledge into practice in assessment processes (Hakim, 2015; Jannati, 2015; Tsagari & Vogt, 2017; Vogt & Tsagari, 2014). These studies discussed that EFL teachers need more practice-based assessment training in L2 teacher education programs to bridge the gap between the theory and practice of language assessment. Two similar studies in the Turkish teacher education contexts revealed that even though EFL teachers in Tukey had knowledge about language assessment, they could not practice their knowledge in their classroom due to several external reasons such as crowded classrooms or lack of technological tools (Tuzcu-Eken, 2016). It is also evident in several studies that neither teaching experience nor post-graduate education contributes to the development of the EFL teachers' LAL (Büyükkarcı, 2016). In their small-scale research study, Yeşilçınar and Kartal (2020) investigate three EFL teachers' perceptions and practices on language assessment of young learners. The data consist of semi-structured interviews that were content-analyzed. The study also revealed a divergence between the language teachers' assessment beliefs and their actual practices as well as their inadequate assessment literacy. The study display that language teachers did not take up an assessor identity due to several reasons such as problems in teacher training. The study proposes that pre-service teacher education programs should further encourage the identity development of language teachers as assessors.

Despite the growing body of research on in-service EFL teachers' language assessment literacy in both international and national teacher education contexts, research

on assessment literacy of pre-service EFL teachers is fairly limited in the literature (Sevimel Sahin & Subasi, 2019). Some of the studies investigating LAL of pre-service teachers have reported parallel findings with the studies conducted with in-service teachers. Even though teacher candidates have the knowledge of language assessment (Viengsang, 2016) or they are aware of the recent developments in English language testing (Komur, 2018), they are not able to put their knowledge into practice (Hatipoğlu, 2015; Komur, 2018; Viengsang, 2016). This points out that there is a gap between theory and practice in language assessment training and existing assessment training procedures cannot bridge this gap. Similarly, Kavaklı and Arslan (2019) suggest that student-teachers need more authentic and practice-based assessment courses and a more active role in the test preparation processes in practicum sessions. The aforementioned studies generally employ introspective data such as questionnaires or interviews to investigate language teachers' assessment literacy levels. The majority of them demonstrate inadequate LAL of both in-service and pre-service teachers and language assessment courses are reportedly insufficient in both contexts (Sevimel Sahin & Subasi, 2019). Since the language testing and assessment courses offered by teacher education programs provide the fundamentals of language assessment for teachers/teacher candidates, an interactional perspective into such courses may highlight the nature of these courses. A micro-analytic investigation into the teacher training contexts in general and into "language testing and evaluation" courses, in particular, can also help to understand the interactional and pedagogical processes that contribute to the development of pre-service English teachers' Testing and Evaluation Knowledge and Skills (TEKSs) in and through classroom interaction in teacher education programs.

Foreign Language Teacher Education Programs offered by the faculties of education are where the teacher candidates are equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills for their prospective language teaching careers. Similarly, these are the spaces where prospective teachers develop their teacher cognition with theoretical knowledge and

practical skills. In addition to being one of the fundamental parts of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, language assessment is also one of the keystones of the language teaching and learning process (Hatipoğlu, 2015) as it mirrors the success or failure of the instruction (Dochy, 2009). Since assessment has a crucial role in the teaching and learning cycle, it is a must-have duty for teacher education programs to train prospective language teachers with the requirements of language testing and assessment (LTA). LTA courses in language teacher education programs have been investigated in both international (Brown & Bailey, 2008; Jin, 2010; Kleinsasser, 2005; Lam, 2015; O' Loughlin, 2006) and national teacher education contexts (Büyükahıska, 2020; Hatipoğlu, 2010, 2015, 2017; Şahin, 2019; Yöney, 2021). These studies provide insights into the LTA courses in different teacher education contexts in relation to the course objectives and content, instructors' perceptions on, and pre-service/in-service teachers' attitudes towards these courses. For instance, O' Loughlin (2006) utilizes postgraduate students' narratives to investigate their learning experiences in a post-graduate second language assessment course. The study has revealed that students' previous assessment experiences, their cultural backgrounds, and the quality of input they receive in assessment courses may influence their willingness or capacity to attain new concepts in testing and evaluation. On the other hand, Brown & Bailey's (2008) questionnaire study provides a general framework for the characteristics of English Language Testing and Assessment courses offered in several countries from the point of course instructors. The findings revealed the levels of coverage for certain testing and assessment topics in such courses. For instance, hands-on experiences such as test critiquing and test analysis had the highest level of coverage. The findings also displayed that the majority of LTA courses include practical concepts of testing such as item writing and/or item analysis. Although language testing and assessment courses have parallel contents, the degree of coverage for each topic varied among different teacher education contexts. Brown and Bailey (2008) suggest a need analysis study to decide language teachers' training needs in foreign language testing and form a valid curriculum accordingly.

In terms of LTA courses in Turkey, Hatipoğlu (2010) investigates an undergraduate level of ELTE course offered at a Turkish state university through a summative evaluation study. The study employs questionnaires and interviews to reveal pre-service English teachers' opinions about the course content and its teaching methodology. The results displayed pre-service teachers' positive attitudes towards the practical aspects of testing and evaluation. Similarly, based on need analysis questionnaires and focus group interviews, Hatipoğlu (2015) uncovers English teacher candidates' testing knowledge as well as their opinions on what an ELTE course content and syllabus should include. The results revealed inadequate assessment knowledge of pre-service teachers. Hatipoğlu (2015) discusses the challenges of covering all theoretical and practical aspects of foreign language testing through a single ELTE course offered in undergraduate teacher education. Therefore, the study suggests further training for pre-service English teachers in ELTE to fulfill the testing and evaluation processes requirements in their prospective teaching careers. Similarly, Büyükahıska's (2020) interview study conducted with pre-service English teachers revealed their needs for further training in assessment as well as their positive attitudes toward the necessity of ELTE courses for their future careers.

Providing a general understanding of the ELTE courses in Turkey, Şahin (2019) emerges as a remarkable one conducted with pre-service teachers and course instructors. Şahin (2019) investigates ELTE courses in Turkey regarding their content, teaching methodology, learning objectives, and role in prospective English teachers' professional development. The results indicated that the majority of ELTE courses in Turkey focus on the theoretical aspects of language testing and the practice-oriented topics such as item construction and/or item analysis are ignored due to the time limitation. These results contrast with Brown & Bailey's (2008) study uncovering that practice-based topics were also covered in the majority of ELTE courses in several countries. To evaluate the effectiveness of an educational process, testing and assessment practices should display parallelism with the teaching methods adopted in an educational context. Therefore, language teachers are

expected to decide on the appropriate testing method aligning with their teaching and the contextual needs of their institutions (Hatipoğlu, 2010, 2015) to prepare their tests accordingly. Given that, acquiring practical skills such as test/item writing and test/item analysis is quite important for pre-service teachers to prepare and administer their own tests (Brown,1996). This points out that ELTE courses in Turkey should revise their syllabi to form more practice-oriented content including such topics as language test construction and test/item reviewing. All these studies, drawing on retrospective data, present significant findings from the perspective of teachers and teacher educators concerning the development of ELTE courses; however, the interactional processes emerging in actual classroom interaction in these courses remain to be explored. This suggests interactionally driven studies on ELTE courses can further unfold how the interaction between a teacher educator and teacher candidates contributes to the pre-service teachers' language testing and evaluation knowledge development.

Item reviewing is seen as one of the fundamental steps of language test construction (Fulcher, 2010) since the process enables practitioners to notice the mistakes or problems in the test before it is administered (Brown, 1996). It is also discussed that accomplishing the item reviewing process in collaboration with co-workers (e.g., other teachers in an institution) is necessary for increasing the test validity (Brown, 1996; Fulcher, 2010). In her remarkable study, Can (2020) investigates item reviewing interactions of EFL instructors working at an English prep school by using Conversation Analysis. The findings revealed the overall organization of item reviewing (IR) sessions as well as the specific interactional resources serving for the establishment of mutual understanding and decision-making among the stakeholders. The sequential analysis of IR interactions demonstrates how problematic test items were recognized and how suggestions to revise the problematic items were offered by the participants. The study is noteworthy in terms of displaying how the interaction between the collaborators in test construction processes contributes to testing principles such as test validity and reliability. Besides, the study provides valuable

implications for the improvement of L2 teacher education programs regarding the ELTE courses offered for pre-service teachers. Given that the study highlights the importance of interaction in writing test items, uncovering to what extent such an interactional practice is integrated into testing courses in undergraduate education gains importance. With this in mind, investigating the interaction emerging in item review sessions in an ELTE course can provide practical implications for language teacher education, particularly for language testing and assessment training.

Testing and evaluation are an integral part of language education as it provides evidence for whether or to what extent the language teaching and learning process has been achieved. For this reason, pre-service teachers are expected to gain the necessary knowledge and praxis base in testing and teaching to fulfill the responsibilities of their prospective careers as L2 teachers. However, many studies display that pre-service teachers' testing skills do not develop adequately with the training they receive in their undergraduate education (Büyükahıska, 2020; Hatipoğlu, 2015; Şahin, 2019). Moreover, pre-service teachers comprehend their inadequacy in testing and evaluation only when they become in-service teachers and face the challenges of assessment processes (Brown & Bailey, 2008; Vogt & Tsagari, 2014). One important reason for this is that pre-service teachers receive theory-based testing training in their undergraduate years. They are not given the opportunity to put their theoretical knowledge into practice (Stiggins, 2002). Although it is evidenced in many studies that pre-service English teachers need more training to improve their practical testing skills such as language test construction or test item analysis, there is only one attempt to examine the classroom learnings of pre-service English teachers. In another exceptional study, Yöney (2021) investigates the classroom interactions of pre-service English teachers and a teacher educator in the context of an English testing and evaluation course. Using Conversation Analysis, the study unearths an interactional phenomenon namely "Assuming Learner Behavior" occurring in item reviewing sessions and shows that it has various interactional functions employed to achieve certain

context-dependent interactional works such as orienting to the different facets of test items (Yöney, 2021). The study contributes to the development of pre-service English teachers' testing and evaluation skills by bringing a classroom interactional insight into their classroom learning opportunities emerging in an ELTE course. In this way, Yöney (2021) provides classroom interaction-based evidence to pre-service teachers' practical knowledge in ELTE courses which is largely unexplored, and to which I will turn in the following chapters.

Before proceeding, it might be necessary to recall points discussed so far and the context of this study to wrap up the gaps in the literature that are also the underlying reasons for this research. The first chapter of literature demonstrates language teachers' professional development in and through interaction in different teacher education contexts. One spectrum of research on interaction in L2 teacher education focuses on teachers' reflective practices as an essential part of teacher development since it allows teachers to analyze their teaching practices with retrospective thinking. Previous research investigated reflective practices of teachers mostly through written materials such as reflective journals (e.g., Bayat, 2010); however, Mann and Walsh (2013) suggest that spoken forms of reflection such as engaging in dialogic processes with mentors or peers are more effective in promoting teachers' genuine reflections. In line with this, video recordings of teaching sessions are reported as one of the facilitators of teachers' spoken reflections as they enable them to observe their teaching practices and discuss these practices in feedback sessions with mentors/peers. In terms of investigating the promises of social interaction in L2 teacher education, Conversation Analysis (CA) is an eligible methodology as it enables researchers to analyze micro-details of interaction between teachers and mentors and display the learning opportunities emerging in those interactions. Therefore, post-observation feedback sessions that bring mentors and teachers together are also investigated within the CA methodology in several studies. This spectrum of research brings new insights into the role of mentor talk in promoting teachers' reflective practices in

feedback sessions and displays the learning opportunities generated by the ongoing interaction in these feedback encounters. The affordances of doing reflection and the role of interaction in promoting teachers' reflective practices have contributed to the development of CA-based teacher training models. CA-based teacher training models such as SETT and/or IMDAT are introduced to improve teachers' classroom interactional competence, and thus their teaching practices. Besides, language teachers' professional development has mostly been investigated in post-observation feedback sessions; however, their classroom learning opportunities emerging in classroom interaction are examined in only a few studies (Duran & Jacknick, 2020; Jacknick & Duran; 2021).

All in all, the studies in the first chapter demonstrate that the improvement of teaching skills is regarded as a sine qua non for teachers' professional development in many teacher education contexts. Although the improvement of teachers' teaching skills is investigated with growing interest, language teachers' assessment knowledge or the improvement of their testing and evaluation skills in and through interaction remains to be explored. Since the knowledge of assessment is also an essential part of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987), the second chapter is devoted to studies in testing and evaluation in L2 teacher education. The second chapter of the literature illustrates language teachers' assessment literacy and their assessment training needs, the relationship between language teachers' testing beliefs and their testing practices, and English testing and evaluation (ELTE) courses offered in different countries. Most of the studies investigating language assessment literacy suggest inadequate assessment literacy of language teachers as well as their further training needs in language assessment. The evaluation of ELTE courses in Turkey demonstrates that there is a theory-oriented content design in these courses and teacher candidates need further training in practical aspects of language testing and evaluation (e.g., test writing, item reviewing). Besides, the majority of the studies in testing and evaluation literature utilize introspective data (e.g., surveys, narratives) to investigate the aforementioned topics such as assessment beliefs or

assessment literacy. However, only a few studies focus on the interactions emerging in different testing and evaluation contexts (Can, 2020; Yöney 2021). All in all, the previous chapters summarize that both teaching skills and testing and evaluation knowledge are indispensable parts of language teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, and a micro-analytic investigation of how these skills are acquired and/or developed in and through interaction is particularly needed. By examining the interactions emerging in test item reviewing sessions in classroom interaction, this study aims to demonstrate the affordances of classroom interaction in shaping pre-service teachers' pedagogical content knowledge with specific reference to language testing and evaluation. These affordances can take the form of interactional resources that are deployed by teacher educators and that can achieve several institutional goals such as preparing the pre-service teachers for their future careers as English language teachers. With this in mind, I will first review teacher identity in interaction and then show how the teacher educator draws on teacher identity as an interactional resource in the findings section.

Teacher and Student Identity in Interaction

Identity as an interactionally constructed phenomenon has been investigated within different research foci in different social settings including teaching and learning contexts. According to Kasper and Wagner (2011) "Identities […] are not assumed to reside in a person but are interactionally produced, locally occasioned, and relationally constituted"(p. 121, 122). In many studies investigating identity in interaction, Zimmerman's (1998) identity definition as "an element of context for talk-in-interaction" (p. 87), is adopted as the theoretical framework. Zimmerman (1998) proposes three categories for "identity-as-context". The first category is discourse identity which is related to the turn-by-turn organization of talk-in-interaction and the positions people occupy in interaction such as current speaker and/or listener. The second category is situated identity related to the context-specific roles of people. For instance, in a teaching and learning environment, people assume the roles of teacher and student. On the other hand, transportable identity

is related to people's individual characteristics which are beyond the context. For instance, a teacher could be a young woman, Japanese, or a football lover. In line with these definitions, identity is related to neither static roles nor predetermined categorizations. Identity is a dynamic and constantly evolving concept emerging in interaction and appertaining to social situations.

One spectrum of research investigating the different functions of identities in classroom interaction focuses on the identity deviations performed by teachers and students (Amador and Adams 2013; Okada, 2015; Richards, 2006; Shvidko, 2018, 2020; Skinner, 2012; Taylor; 2021). In these studies, identity deviations refer to the teachers' or students' orientations to the other facets of their identities aside from the established roles of teacher and/or student (Taylor, 2021). This line of research suggests that participants' invocation of 'non-situational identities', defined by Taylor (2021) as "identities above and beyond institutionally assigned roles of teacher and student" (p. 5), may have interactional functions in achieving certain pedagogical purposes such as creating symmetrical classroom environments and facilitating authentic conversation (Richards, 2006), creating interactional space for learners (Okada, 2015) and expressing empathy and affiliation (Shvidko, 2018, 2020; Taylor, 2021; Waring, 2013b).

For instance, Richards (2006) suggests that through orienting to non-default classroom identities apart from the roles of teacher and student, the normativity of classroom interaction following the Initiation-Response-Feedback (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) sequences may be diversified. Therefore, a less asymmetric classroom environment can be created in teacher-fronted classrooms and authentic conversations can be facilitated. Waring (2013b) displayed how the initiation and maintenance of playful talk are accomplished through identity shifts by investigating the different identities assumed by students in interaction in an English as a second language (ESL) classroom. The study demonstrated that the students' orientations to personal identities (e.g., basketball lovers) created space for more authentic conversation. Some of the studies focus on the identity

shifts made by teachers and the affordances of teachers' orientation to different facets of their identities in facilitating classroom interaction. For instance, Skinner (2012) investigated the identity orientations of teacher trainees in two different instructional settings as microteaching episodes and real classroom interaction. It is observed in microteaching sessions that the situated identity roles could be reversed when there was a problem with giving instructions to the learners. In other words, the teacher trainees could assume the role of the student whereas the microteaching learners assumed to role of the teacher. However, in real classroom interactions, the teacher trainees took on their situated identity and tried to keep up this identity through the lesson by maintaining IRF sequences or not accepting the students' correct answers unless they are the expected answers. It is also observed that the teacher trainees displayed orientation to their transportable identities as TESOL students in microteaching episodes. All in all, the study demonstrated that the teacher trainees' use of reversed situated identities and transportable identities in microteaching sessions creates interactional space for microteaching learners and facilitates authentic conversation among the learners (Skinner, 2012). Therefore, it is suggested that the use of non-situated identities which are beyond the traditional role of teacher and student should be encouraged as it allows for more meaningful communication in classrooms. Skinner (2012) proposes that invocation of reversed situated identities can be achieved through tasks in which learners are supposed to teach each other. Besides, classroom activities in which learners can invoke their transportable identities may also create interactional space for learners and promote authentic conversations in language classrooms.

Similarly, Okada (2015) argues that in language classrooms, the identities of teachers and students are normative and the interactional actions follow this normativity of institutional roles through IRF sequences formed around role-bound actions (e.g., initiation of the teacher, a response from the student, feedback from the teacher). However, these are not the only identities teachers and students occupy in language classrooms. They also

have their transportable identities (Zimmerman, 1998) that a teacher might be a young man or a football lover, and a student might be a girl or a photographer. Okada (2015) frames these identities as 'non-role-specific identities' (p. 77) and investigates if they perform any interactional or pedagogical action in language classrooms. Okada's (2015) study investigated how an English teacher's orientation to his own and his students' identities other than the teacher and student identities promoted student participation in article discussions in an English for specific purposes (ESP) classroom. Upon the discussion leader directed his science-related question to the teacher, the teacher identified himself as a 'sociologist', and thus a non-expert in science. Then, he positioned the students as scientists and this positioning ascribes certain epistemic responsibilities to those students (e.g., answering the science-related question correctly). In doing so, the teacher educator initiated a discussion in relation to the discussion leader's question among the students. Therefore, the teacher's orientation to 'non-role-specific' identities achieves the pedagogical purposes of an ESP classroom which is to teach and learn the target language to use in specific fields such as science. The study clearly demonstrates that identities are employed as "an interactional and educational resource" (Okada, 2015, p. 74) to achieve several pedagogical purposes in language classrooms. There are also studies that focus on the identity shifts occurring in feedback sessions that take place in different educational contexts (Taylor, 2021; Thonus, 2008). Taylor (2021) examined a writing instructor's reference to her own and her students' non-situational identities in providing feedback to students' writing assignments. The study displayed that the instructor accomplished certain pedagogical purposes of writing tutorials through these identity orientations. For instance, referring to her transportable identity as a 'Polish' in interaction, the instructor highlighted that the students' writings should address all the readers, and thus reminded the concept of the target audience. Sharing her previous learning experience, the instructor positioned herself as a student, and thus expressed empathy and affiliation with a student who had difficulty in a particular topic.

Another spectrum of research that investigates identity as an interactional phenomenon focuses on interlocutors' positional identities within the framework of positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990, 1999). Positioning theory was first proposed by Davies and Harré (1990) and then many other researchers have utilized positioning theory as a methodological lens to investigate classroom discourse in different teaching and learning contexts (Davies 2000; Enyedy et. al., 2008; Menard-Warwick, 2008). Kayi-Aydar and Miller (2018) propose that "It is through positioning moves that people assign certain positions to themselves and others, and along with each position comes a set of rights, duties and/or obligations" (p. 3). In line with this statement, positions are not predetermined or static categories of individuals but they are ascribed to them by others in interaction. By positioning oneself and/or others as certain kinds, interlocutors ascribe themselves a number of roles or responsibilities related to the social situations in which the positioning occurs. In other words, positionings are not completely independent acts, but they are contingent upon the sequence of interaction and they are understood within the context in which they occur. The positioning moves can also change the flow of the interaction and recreate the storylines. For instance, if an individual is assigned a position of teacher in interaction, that individual is ascribed epistemic responsibilities of being a teacher. The person either aligns with the attributed position or declines it. In each situation, different storylines come into existence. Harré and van Langenhove (1999) propose two types of positioning which are interactive positioning (i.e., assigning certain positions to others) and reflexive positioning (i.e., assigning certain positions to oneself). Through positioning acts, people locate themselves or others in particular positions assigning them rights, duties, or obligations in and through interaction. In occupying a particular position, someone has the right to do or not to do certain things or act in a certain way. When someone occupies the same position over a period of time, it forms one's positional identity (Kayi-Aydar & Miller, 2018). In teaching and learning contexts, the ways in which students position themselves or are positioned by others influence their interactional actions, and thus their language learning opportunities. For instance, a student positioned as a passive learner on a regular

basis may develop a positional identity as a silent student and this positioning may limit the students' further contributions to the classroom interaction.

One line of research focusing on learner positioning investigates the interactional organization of multilingual content classrooms populated by learners of additional languages. These studies examine how these learners were positioned/not positioned as members of the classroom community (Duff 2002; Enyedy et. al., 2008) or as capable/incapable concerning the course content (De Costa 2011; Pinnow & Chval, 2015). For instance, Enyedy et. al. (2008) investigates a mathematics teacher's positioning of bilingual students (Spanish English) as co-contributors to the ongoing discussion by revoicing their utterances (e.g., translating students' utterances from Spanish to English) in a multilingual mathematics classroom. The study revealed that the teacher's positioning of the bilingual students as insiders to the classroom community by revoicing their contributions facilitates students' participation in discussions as well as their ability to express their ideas in English (Enyedy et. al., 2008). In a similar study, Duff (2002) investigated a high school teacher's attempts to integrate different learning styles through various classroom activities in a multilingual classroom in Canada. In doing so, the teacher aimed at positioning the non-local students as insiders to the classroom community. However, the students labeled the teacher's positioning acts as awkward and stated that these efforts mark their difficulties in the classroom and position them as outsiders to the classroom community.

Another line of research conducted within positioning theory investigates the relationship between social positioning and the language learning opportunities in different language classrooms such as English as a second language (ESL) classrooms (Menard-Warwick, 2008; Talmy, 2004; Kayi-Aydar, 2013, 2014), or Spanish as a heritage language classrooms (Abdi, 2011). Most of these studies utilize classroom observation data, audio or video recordings of classroom interaction, and interviews with the participants as the primary data sources. The findings of these studies display that interlocutors' (teachers and

students) interactive or reflexive positioning acts can promote or limit students' contributions to classroom conversations. For instance, Menard-Warwick's (2008) study investigates an English teacher's interactive positioning acts that contrast or align with her students' gendered identity claims. In an ESL classroom including Latina immigrant women, the teacher positioned those women as homemakers and attributed them gender-related skills such as cooking or repair while working on a unit about employment. However, it is revealed that one student's claim of identity as a businesswoman contrasted with her attributed identity as a homemaker, and thus the teacher's interactive positioning acts blocked the student's contributions to the classroom events. Whereas, in the same classroom, the students aligning with their attributed identity displayed a certain level of language improvement. Some of the studies focus on classroom participation behaviors and positionings of outspoken students in classroom discourse. For instance, Kayi-Aydar (2013) demonstrates how an outspoken student dominated the classroom interaction by turn-takings and assumed teacher-like positions by giving directions to his peers or paraphrasing their questions, and even correcting their language use during pair work activities. Questioning the teacher's methodological choices, the focal participant continued to display the same participation framework (i.e., assuming teacher-like positions) while interacting with the teacher. In doing so, the focal participant assigned himself powerful positions that diminished the other voices in classroom conversations, and thus blocked the learning opportunities for other students. In a similar study, Kayi-Aydar's (2014) investigates two ESL learners' participation behaviors and reflexive positioning acts during different classroom activities in an adult ESL classroom. Utilizing a wide range of data sources (field notes, audio-video recordings of classroom events, student diaries, interviews) and methodologies (the constant-comparative method, cross-case analysis, and discourse analysis) the study provides an in-depth analysis of the relationship between two focal students' reflexive positioning acts and their acceptance into the classroom community. The analysis revealed that although the students display similar participation behaviors (e.g., dominating the classroom conversation) and reflexive positioning acts (e.g., assuming

teacher-like positions) one of them was accepted into the classroom community whereas the other one was excluded. One of the focal student's friendships with other students and communication strategies such as using humor made him an accepted member of the classroom. However, the other participant could not develop a strong relationship with other students and was positioned as an outsider to the classroom community despite his similar participation behaviors and reflexive positioning acts.

Another spectrum of research on positioning focuses on teachers' reflexive or interactive positioning acts and their influences on the development of students' professional identities. Vetter's (2010) micro-ethnographic study displayed an interactional work achieved by an English teacher's positioning acts occurring in literacy classroom interactions. Referring to the students' interests and making connections to their backgrounds in classroom interaction, the teacher assigned them positions as readers and writers. The teacher's recurrent positioning acts seemed to accomplish the pedagogical purpose of a literacy class by changing the reluctant and disengaged students into engaged readers and adequate writers. Analyzing classroom interactions using discourse analysis and within the framework of positioning theory, the study contributes to the understanding of the relationship between positioning, identity, and learning. Maloch's (2005) study demonstrated how the social positions of two African American students formerly positioned as incapable learners by their peers reshaped positively thanks to the teacher's critical scaffolding. All in all, these studies demonstrated that through positioning moves, students develop certain identities influencing their interactional actions in the classroom, and these interactional maneuvers can create or block language learning opportunities for themselves and others. The implications of these studies suggest that teachers should be more aware of social positioning in order to create an interactional space for all learners in which students can develop positive selves.

Previous research displays that the term of teacher and/or student identity is not a static or preset category but it is flexile and context-dependent entity (e.g., Taylor, 2021).

Moreover, identities can be ascribed to people by others and used as interactional resources to achieve different actions (Kayi-Aydar & Miller, 2018). For instance, students or teachers can occupy positional identities through positioning acts, and thus they may create or hinder learning opportunities in classrooms. Although these studies provide meaningful implications for L2 teaching and learning, their theoretical basis does not effectively explain how teacher/student identity emerges in situ. Adopting multimodal CA, this thesis may better highlight the use of teacher identity as an interactional resource/strategy in an L2 teacher education context and display how an L2 teacher educator conducts the act of positioning in classroom interaction.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The chapter will provide methodological details regarding the type of research, research setting and participants, data collection procedure and instruments as well as the ethical considerations addressing validity and reliability issues in Conversation Analysis (CA) research.

Setting and Participants

The data for this study was collected from an English Language Testing and Evaluation (ELTE) course in an English language teaching program (ELT) in a Turkish state university in Ankara. The participants consisted of 23 senior-year ELT students and a professor lecturing in different subjects such as pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and language testing and assessment. The focal ELTE course was offered in the summer term of the 2018-2019 academic year and the syllabus consisted of six weeks with seven hours of instruction per week (see Table 1 for course outline). The focal course was designed as a flipped classroom that involved two and a half weeks of lectures on teaching and testing, types of language tests and test development stages, and test validity. In line with the course content, the teacher trainees (the participants of the study) were supposed to form groups of four to five members (see Table 2) to prepare a language achievement test and submit the first draft of the test by the end of the second week.

Table 1

English Language Testing and Evaluation Course Syllabus

Week	Content	Tasks
Week 1	General introduction	Form peer groups
	Fundamentals of testing	Start developing a language test
	Test types	
	Test development stages	

Week 2	Validity Writing multiple choice questions	Complete the table of specifications Submit the first drafts of the language test
Week 3	Reliability Testing grammar & vocabulary	Submit peer feedback on table of specifications, multiple choice questions, grammar and vocabulary sections
Week 4	Testing reading Testing writing	Submit the revised grammar and vocabulary sections Submit peer feedback on reading and writing sections
Week 5	Testing Listening Testing Speaking	Submit the revised reading and writing sections Submit of peer feedback on listening and speaking sections
Week 6	Evaluating test items Self-evaluation presentations	Submit of the revised listening and speaking sections

The tests had to be prepared for grades 5-8 and they were supposed include 6 different sections which aims to test Grammar, Vocabulary and the four skills of language (Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking). After two weeks, the course followed the flipped classroom design involving test preparation/revision at home and feedback sessions in classroom. Two feedback provider groups were assigned for each test writer group. The feedback provider groups were supposed to critically evaluate the structure and content of the tests and share their feedbacks in classroom feedback sessions which were held on Mondays and Tuesdays. In these sessions, the teacher educator and the teacher trainees were reviewing the language achievement tests item by item.

Table 2

Group Names and Members

Group Names	Group Members
Group 1	SER, ESI, BUS, TAR, KEN
Group 2	TUR, CEY, MET, FER
Group 3	CAN, BER, YAS, ZEY, SAF
Group 4	ATA, EFE, ECE, NAZ
Group 5	SEL, BUR, MEL, DEM, NUR

After each feedback session, the test writer groups were expected to revise their tests and submit their revisions to the Google Group of the course and the online platform of the university (METU CLASS) in the subsequent days. The course syllabus also included 1 week of self-assessment presentations of the revised version of the tests.

Data Collection and Instruments

The data were collected from the ELTE course offered in a Turkish state university in 2018-2019 Summer Term. 18 hours of classroom interaction (i.e., eight classes) were video recorded using three cameras, one was placed at the back of the classroom and the other two were positioned at the front of the classroom. The episodes analyzed in this study were extracted from four recorded classes which were language test item reviewing sessions. In total, 9 hours and 20 minutes of ELTE course interaction have been analyzed. Before collecting the data, consent forms were distributed to the participants and they were informed that the research would be conducted by keeping the identities of the participants anonymized in the transcripts. The collected data stored on external disks where third parties could not access and in cloud storage areas whose passwords were known only by researchers and were not shared with third parties. The recordings used only for research purposes. It was clearly stated that the participants were free to leave at any stage of the

research and the research would stop in all cases that violate the principle of voluntary participation.

Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis (CA) was used as the method of analysis in the study. CA has evolved from ethnomethodology and Garfinkel's studies (1964) and it was started by sociologists Harvey Sacks and Emanuel Schegloff as a "naturalistic observational discipline that could deal with the details of social action rigorously, empirically, and formally" (Schegloff & Sacks 1973, p.289). Ethnomethodology (EM) is a sociological approach that studies the organization of social actions from an emic (participant-relevant) perspective. In a similar vein, CA aims to analyze the methods deployed by the members of the society to accomplish several social actions (e.g. requesting, inviting, or complaining) (Markee & Kunitz, 2015) in and through social interaction. Seedhouse (2005b) discusses that CA has two main research aims. One of them suggests that people employ different linguistic or semiotic resources to interact with each other in different settings. The resources are called interactional organizations and CA, with an emic-perspective, aims to describe the order of the interactional organizations which constitutes talk-in-interaction. Although CA was first employed to analyze the organization of ordinary conversation, it was applied in different contexts including institutional settings (i.e. language classrooms), hereby CA has been adopted as a qualitative research methodology for a range of research areas including second language acquisition (Seedhouse, 2005a). Another principal aim of CA research is to track the establishment of intersubjectivity between participants. In basic terms, intersubjectivity stands for mutual understanding. According to CA, cognition is a socially distributed phenomenon which is shared and grounded in interaction (Atkinson, 2011). On that account, the aim of analysts is to employ an emic perspective to unearth "how participants analyze and interpret each other's actions and develop a shared understanding of the progress of interaction" (Seedhose, 2005, p.166). In the early years of CA, audio-recordings were the only accessible data base. However, with the rise of video recording,

non-verbal resources came into prominence and seminal studies were conducted on gesture and gaze practices in interaction (e.g. Goodwin, 1984).

Until very recently the orientation of second language acquisition (henceforth SLA) research has been toward the cognitive aspects of language acquisition and the social and contextual factors that affect language learning process are recently gaining momentum. In virtue of Firth and Wagner's (1997) call for a reconceptualization of SLA research, the SLA studies reoriented toward the social aspects of language learning and thus Social Turn in SLA is started. In their critique, Firth, and Wagner (1997) highlighted the three major concerns related to mainstream SLA research. First, the predominance of cognitivist studies ignores the contextual and interactional dimension of language learning. Secondly, the lack of emic (participant-relevant) perspective and finally, the lack of naturally occurring data base is criticized. Traditional SLA studies have discussed the language learning as a mental process isolated from the social context. On the other hand, CA-SLA conceptualizes the learning as a socially distributed phenomenon, and it suggests that learning is interconnected and observable within the micro-details of social interaction (Pekarek Doehler, 2010).

Methodological apparatus of Conversation Analysis corresponds to the three criteria (i.e. social and contextual dimensions of language learning, emic-perspective and naturally occurring data base) which are highlighted in the Firth and Wagner's (1997) paper.

Conversation Analysis, a qualitative research methodology to investigate social interaction, has its own principles and procedures. Seedhouse (2005a) describes the four main principles of conversation analytic research as it follows.

1. *There is order at all points of interaction.*

2. *Contributions to interaction are context-shaped and context-renewing.*

3. *No order of interaction can be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental, or irrelevant (Heritage, 1984, p.241).*

4. Analysis is bottom-up and data-driven (p.166-67)

Most of the mainstream linguists' (e.g. Chomsky, 1965) claim that the ordinary conversation is too chaotic and disorderly to be studied. However, Sacks (1992) puts forward the idea that there is an order and systematicity at the heart of talk-in-interaction. Contributions to the interaction are context-shaped because each turn is shaped by the sequential environment in which they occur, and they cannot be fully analyzable in isolation. Contributions are also context-renewing because each turn reshapes the ongoing interaction for the upcoming turns. Every contribution to interaction is affected by what precedes and affects what comes next. The procedure is also called as *next turn proof procedure* (Sacks et. al., 1974). The third principle of CA suggests that even the microseconds of the interaction are relevant and essential for the analysis. No detail can be overlooked as accidental or irrelevant. Based on the principle, highly detailed CA transcription conventions (Jefferson, 2004) were created. Although the first database CA investigates is spoken-interaction (i.e. the telephone conversation of suicide call lines), with the rise of video-recordings researchers started to observe the significance of non-verbal resources in interaction. In line with the new domain, Mondada's (2018) transcription convention has been used to display embodied actions. Lastly, the analytic mentality of CA is bottom-up and data-driven. The principle emphasizes that the data analysis process is conducted without any pre-determined, exogenous theory. There is no analyst's interpretation on participants' verbal or non-verbal conducts in interaction. Seedhouse (2005a) and Sidnell (2013) suggest that the analyst should not refer to background factors such as gender, race, or power unless the participants orient to them in details of interaction. Every single finding has its proof in the transcribed data and therefore emic perspective is ensured. In other words, researchers must show rigorous and robust evidence for their analysis and they must make it observable through the transcribed data. CA only deals with naturally occurring data because it aims to analyze the interactional organization of social actions in their ordinary settings with reference to their "indexicality, contingency and

dynamic emergence" (Mondada, 2013, p.33). Through repeated watching of the recordings, one can study the temporal and embodied details which are remarkably crucial for the analysis of interactional phenomena (see Mondada, 2013 for detailed information).

Conversation Analysis aims to investigate the social actions that participants in interaction accomplish along with the particular interactional resources that they use to achieve those actions (Sidnell, 2013). The interactional organizations CA studies are turn taking practices, adjacency pairs, sequence organization, preference organization and repair practices. When interacting with each other, people take turns to talk. A turn is composed of one or more Turn Constructional Units (TCUs) that are the basic mechanism of talk-in-interaction CA deals with (Drew, 2013). Every TCU is a meaningful and autonomous utterance and has a recognizable completion point in the sequential context in which they occur (Clayman, 2013). The completion points of each TCU create a room for other recipients to jump into conversation, a room which is referred as Transition-Relevance Place (TRP). According to Clayman (2013) interaction is a collaborative action that is achieved by the participants' taking turns at talk. The collaborative work includes deciding who speaks first and who speaks next as well as deciding where to speak or when to stop. At some events, the turn-taking system is pre-organized (e.g., debates, interviews, ceremonies). However, in ordinary conversation interactants themselves orient to '*one party speaking at a time'* norm to avoid overlapping talk. Turn allocation in conversation arises in two ways. One of them is the current speaker selects next speaker and leaves the floor to him/her or the next speaker self-selects at a possible TRP (Hayashi, 2013).

Schegloff (2007) states that in the turn-taking mechanism each turn has been affected by its prior turn and each one affects the next turn. The reflexive relationship between turns constitutes the concept of adjacency pairs. In basic terms, adjacency pairs are combination of two turns (namely the first pair part and second pair part) which have a "pair-type relation" (Stivers, 2013, p.193) in conversation. For example, an invitation is responded either with an acceptance or with a declination. Even though adjacency pairs

are usually located immediately after one another, the basic two-part sequence may be expanded in several ways (i.e. pre-expansion, insert expansion and post expansion). The concept of adjacency pairs generates preference organization. For instance, an invitation either responded with an acceptance (preferred response) or with a declination (dispreferred response). Expansion sequences are in the service of preference organization as they are initiated to maintain intersubjectivity or affiliation. The last interactional organization to be mentioned here is repair. The basic turn taking mechanism constitutes adjacency pairs and adjacency pairs come together to establish sequence organization. However, this mechanism does not operate smoothly all the time. If any problem interrupts the flow of interaction, repair practices come into view. Repair is another important concept of CA, and it was first defined by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) as the set of practices issued by a co-interactant to overcome any trouble in speaking, hearing, or understanding and thereby to maintain or restore the intersubjectivity (Seedhose, 2004). Repair practices can ensue in four basic types: (i) self-initiated self-repair, (ii) other-initiated self-repair, (iii) self-initiated other-repair and (iv) other-initiated other-repair. In the first type, current speaker recognizes trouble source and produce correction. In the second type, other recipients realize trouble source and make it obvious for the current speaker to repair himself. In the third type, the current speaker recognizes the repairable but co-interactants do the correction. In the last type, other recipients both recognize trouble and produce solution to CA, a qualitative and data-driven research methodology, aims to investigate the orderliness of naturally occurring social interaction. CA has been used in a wide range of language learning and teaching areas including applied linguistics, language proficiency assessment and language classroom interaction (Seedhosue, 2005a).

The growing body of research on language classroom interaction (Seedhouse, 2004; Walsh, 2011, 2013; Sert, 2015; Li, 2013) apparently displays that learners' language learning opportunities can be maximized in and through classroom interaction. Moreover, conversation analytic research brings new insights into the language teacher education

area by means of the studies which investigate reflective practices of language teachers as well as their classroom interactional competence (Sert, 2015; Can Daşkın, 2015; Walsh 2011; Malabarba, 2019; aus der Wieschen & Sert, 2018; Evnitskaya & Berger, 2017; Eskildsen & Wagner, 2013). The current study adopts CA methodology to examine naturally occurring classroom interaction between a teacher educator and pre-service English teachers. The context of the study is an English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) course. Despite the growing body of research that explores language teachers' teaching skills or mentor-teacher interaction in post observation feedback sessions, classroom interaction studies on language teachers' testing skills have remained unexplored. Thanks to its emic-perspective and data-driven approach, CA seems to be a suitable research methodology to investigate naturally occurring classroom interaction and to better observe the micro-details of interaction that contributes to pre-service English teachers' professional development in terms of language testing.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was conducted within a multimodal CA framework. As the first step, an unmotivated looking procedure was carried out in order to reveal interactional patterns in the classroom interactions. With this purpose in mind, the data were repeatedly watched without any pre-assumptions. This unmotivated looking procedure revealed an interactional pattern employed by the teacher educator in classroom feedback sessions. I noticed that whenever there was a mistake regarding the test item writing, the teacher educator or trainees initiated a test item problematization (TIP) sequence. Following this, I transcribed the TIP sequences (16 cases) in detail using Jefferson (2004, see Appendix A). In these TIP instances, the teacher educator used different interactional resources to problematize different aspects of the test items. The problems regarding the testing principles, test structure or test validity and reliability were problematized with reference to test designer identity (1 out of 16 TIP instances), and reference to past learning event (2 out of 16 instances). The problems regarding the grammatical accuracy of the test items

were problematized with reference to English speaker identity (3 of TIP instances) or orientation to teacher identity which constructed the focal phenomenon of this thesis (see Table 3 for details). In 10 TIP sequences, the educator criticized the teacher trainees due to their grammar mistakes by orienting to their prospective teacher identities. Naming these as Orientation to Teacher Identity (OTI), I transcribed the episodes with OTI practices by including multimodal resources based on Mondada (2018, see Appendix B). Then I selected the most representative cases (9 Extracts) which I will present in the Findings section.

Table 3

Test Item Problematization Sequences

Problematization Sequences		
without OTIs		6
with OTIs		10
	reference to future career	4
	reference to student category	6
Total		16

OTI refers to the educator's positioning of L2 teacher trainees as actual teachers. By doing this, she assigns the trainees a set of epistemic roles/responsibilities. When the teacher educator carried out this positioning action, she explicitly called the teacher trainees as "English language teachers" or referred to a non-present group of students by uttering the word "your students". Of 9 instances in which TIP sequences include OTIs, 5 were teacher educator initiated and 4 were teacher trainee initiated. Below episode taken from Extract 01 previews an enactment of OTI by the teacher educator.

```
01    ESI: ♣hocam articles are still trouble $makers$

          ♣gazes at teacher --->

02    TEA: ((laughs))

03    TEA: +$i ↑kno::w↓ but-$
```

```
04     ESI: especially here

05     TEA: =but+ +you are going to be♣come english language

           --->+ +gazes at learners --->
       esi   ----------------------♣

06            teachers +#in (0.5) a year most of you right↑#+ ±so::± you
                      +scan the learners with her gaze-----+ ±-23—±
                       #esi gazes at tea and nods --------#
             23: tea raises eyebrows, her palms show up

07            have to be careful about+ them

                 ---------------------->+
```

Before the extract begins, the participants gave feedback to the grammar section of Group 1's language test and the teacher educator problematized the question three due to Group 1's nonuse of determiners. In lines 01-04, ESI (one of the members of Group 1) provides a justification for their mistake in the test item stating that the use of articles is troublesome in test writing. In lines 02-03, the teacher educator demonstrates partial agreement, then she articulates a 'but' pre-face. In lines 05-07, the teacher educator provides a counter argument to ESI's justification with Orientation to Teacher Identity. First, the teacher educator announces that the L2 teacher trainees are going to be English language teachers soon. In doing so, she positions them as L2 teachers in interaction and assigns a category-bound epistemic responsibility to them (i.e., to be careful about the use of determiners). As seen in the extract the teacher educator draws on the trainees' prospective teacher identities within a professional training session. As a result, she assigns certain roles and responsibilities to the pre-service L2 teachers. When they do not display their epistemic roles/responsibilities while writing test items, the teacher educator holds them accountable.

3.5 Validity and Reliability of the Study

Peräkylä (1997) describes validity as "the correspondence between a theoretical paradigm and the observations made by the researcher" (p. 294). Validity is to which degree

the study measures what is aimed to be measured at the beginning. There are four types of validity: internal validity, external validity, ecological and construct validity. According to the Seedhouse (2005a) internal validity is related to the "soundness, integrity and credibility of findings" (p. 180). Conversation Analysis aims to investigate the normative practices of social interaction with a participant-relevant (emic) perspective. The analyst does not claim anything beyond the observable conducts of interactants in the details of interaction or no pre-determined theoretical assumptions lead the data analysis process. So, the internal validity and construct validity are ensured. External validity is about the generalizability of the findings for the other contexts apart from the setting in which the study is conducted. CA studies shed light on both "the particular and general simultaneously" (Seedhouse, 2005a, p. 180). In consideration of CA framework, the study aims to display the micro-moments of classroom interaction that has potentials for pre-service English teachers' professional knowledge development. The findings will be presented not as a description of what other educators and trainees do in classroom feedback sessions but as what other teacher educators and trainees can potentially do in such feedback encounters. In CA studies only naturally occurring data is investigated. The principle secures the position of CA research in terms of ecological validity.

Peräkylä (2003) suggests that reliability is concerned with the data collection (i.e. what should be recorded), the quality of recordings and the sufficiency of the transcripts. CA research presents the data with highly detailed transcripts. No order of interaction is treated as accidental or irrelevant. The availability of video and audio recordings enables readers to test the reliability of the study. For example, in CA data sessions, other researchers can contribute to the analysis by examining the transcripts and repeatedly watching the video/audio recordings. The transparency of data analysis process consolidates the reliability of CA research.

In the next chapter, I will present 9 Extracts which I chose as the representative cases of my focal phenomenon, Orientation to Teacher Identity. Before providing further

information regarding the findings of the study, it is essential to redefine the test item problematization (TIP) sequences and the focal phenomenon of this thesis. In TIP sequences, the teacher educator problematizes the teacher trainees' troubles in displaying their professional knowledge in the process of test writing and starts a professional criticism sequence regarding these problems. In these TIP sequences, a recurrent interactional resource, namely Orientation to Teacher Identity (OTI), arises and it is the focal phenomenon of this thesis. OTI can be defined as the teacher educator's use of teacher identity as an interactional resource/strategy to position the L2 teacher trainees as actual English teachers, assign epistemic roles/responsibilities, and thus ground her language test item problematization acts on these non-displayed responsibilities. Now I move on to the data analysis section.

Chapter 4

Findings

This chapter presents analyses and findings of an interactional phenomenon of orientation to teacher identity as an interactional resource in test item problematization sequences in-classroom feedback sessions of an English Language Testing and Evaluation (ELTE) course.

The chapter sets out to analyze (a) how interactional unfolding of test item problematization sequences occurs, (b) in what points of interaction and how OTI is employed as an interactional resource, and lastly (c) what social and institutional actions are achieved by the use of OTI. The data revealed 16 instances of test item problematization sequences, and the analysis is particularly interested in the interactional resources, observed when the teacher educator orients to English teacher identity. Therefore, 9 cases of 16 problematization episodes will be analyzed in this section. In other words, the incipient analyses will present how OTI in situ emerges as an interactional resource to do the act of test item problematization and in what ways the use of teacher identity achieves the institutional goals of an ELTE course. Since they sequentially vary, the problematization sequences are categorized into two groups (1) educator-initiated problematization and (2) trainee-initiated problematization. Section 4.1 will illustrate 6 instances of educator-initiated problematization sequences, and section 4.2 will illustrate 3 instances of trainee-initiated problematization sequences.

Before providing detailed analyses of each sequence, it is necessary to recall the context of the study. With a conversation analytic perspective, the study investigates the interactional organization of classroom feedback sessions with pre-service English teachers in an ELTE course in a Turkish higher education setting, and it aims to document in what ways the interactions among educator and trainees can create or hinder potential professional learning opportunities for teacher candidates with specific reference to

language testing and evaluation skills. The next section will illustrate the educator-initiated problematization instances in which the teacher educator draw on teacher identity as an interactional resource to construct her critical feedback.

Teacher Educator-Initiated Problematization

    Extract 1

        The first problematization instance is from week 4. The episode presented in this extract occurs in a feedback session regarding the grammar section of the focal test. The test under examination is written by Group 1 as an achievement test for 5th grade EFL learners. In the extract, TEA is the teacher educator, ATA and EFE are the members of Group 4 (feedback giver), and SER, ESI, and BUS are the members of Group 1 (test writer). The focal problematic question in the extract is "can she play guitar?".

```
01    TEA: +now (1.2) can she pl+a:y↑ evet↑ (.)+ number three+
                                     yes
           +shifting her gaze between paper and learners-----+
02         +question number three (.) comments+
           +gazes at learners ---->
03         (1.2)+# *(1.5)* (3.3)
      tea  ---->+#gazes at  paper ---> line 05
      ata          *raises his hand*
04    ATA: #˚nerde˚#
           where is it
           #---6---#
           6: shifting gaze from ece to paper
05    EFE: üçe geçtik
           it's the third one
06         ♥(0.9)♥ (2.3)
      efe  ♥raises his hand♥
07    TEA: #+the spacing problem i've already talked about that (.)
```

```
        ->#+gazes at group one --->
08      it's a (0.3) problem for all of the your+ questions
        ------------------------------------->+
09      (0.9)
10      so the question is +can she pla:y↑
                           +gazes at learners --> line 12
11      (3.6)
12   TEA:  [yes=
13   ATA: #[˚the guitar˚
   ata   #-----11-----> 11: gazes at teacher
14   TEA: =should it be a guita:r↑ o:r
15   ATA: $a- a guitar$#
        ------------>#
16   EFE: ♦[a guitar]♦
17   TEA:  [=guita:r]+
   tea   -------->+
        ♦-----12----♦ 12: efe gazes at teacher
18   TEA: +±ah±↑ (1.1) english language ↑teachers
        +gazes at group one ----> line 28
        ±-14-±  14: tea raises eyebrows, nods, her palms show up
19   SER: ˚a guitar˚
20   ESI: ˚the guitar˚
21   BUS: ♠the guita[r♠
22   TEA:          ±[or the guitar=±
        ♠-----15----♠
            ±-------16-------±
   15: bus gazes at teacher and nods
   16: tea's hand moves up and down and head moves left and right
      esi: gazes at teacher and nods
23      (0.8)
24   TEA: uh (1.0) come ↑on (.) articles do not forget them
```

```
25        remember ±one of the things that you have to check±
                    ±raises her index finger up-------------±
26        over and over again (0.7) ±are <the articles (.) the
                                    ±counting with her fingers --->
27        prepositions (0.3)± the subject-verb agreements>
          ----------------->±
28   ESI: ♣hocam articles are still trouble $makers$
          ♣gazes at teacher --->
29   TEA: ((laughs))
30   TEA: +$i ↑kno::w↓ but-$
31   ESI: especially here
32   TEA: =but+ +you are going to be♣come english language
          --->+ +gazes at learners --->
        esi    ----------------------♣
33        teachers +#in (0.5) a year most of you right↑#+ ±so::± you
                    +scan the learners with her gaze-----+ ±-23—±
                     #esi gazes at tea and nods --------#
          23: tea raises eyebrows, her palms show up
34         have to be careful about+ them
                   ---------------------->+
```

Extract 1 reveals the sequential organization of an educator-initiated problematization and the specific interactional resources utilized in this test item problematization episode. The focal resource in the extract is the teacher educator's orientation to the teacher trainees' English teacher identities by referring to their epistemic responsibilities (e.g., having a good command of the English language) as English teachers and holding the participants accountable when they cannot display their epistemic responsibilities in preparing exam manuscripts.

In lines 01, TEA moves on to another question, namely question three, in the exam manuscript. After the 1.2-second of silence, TEA initiates a Designedly Incomplete

Utterance (DIU) (Koshik, 2002) which articulates a part of question three (`can she pl+a:y`↑) which is the problematic question in the exam. After a transition marker (evet↑) in Turkish, which is the participants' first language, she reminds the participants of the question number to elicit their contributions while shifting her gaze between the exam paper and the participants. In line 02, TEA repeats the question number again and invites the participants to make their comments on the focal question. Then, TEA provides a 6-second wait time for the participants. In 1.2-second of this silence, ATA bids for a turn raising his hand. However, TEA does not orient to ATA's turn bidding as she gazes at the exam paper. In line 04, ATA asks his group members about the question being discussed at the moment while shifting his gaze from ECE to the paper. In line 05, EFE provides the second pair part (SPP) of ATA's question. Following 3.2-second of silence, EFE bids for a turn raising his hand, but the teacher educator displays no orientation. Then, TEA gazes at Group 1 and refers to a past problem (`the spacing problem`) that was previously discussed. In the subsequent line (08), TEA problematizes the focal question (Question 3) by stating that all of the questions in Group 1's exam manuscript have the same spacing problem. After a 0.9-second of silence, TEA starts with a so-preface and re-orients to the focal question. At the turn-final position, TEA gazes at the teacher trainees and initiates a prosodically salient DIU, a part of question three, to elicit contributions from them regarding the problem in the focal question. However, the teacher trainees do not provide any contributions for 3.6 seconds. Following this gap, TEA initiates another DIU (line 12) which overlaps with ATA's candidate response (`[the guitar`) in line 13. In line 14, TEA does not orient to ATA's contribution. Instead, she initiates another DIU with which she asks the problematic point in the focal question. In line 15, ATA, continuing to gaze at TEA, provides another candidate response with laughter, which is not oriented by TEA either. Following this, EFE provides the same candidate response (`a guitar`) in line 16 overlapping with TEA's turn completion of her DIU in line 17. It is noteworthy that ATA and EFE are the members of Group 4 which is not the test writer group but the feedback giver group. Moreover, in line 18, she directs her gaze towards Group 1, the test writers, instead of Group 4 and employs an epistemic

status check (`ah↑`). Following a 1.1-second of silence, TEA orients to the participants' (the members of Group 1) prospective English teacher identities (`english language ↑teachers`) by explicitly calling them English teachers. In doing so, the teacher educator positions the participants as English language teachers in interaction even though the participants are yet to be teachers. The educator's use of epistemic status check and positioning of the test writers as members of the English teacher category indicates that the participants are expected to have epistemic access to certain category-bound knowledge such as pedagogical or metalinguistic knowledge and display this knowledge in the test writing process. TEA also raises her eyebrows, nods, and opens her palms upward in the same line. The embodied actions display that the teacher's turn in line 18 marks the test item as problematic. TEA's embodied actions towards the members of Group 1, the 1.1-second wait time, and the educator's orientation to test the writer group's teacher identity indicate that she tries to elicit the correct response from Group 1. Therefore, TEA's turn in line 18 raises the concern about the teacher trainees' epistemic status regarding the use of particular metalinguistic knowledge, namely the use of determiners. In the subsequent lines, the three members of Group 1 (SER, ESI, and BUS) provide two alternative responses (`°a guitar°, °the guitar°, the guitar`) respectively, indicating that the teacher trainees have epistemic access to the correct use of determiners but they could not display it while preparing the test. After eliciting the correct responses from the members of the test writer group, TEA repeats one of the correct responses with an emphasis on the missing part of the test item (`or the guitar`) in line 22. Following a gap of silence, in line 24-27, TEA starts elaborating the test item problematization and reminds the epistemic responsibility of teacher trainees both as test writers and English teachers with reference to a past learning event (`remember ±one of the things that you have to check`) (Can Daşkın, 2017; Can Daşkın & Hatipoğlu, 2019) about one of the critical steps in test writing process (i.e., proofreading step). First, the teacher educator employs a surprise marker (`come ↑on`), and then explicitly tells the topic of interest, namely articles. Following this, she announces what

the teacher trainees are expected to check in the test writing process, that is, correct use of articles (line 26) prepositions (line 27), and the subject-verb agreement (line 27), all of which are related to metalinguistic knowledge. Since the test writers construct an ungrammatical test item, they are held accountable by the teacher educator for not having displayed their epistemic access to what was previously discussed in the classroom (i.e., proofreading) and to the correct use of determiners. In doing so, the teacher educator orients to the participants' epistemic responsibilities both as test writers and English teachers. In lines 28-31, ESM gazes at the teacher and justifies their mistake about using determiners with a smiley voice, which may help to maintain affiliation (Sert & Jacknick, 2015) in the case of providing justification. In line 29, TEA displays mutual alignment with laughter particles and mitigates her problematization. In line 30, TEA displays partial agreement with the use of the 'I know but' structure. In lines 32-33, she provides her counterargument which also orients to the participants' prospective English teacher identities. The teacher educator positions the participants as the future members of the English teacher community, and thus she ascribes certain epistemic responsibilities to the participants about the use of determiners (`you have to be careful about them`). Since the participants are pre-service teachers of English in their senior year, the teacher makes apparent that the pre-service teachers should display their epistemic access to the metalinguistic knowledge no matter how challenging it is, as articulated by ESI in line 28.

Extract 1 illustrated the sequential unfolding of an educator-initiated problematization episode and how the teacher educator oriented to the participants' English teacher identities as an interactional strategy when problematizing the participants' test items in classroom feedback sessions. In lines 01, 02, 10, 12, 14, and 17, TEA designed her turns to initiate the whole class discussion and elicited the problematic part in the focal test item (can she play guitar). After eliciting some responses from the members of Group 4 (feedback giver) in lines 13, 15, 16, the teacher educator oriented to the test writer group (Group 1) to elicit the problematic part of the item (line 18). When she did the act of

problematizing an item, the teacher educator oriented to test writers' teacher identity by explicitly calling them English language teachers and she used the teacher identity as an interactional resource to check the test writers' epistemic access to the correct version of the test item. It can be observed in lines 19-22 that the teacher trainees had epistemic access to the correct use of determiners. However, they had trouble in displaying this epistemic access in test writing. After getting the preferred responses from Group 1 in lines 19-22, she held the participants accountable for not displaying their epistemic responsibility as test designers/teacher trainees while preparing their exams with an RPLE. It can be argued that in the teacher education context the participants are expected to display their epistemic access to certain knowledge rather than assuming that they have that knowledge. It became more evident in the following lines that when one of the participants provided a justification (lines 28-31) for the educator's account-giving related to the participants' epistemic roles as test designers, the teacher educator provided a counterargument which again positioned the pre-service English teachers as the members of English language teacher community (line 32-33). In doing so, the teacher educator ascribed several epistemic responsibilities to the pre-service teachers about their English language proficiency, content knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge. The absence of such epistemic responsibility displays resulted in teacher educator's problematization referring to the participants' prospective identities as English teachers. Therefore, these lines indicated that teacher trainees have dual roles as assessors and teachers in their future English language teacher careers and they are expected to display the epistemic responsibility of both institutional roles. Considering that there is a reflexive relationship between the pedagogical agenda and the organization of classroom interaction (Seedhouse, 2004), the interaction is shaped to achieve particular institutional goals in the teacher education context. In the context of the current study, the institutional aims were to teach and learn the principles of testing and evaluation in English language teaching. It can be argued that the educator's orientations to the participants' English teacher identities transformed this problematization sequence into a potential learning environment where the teacher

educator marks the pre-service teachers' epistemic roles and responsibilities as prospective English teachers. The extract also showed how the classroom interaction among the teacher educator and the trainees can facilitate potential professional teacher development of the participants with specific reference to testing and evaluation skills of second language (L2) teaching. To illustrate, the educator employed the RPLE in lines 25-27 to remind the participants of one critical step in preparing a test: the proofreading step. The teacher educator's shifting orientation from whole class to the test writer group (i.e., shifting gaze toward Group 1) and the multimodal actions utilized by the educator in interaction (e.g., raising eyebrows, nodding, palms showing up) made the educator's criticism, concerning the participants' troubles in practicing their professional knowledge and displaying their epistemic responsibilities as test designers and English language teachers, more apparent to the participants. With that, I now turn to the next extract that also shows an educator-initiated problematization.

Extract 2

Extract 2 demonstrates the second instance of educator-initiated problematization in which the teacher educator orients to teacher identity of the teacher trainees. In the extract, the focal interactional resource that serves as orientation to teacher identity invokes a non-present category of people in interaction (Leyland, 2021). The teacher educator mentions a group of fictional students who are not there at that moment, thereby bringing a non-present category of participants interaction. By doing so, the teacher educator positions the pre-service teachers as the members of the student-teacher category, and she attributes category-bound responsibilities to them. Since the test writer group has trouble in displaying these responsibilities in test writing, the teacher educator problematizes their test items by orienting to their teacher identities. The second episode occurs approximately two minutes after the first instance of the teacher educator problematization sequence displayed in the previous extract. The participants give feedback to the same test which is written by Group 1 as an achievement test for 5th grade EFL learners. The focal problematic question

in Extract 2 is also the same as the one discussed in Extract 1. In the extract, TEA is the teacher educator, ATA and ECE are the members of Group 4, ESI and BUS are the members of Group 1. Before the extract begins, the teacher trainees were discussing two different problems about the focal question (one of them is displayed in Extract 1).

```
01    TEA: +↑evet (.) şimdi bu soru çünkü gerçekten ↑bayağı bir
            yes, now this question because it really requires a lot of
            +draws circles with her hand ---->
02         hani (0.8) err: discussion gerek♦tiren bi soru♦+
           i mean it is a question which requires discussion
                                      ♦ata nods-----♦
           ---------------------------------------->+
03         +dinliyorum+ (0.3) çünkü hep ben konuşuyorum
           i'm listening because i'm the one always talking
           +-----2-----+  2: tea gazes at and points at group four
04         (0.9) +(1.9)
     tea        +gazes at exam paper --->
05    TEA: evet (.) what do you t[hink=+
06    ESI:                       [*$çok belli bence$*
                                   I think it's quite obvious
      tea   ------------------------->+
      esi                  *gazes at bus----*
07    TEA: =+can she play+ ±the guita:r↑ or can she play a guitar↑
            +-----5-----+  ±reads from the paper ---> line 8
            5: shifts her gaze between the paper and the participants
08    TEA: (.) let's say that we have a tick ↑oka:y↓ the answer
09         is± +(0.8) yes she ca:n (0.5) no+ ±she ca:n't+
           ->± +shifts her gaze from paper to participants+
10         (0.6)
11    ECE: ♥˚never˚♥
           ♥gazes at tea♥
```

```
12    TEA: +$never ne ya$

           what is that never

          +-----9----> line 14

          9:gazes at group one & opens her palms upward

13    ATA: (i know Lara'yla Lanson-)

14    LL:  ((inaudible voices and laughs))

15    ATA: (♦$Lara'yla Lanson'ın problemi var$♦)

            ♦gazes at tea-------------------♦

16    TEA: but- ♦bu+t (.) ♫can she play♫ the guitar↑+ (0.3) ±never±
          ------->+                                    ±--11--±

           11: tea moves her head left and right, her eyes rolling

17    ALL: ((laughs))

18         (0.4)

19    TEA: +it's ±not the correct answer± (0.2) #how many times
          +gazes at group one ---> line 25      #----14 ---->
                 ±opens her palms upward±

           14: walks towards group one, brings her fingers together

20         have you answered <can you do something># with never
          -------------------------------------->#

21         (1.7)

22    TEA: ↑why are you teaching your students incorrect

23         english (4.0) ♠(3.0)♠ what did we talk about

24         (0.3)         ♠--15--♠ 15: opens her palm upward

25         <every answer should be grammatically correct>+
          ------------------------------------------->+

26         (1.6)

27    TEA: >can she play the guitar↑< ♠never (.) $WHA:::::T$♠
                                    ♠----------16--------♠

           16: gazes & frowns at group one, opens her palms upward
```

In lines 01-02, TEA reinitiates the classroom interaction by stating, in their L1 (Turkish), that the focal question needs further discussion. ATA confirms the teacher educator's comment by nodding synchronically with the TEA's turn completion in line 02. In line 03, TEA bodily orients to Group 4, and allocates the turn to the members of Group 4. She also explicitly gives an account for her turn allocation in Turkish (`çünkü hep ben konuşuyorum`) which means '*because i'm the one always talking*' in English. After providing 2.8-second of wait time to the participants, TEA initiates a question in line 05. In the following line, ESI gazes at her group member BUS and tells in her L1 with a smiley voice that the problem of the focal question is quite apparent. TEA does not orient to ESI's contribution. Instead, she starts reading the focal question from the exam paper in line 07. It should be noted that the teacher reformulates the question stem with two possible correct forms due to the previous problem demonstrated in Extract 1 in which the participants did not use determiners in the question stem. In lines 08-09, TEA continues to read option A and B of the question and shifts her gaze from the exam paper to the participants to elicit the problematic option in the question which is option C. After 0.6-second of silence, ECE self-selects and provides the problematic option in a soft voice (`˚never˚`) in line 11. After eliciting the problematic option in line 11, teacher educator continues with her comment starting in line 12. She asks a rhetorical question (`+$never ne ya$`) in Turkish orienting to option C as dispreferred. She also combines her utterance with a smiley voice, gazes at Group 1, and opens her palms upward, all of which indicate that she starts the problematization sequence in a sarcastic way in line 12. The teacher's comment is treated as laughable by the other participants (line 14) and one of the participants (ATA) even makes a joke about the construction of the test item (lines 13-15). In line 16, TEA reads the question stem (`♫can she play♫ the guitar↑+`) and the problematic option (`±never±`), with a prosodic emphasis on the option C. As she emphasizes the problematic option (`never`), she also displays the option as incorrect with embodied actions moving her head and rolling her eyes. The teacher's verbal (line 12), prosodic (smile in line 12, highlight of

the option in line 16) and embodied actions (e.g., hand, eye, and head movements), and the other participants' responses (laughs and jokes) mark the option C as problematic and incorrect. The teacher's comment is again treated as laughable by the other participants (line 17). After a gap of silence, TEA gazes at Group 1 and continues with her feedback. In line 19, she first explicitly marks the option as incorrect. Then, she asks Group 1 whether they have answered a similar '*yes-no*' question with a never, thereby orienting to the participants' language learner identity in lines 19-20 (`how many times have you answered can you do something with never`). In what follows, TEA self-selects and poses a prosodically salient question which orients to the test writers' English teacher identity (↑`why are you teaching your students` `incorrect` `english`) in lines 22-23. First of all, the teacher educator invokes a non-present category of people (Leyland, 2021) by mentioning a group of fictional students who are not present at that moment, hence non-present participants in the interaction. By invoking the student category in interaction, the teacher educator positions the pre-service teachers as members of the English teacher category. Then, she holds the test writer group accountable for not displaying their category-bound responsibilities and teaching the students incorrect English through the problematic test item. Therefore, the teacher educator's reference to student category serves as an interactional maneuver of orienting to pre-service teachers' teacher identity and problematizing the lack of displaying their epistemic responsibilities as teachers in test writing. After 7.0-second of silence, in line 23 TEA self-selects and refers what they talked about earlier (Can Daşkın, 2017; Can Daşkın & Hatipoğlu, 2019). This indicates that the participants are expected to construct grammatically correct test items, and thus TEA attributes epistemic responsibilities (lines 23-25). Accordingly, the members of the Group 1 should be able to display their epistemic access to what they are expected to practice (line 25) both as test designers and as prospective English language teachers. In line 27, TEA repeats the focal question and the problematic option. In line 27 the problematization sequence reaches its peak point with the teacher educator's mocking utterance including the laughter particles, the elongation, and the increase in the volume of (`$WHA::::T$`) as

well as with embodied actions accompanying her utterance (e.g., gazing and frowning at Group 1, opening her palms upward).

This extract demonstrated another way of orienting to teacher identity in TIP sequences. In this extract, the teacher educator referred to a non-present category of people (i.e. EFL learners) in interaction to achieve a series of interactional actions. First of all, the teacher educator's invocation of student category positioned the pre-service teachers as the members of the teacher category which ascribed pre-service teachers category-bound epistemic responsibilities. In this extract, the test writer group was expected to construct grammatically correct test items. Due to the lack of displaying this responsibility in the test writing process, the test writers were held accountable by the teacher educator. The sequential unfolding of the episode started with the teacher educator initiating the whole-class discussion in lines 01-03. After providing 2.8-second of wait time, the teacher educator uttered a question to elicit the teacher trainees' comments in line 05. In the following line, a member of the test writer group (ESI) stated that the problem in the item was obvious. The teacher educator did not orient to ESI, instead, she continued to read the focal question, option B, and option A (lines 07-08). In line 11, a member of the feedback giver group (ECE) provided the problematic option (option C) in a soft voice. It may be argued at this point that the teacher educator was recognizably aware of the problematic part of the question and designed her turns accordingly. Even if the teacher educator created some space for learner contributions in lines 03-10, and she elicited the problem in line 11, she self-selected as the next speaker and provided her comment on the problematic item starting in line 12. First, the teacher educator emphasized the problematic option in a playful manner in her L1 (line 12), which was treated as laughable by the teacher trainees. Then, she provided another mocking comment in line 16, which was again treated as laughable. After a brief gap of silence, the teacher educator oriented to the test writer group and started the act of problematizing in a more serious manner. First, the teacher educator referred to the teacher trainees' language learner identities in lines 19-20 (**`how many times have you answered <can you do something> with never`**). Then, she oriented to the

teacher trainees' English teacher identity by using a non-present category of people (i.e. EFL learners) as an interactional resource. By bringing the new category of people, 'your students', in interaction, the teacher educator displayed viewing the participants as the members of the English language teacher category, thereby orienting to the pair of the student-teacher category. Because of their roles within this category, the pre-service teachers were ascribed certain epistemic responsibilities (e.g., teaching English grammar correctly). Because of the ungrammatical test item in the exam manuscript, the participants were held accountable for not displaying their epistemic responsibilities as English teachers (`↑why are you teaching your students incorrect english`). Moreover, the RPLE (lines 23-25) demonstrated that the participants were also responsible for not displaying their epistemic access to what was discussed before in the classroom in terms of testing principles (`What did we talk about every answer should be grammatically correct`). So, the teacher trainees were held accountable for not constructing grammatically correct test items, and thus teaching incorrect English to the students. Therefore, lines 22-25 showed the teacher educator's orientation to the participants' dual roles as test writers and English teachers.

In consequence, Extract 2 illustrated the teacher educator's orientation to pre-service teachers' English teacher identities through the invocation of the student-teacher category in interaction. By invoking these categories, the teacher educator highlighted the category-bound responsibilities of pre-service teachers (e.g., to teach English correctly) and she held the test writer group accountable for not displaying their responsibilities as English teachers. Extract 1-2 were similar in displaying that the educator's orientations in interaction might be diversified as an orientation to language user/test writer and English teacher identity. It might refer to the pre-service teachers' dual roles as teachers and testers in their prospective English teaching careers. The extract is also important in that it displayed how the act of problematizing an item is framed in a rather sarcastic way in interaction. Extract 1 and Extract 2 were also similar in demonstrating that the orientation to teacher identity

was deployed as an interactional strategy by the teacher educator in constructing her critical feedback about the problematic test items. However, the ways in which the teacher educator oriented to teacher identity varied in Extract 1 and Extract 2. In the first extract, the teacher educator explicitly called the pre-service teachers as English language teachers in interaction. But in the second extract, she invoked a non-present category of people (i.e., your students), and thus positioned the pre-service teachers as the members of the English teacher category. In doing so, the teacher educator made it observable that the participants were English teachers and criticized them for not displaying their epistemic responsibilities as teachers. Now I will present Extract 3 which displays another instance of orientation to teacher identity in an educator-initiated test item problematization episode.

Extract 3

The following extract represents another instance of an educator-initiated problematization episode from week 4. Similar to the previous extract (Extract 2), the teacher educator positions the participants as English teachers by referring to a non-present group of students in interaction. By invoking this student-teacher category, the teacher educator highlights the problems which may create difficulties for students in the test. Therefore, she constructs her critical feedback on the test writers' teacher identities by holding them accountable for constructing problematic test items for their students. In the extract, TEA is the teacher educator and CAN is a member of Group 3 (test writer).

```
01    TEA: +and why do you have an exclamation mark
           +gazes at group three ---> line 11
02         <do you want to scare> your students
03          (0.4)
04    CAN: ♥hocam i do not understand why↑ people (.) the honest-
           ♥gazes at teacher, knits his eyebrows --->
05         this is a genuine ques*tion i don't understand♥ the (.)
      can ----------------------------------------->♥
      tea                      *smiles ---> line 9
```

```
06        reasoning behind it (0.7) exclamation mark is not only

07        used to transfer your emotions that is also used to take

08        li♠ke (0.6) draw ↑attention↓♠ (0.3) so this (0.5) draws
           ♠makes a deictic gesture--♠

09        attention (.) ♦hello↑♦ hi↑ (.) ☻look at here☻
                        ♦--6---♦         ☻-----7------☻
           6: can raises his arm, waves his left hand
           7: can downs his hand, points at the floor
      tea ----------------------------------------------->*

10  TEA: *(clicks her tongue)* but not on the exa:ms↓ (0.4) or
           *--------8----------* 8: moves her head left and right

11         not on the exam papers+
           -------------------->+

12           (0.4)

13         +because remember (0.3) we said that whenever we're
           +gazes at learners --->

14         writing exam+ +we don't want to scare our students we
           ----------->+ +gazes at group three --->

15         don't want them to be excited we don't want to them to be

16         sa::d>+ so this is just an instruction
           ----->+

17           (0.3)

18         *read the following questions (0.2) and choose the
           *reads from the paper --->

19         appropriate answer (0.2) to mark and mark it on (.) or

20         mark your answer* +on the coding sheet (.) and then you
           --------------->* +gazes at group three ---> line 23

21         have full stop (0.4) right↑

22         err: sometimes students mi↑ght take this very personally

23         and they say *what- what's with the exclamation mark*+
```

```
                    *----nodding, raises her eyebrows-----*

         ------------------------------------------------>+
24   CAN: ♠uuuh♠
         ♠-14-♠ 14: makes a sad face
25   TEA: +oka:y↑ so try to be <as mutual as possible> right↑
         +gazes at group three ---> line 30
26      (0.5)
27   TEA: you have to (1.1) refer or you have to be able to
28       adress ↑all of your students in your cla:ss (.) some
29       students are more emotional more sensitive than the
30       others+
         ----->+
31   CAN: ♠okay♠
         ♠nodding♠
32   TEA: +so as i said as little as- write as little as possible
         +gaze shifts between group three and the other learners ->
33       and write as objective as possible+
         ------------------------------->+
34   CAN: ♠okay♠
         ♠nodding♠
35   TEA: okay (.) so no exclamation marks at the end of the
36       $instructions$
```

The extract begins with the teacher educator's questioning about the use of exclamation mark in the exam paper in line 01. In the subsequent line, TEA initiates another question bringing a non-present group of participants (**your students**) into the interaction. By referring to these non-present actors in interaction, TEA indicates that the use of exclamation marks in the exam paper is problematic for test takers (i.e., students). In doing so, the teacher educator orients to the test writers' teacher identities as an interactional resource to start a problematization sequence concerning their incorrect use

of a particular punctuation mark in test writing. After a brief gap of silence, CAN self-selects and displays resistance to the teacher educator's feedback in lines 04-09. First, he displays a misunderstanding of the teacher educator's feedback with a question referring to the general use of exclamation mark (`exclamation mark is not only  used to transfer your emotions that is also used to take li♦ke (0.6) draw ↑attention↓`) in lines 05-08, and afterward, he provides a justification for their use of the exclamation mark in the exam paper in lines 08-09 (`so this (0.5) draws attention (.) ♦hello↑♦ hi↑ (.) ☻look at here☻*`). In lines 10-11, TEA rejects CAN's justification. First, she displays disagreement with two multimodal actions (i.e., clicking her tongue, moving her head left and right). Then, she provides a counter-argument with 'but' conjunction (`but not on the exa:ms↓ or not on the exam papers+`). After a brief gap of silence, TEA gazes at the other trainees and uses RPLE (`because remember (0.3) we said that`) in lines 13-16 to elaborate her counter-argument, and thereby the act of problematizing. With the RPLE, she reminds the participants that unlike the general use of exclamation marks, using them in the exam papers may scare the students or make them excited. Therefore, the teacher educator holds the participants accountable for not displaying their epistemic roles as teacher trainees because of the problematic use of the exclamation mark at the end of instruction in the exam manuscript. TEA's turns in lines 14-15-16 also display an orientation to teacher identity as she refers to the non-present group of students and highlights the pre-service teachers' responsibilities towards these students (`we don't want to scare our students don't want them to be excited we don't want to them to be sa::d>`). These lines also display mutual alignment as she orients to both the teacher trainees' and her own English teacher identity with the use of 'we' and 'our students'. After a brief gap of silence, the teacher educator self-selects and reads the focal instruction in lines 18-20. In line 20, she reformulates Group 3's instruction in the exam paper and she employs an understanding-check (`right↑`) (Waring, 2012) at the end of her turn indicating that Group 3 should use a full stop rather than an exclamation mark at the end of the instruction (`and`

`then♠ you have full stop (0.4) right↑`). In lines 22-23, TEA provides another supporting argument regarding her act of problematizing the use of exclamation marks. In line 24, CAN display multimodal orientation to the teacher's argument with an emotive token and by making a sad face. In line 25, TEA provides a minimal receipt (`+oka:y↑`), and then she continues with a piece of advice (`so try to be ♫<as mutual as possible>`) and she produces an understanding check at the end of her turn. In lines 27-30, TEA orients to the participants' teacher identities once more and their epistemic roles by referring to the characteristics of different groups of students (`you have to (1.1) refer or you have to be able to adress ↑all of your students in your cla:ss`). After CAN's acceptance of the problem in line 31, TEA provides advice for the teacher trainees in lines 32-33. After CAN's multimodal acceptance of the advice in line 34, TEA closes the sequence with the repetition of her previous feedback.

Extract 3 began with the teacher educator's initiation of the problem with the questions in lines 01-02. The extract is similar to Extract 2 in displaying the teacher educator's reference to a non-present category of students as a way of orienting to teacher identity. To criticize the misuse of the exclamation mark in the exam paper, the teacher educator referred to a fictional group of students and highlighted a potential problem the students may face due to the problematic use of exclamation marks in the test. In doing so, the teacher educator invoked the student-teacher category in interaction, and thus she oriented to the test writers' teacher identity. The focal extract is also similar to the previous extracts in displaying that the teacher educator used teacher identity as an interactional resource to initiate (Extract 1) and elaborate (Extract 2) the test item problematization sequence. After the initiation of the problem, CAN, a member of the test designers group displayed resistance to the teacher educator's feedback by referring to the general use of the exclamation mark in lines 04-09. Thereupon, the teacher educator elaborated her act of problematizing with a counterargument which stated that exams were excluded from the general use of the exclamation mark. In lines 13-16, the teacher educator supported this

argument with an RPLE exemplifying three important roles of the teachers in the testing process: don't scare students, don't make them excited, and don't make them sad. Therefore, she justified the problem of using an exclamation mark at the end of the instruction with reference to a group of fictional students, and thereby with an orientation to the teacher trainees' teacher identities. In lines 22-23, the teacher educator invoked the non-present category of people (students) once again, and she oriented to another potential problem the students may face due to the problematic use of the exclamation mark.

Extracts 3 displays that orientation to teacher identity was employed as an interactional resource to achieve a series of institutional goals of an ELTE course. First, invoking the student category and referring to the potential problems they may confront in the exams helped the teacher trainees to generate a clearer understanding of the teacher educator's problematization about the focal test item. It can be observed in lines 22-23 that after the teacher educator's reference to a potential problem of the students, CAN displayed alignment with the feedback (line 24) instead of demonstrating resistance. The teacher educator's reference to different characteristics of the students in lines 27-30 also facilitated CAN's multimodal acceptance of the feedback in line 31. Second, the teacher educator's orientations to the teacher identity provided a basis for the incipient advice. For instance, in lines 25-32-33, the teacher educator built her advice on her previous references to the potential challenges or certain characteristics of the students and she highlighted the epistemic roles of the teacher trainees as prospective English teachers in her advice. It may be argued that the teacher educator's invocation of the student-teacher category as an interactional resource helped the teacher trainees to gain a clearer perspective about the needs of the students in the exams and it may facilitate their professional knowledge development regarding testing and evaluation in English. With this in mind, I will now present the next extract which displays another example of orientation to teacher identity by invoking a non-present category of students in an educator-initiated TIP sequence.

Extract 4

Extract 4 comes from week seven, and it is similar to the previous extracts (Extract 1, 2, 3) in displaying the teacher educator's problematizations of an ungrammatical test item by orienting to teacher identity of the test writers. In the focal extract, the teacher educator starts a problematization sequence by invoking the student-teacher category and referring to the teacher trainees' epistemic responsibilities towards their students. Therefore, she employs the invocation of the non-present group of students in interaction as a way of orienting to teacher identity, which is similar to the previous extracts as (Extract 2, 3). In the extract, the teacher educator gives feedback to Group 5 about the writing section of their exam which was prepared for 7th grade as a final achievement test. In the extract, TEA is the teacher educator, TUR is a member of Group 2, SEL is a member of Group 5, ECE and ATA are the members of Group 4, and CAN is a member of Group 3. Group 2 is assigned as the feedback provider for Group 5, they start giving their feedback. After listening to Group 2, the teacher educator starts making her own comments.

```
01    TEA: now first of all↑  (0.3) +let us look at question one+
                               +gazes at group five---------+
02         (0.5)
03    TEA: +<write which wild animal lives in which environment>
           +shifts gaze between exam paper and group five --->
04         and then you give an example+ *first of all ↑how do you
           -------------------------->+ *goes to desk --->
05         write (.) an- the abbreviated version of an example

06         (1.1)*(1.3)
           ---->*
07    TUR: ♥e nokta g (.)♥ ♦ay- e point g pointti♦
            e point g
           ♥------4------♥ ♦shifts gaze to exam paper---♦
           4: gazes at TEA
08         (0.2)
09    TEA: +exactly+
```

```
        +---6---+
        6:gazes at TUR
10      (0.7)
11  SEL: e point [g mi]
12  TEA:        *[so:]
    tea         *goes to board --->
13  TUR: ♥e point g point nokta koycan
                         put a dot
        ♥gazes at SEL --->
14  TEA: so it is*
        ------->*
15  TUR: o araya♥
          in between
          ---->♥
16  TEA: ±e
        ±writes on board --->
17  SEL: haaaa
18  TEA: dot g dot and± and then a comma
        ----------->±
19      +(1.0)
        +approaches and gazes at group five-->
20  TEA: so you have to be (0.2) examples for your students+
21      (0.7)+
        ---->+
22  TEA: and then you write a sentence such as <shark lives +in ocean>
                                                      +---13 --->
        13: gazes at group five
23      ♣where we have already two♣ ♠grammatical mistakes♠
        ♣-----------14-----------♣ ♠-----------15------♠
        14: raises her eyebrows, makes two with her fingers
        15: tilts her head, nodding
24      (0.9)
25  TEA: what are the grammatical mistakes here+
        ------------------------------------>+
26  ECE: sharks live in the oc[ean]
27  CAN:                      [shark]s live=
28  TUR: °  sharks live [in the ocean]°
29  TEA:              [+either you] can say sharks live in the ocean+
                       +--------------------16--------------------+
        16: shifts gaze between the other learners and group five
30  TUR: sharks
```

```
31    TEA: +♣the ocean♣ #right↑#
         +gazes at group five --->
         ♣----18----♣ #sel nods#
         18: raises her eyebrows, nodding, makes a deictic gesture
32    ATA: or the shark
33    TEA: or you can- you you have to say a shark lives in# the ocean
34       (0.5)                                        #sel nods -->
35    TEA: #♣remember↑♣ so you are asking students $to write (0.4)
        ->#♣----19---♣
          19: raises her eyebrows, nodding
36       grammatically correct sentences$ but your examples
37       sentences are un- ungrammatical

38       (0.9)+
          --->+
39    TEA: +okay↑ (0.8) so that is really disappointing+
          +moves her head down, makes a sad face------+
```

In line 01, TEA directs the teacher trainees to question one and then she reads the instruction of the question from the exam paper in line 03 (`write which wild animal lives in which environment`). After a brief gap of silence, TEA self-selects and states that Group 5 provides an example sentence for the question in line 04. In the following line, TEA asks learners how to write the abbreviation of "for example" with a rising intonation at the beginning of her utterance. In doing so, TEA addresses the first problem in concern with the misconstruction of the abbreviation for the Latin phrase *exempli gratia* which means "for example" in English. After the 2.4-second wait time, TUR, a member of group two, gazes at TEA and provides the correct response in Turkish to solve the problem. However, in the same turn, she repairs herself by replacing the Turkish response with the English translation. In line 09, TEA accepts TUR's response by establishing mutual gaze and with a strong confirmation token (`+exactly+`). After 0.7-second silence, SEL, a member of group 5, initiates a clarification request in hybrid language on TUR's response in line 11. SEL's utterance is interrupted by TEA's overlapping turn initiation (`*[so:]`) in line 12. It should also be noted that TEA starts walking toward the board when she initiates the overlapping turn. In line 13, TUR repeats the correct response with an explanation in Turkish (`e point`

`g point nokta koycan)` which is interrupted by TEA's turn appositional beginning in line 14. TUR completes her utterance in line 15 with another explanation in Turkish (`o araya`). In line 16, TEA starts writing the abbreviation for *exempli gratia* on the board by simultaneously producing it. In line 17, SEL utters a change of state token (`haaaa`) which indicates a change in SEL's epistemic state. In the following line, TEA produces the rest of her utterance and at the completion point, she stops writing and turns to learners. Starting in line 19, the teacher educator orients to the actual problem in the test item. First of all, TEA bodily orients to the test writer group and ascribes an epistemic responsibility to the teacher trainees by invoking a group of non-present students in interaction (`you have to be examples for your students`) in line 20. The teacher educator's invocation of the non-present student category, and her ascription of an epistemic responsibility which pertains to the student-teacher category (i.e., to set a good example for students) positions the teacher trainees as English language teachers. After 0.7-second silence, TEA refers to the example sentence written by the test writer group and announces the actual problem in the test item that the example sentence written by the test writer group is ungrammatical. After 0.9-second silence, in line 25, TEA asks a question to elicit the grammatical mistakes in the example sentence. ECE, a member of Group 4, provides the corrected version of the example sentence in line 26. At the turn final position of her utterance, she overlaps with CAN who self-selects to correct the grammatical mistake in the example sentence. In the following line, TUR also provides the correct version of the example sentence. At the turn final position, TUR overlaps with TEA's turn providing one of the alternative versions of the test item in line 29. After the minimal contribution of TUR in line 30, TEA gazes at Group 5, corrects one of the mistakes in the example sentence by emphasizing the missing grammatical item (**the**) in line 31. In line 32, ATA who is a member of Group 4 provides a candidate response to correct the mistake but his turn is not oriented by TEA or any of the trainees. In the following line, TEA provides another correct version of the example sentence by emphasizing the missing grammatical items (i.e. determiner "a", third-person

singular "-s"). After a brief gap of silence, TEA refers to what students are expected to know (`remember`) and indicates that the teacher trainees are expected to display their epistemic access to the correct use of determiners while they are constructing their test items. In lines 31 and 33, SEL (a member of the test writer group) orients to the educator's feedback by nodding. After a brief gap of silence, TEA provides another feedback which draws on teacher identity of the test writers (line 35-37). First, she refers to the expectations of the test writers from the test takers (i.e., learners) (`so you are asking students $to write (0.6) grammatically correct sentences$`) and then, she announces that the focal test items are ungrammatical (`but your examples sentences are un- ungrammatical`). TEA's turns in lines 35-37 indicate that the test writers previously positioned as English teachers are expected to be more knowledgeable than the test takers. Therefore, these lines (line 35-37) highlight another category-bound epistemic responsibility of the teacher trainees (i.e., to write grammatically correct sentences). Due to the problematic test items, the teacher educator holds the test writer group accountable and criticizes them for not displaying their epistemic access of the correct grammar even though they expect their students to do so. Finally, TEA moves her head down, looks at the exam paper with a sad face, and closes the problematization sequence with a negative assessment (`that is really disappointing`).

Extract 4 presented how the teacher educator drew on teacher identity of the teacher trainees by invoking the student-teacher category and referring to the teacher trainees' epistemic roles or responsibilities that are bound to the teacher category. The extract also displayed how these attributed roles/responsibilities were employed by the teacher educator as interactional resources to do the act of problematizing the test items. In lines 01-05, the teacher educator initiated the whole-class discussion regarding the focal test item (i.e., question number one). The question in lines 04-05 (`first of all ↑how do you write (.) an- the abbreviated version of an example`) addressed the first problem in the focal question which was the misuse of the abbreviation for *exempli gratia (e.g.,).* The

second and the actual problematization sequence was initiated by the teacher educator approaching and gazing at the test writer group starting in line 19. In line 20, the teacher educator oriented to teacher identity of the teacher trainees by referring to a non-present group of students and highlighting the epistemic responsibility of the teacher trainees towards these students (`so you have to be (0.2) examples for your students+`). In lines 22-23, TEA articulated the example sentence given by the test writer group and announced the actual problem in which there was an ungrammatical sentence. While announcing the problem, she raised her eyebrows, made a deictic gesture, tilted her head, and nodded, all of which marked that the test item problematization started. It may be argued that the teacher trainees were positioned as English teachers with the teacher educator's epistemic role ascription in line 20 and constructing an ungrammatical test item contrasts with the epistemic roles of the teacher trainees as English teachers. Therefore, the ungrammatical test item was problematized with reference to the teacher trainees' English teacher identities. It became more apparent with the teacher educator's irony in lines 35-37 that the teacher trainees were expected to display their epistemic responsibility and obligation to write grammatically correct sentences in the exams. The only orientation displayed by the test writer group was gazing at the teacher educator and nodding, which may show a shred of evidence to their acknowledgment of the responsibilities attributed to them by the educator. The next extract will present another example of educator-initiated TIP sequence that occurs in a feedback session regarding the Group 5's writing test.

Extract 5

Extract 5 presents another instance of educator-initiated problematization episode which occurs approximately 6 minutes later than Extract 4. The class is still giving feedback on Group 5's writing test. The extract displays the teacher educator's problematization of ungrammaticality in the test items by orienting to the test writer group's teacher identities. To problematize the test item, the teacher educator refers to the student-teacher category and highlights the teacher trainees' category-bound roles as English teachers. TEA is the teacher educator and TUR is a member of Group 2 (feedback provider).

```
01    TEA: +and again we have a problem grammar problem (0.7) in th*ree
                                                                  *--1->
          1: gaze shifts between exam paper and learners
02         what is the grammar problem in three
03         (1.7)
04    TUR: how frequent
05         (1.0)
06    TEA: according to the [cha:rt]
07    TUR:                  [↑how oft]en
08    TUR: how oft-
09    TEA: how frequent or*
           -------------->*
10         +(0.7)
      tea: +palm shows up, gaze to group five --->
11    TUR: how often
12    TEA: *how often*
           *----3----*
           3: R eyebrows, nodding
13         (0.6)+ #(0.3)
           ---->+ #gaze shifts between exam paper and group five --->
14    TEA: jane takes (1.0) part (0.5) in# +each of the activities
           -------------------------># +gaze to group five --->
15          (1.0)
16    TEA: $dimi$ (0.5) ♦this is a writing activity and you↑ are going to^
           isn't it    ♦smiles and approach to group five --->
17         judge your students on the grammaticality of their sentences♦
           ------------------------------------------------------->♦
18         ♥˚and your instructions are full of grammar mistakes˚
           ♥shows exam paper to group five, R eyebrows, nodding --->>
```

In line 01, TEA initiates the problematization sequence regarding the question three which includes two grammar problem. In the next turn, TEA initiates a question to elicit one of the grammar problems in the focal question. After a gap of silence, TUR provides the problematic part of the question in line 04. However, TEA does not orient to TUR's

response. After a gap of silence, in line 06, TEA starts reading aloud the instruction of the question and initiates a Designedly Incomplete Utterance (DIU) (Koshik, 2002) to elicit the problematic part of the instruction. It is noteworthy that she shifts her gaze between the exam paper and Group 5. In line 07, TUR corrects the problematic part of the question with a rising intonation at the turn initial position and she overlaps with the TEA's preceding turn. TEA does not orient to TUR's response once again. In line 08, TUR initiates the next turn to provide the correct response but she does not complete her utterance. In line 09, TEA initiates another DIU to elicit the problematic part of the question. Even though TUR provides the problematic part in line 04 and corrects the problem in lines 07 and 08, TEA does not display orientation to any of these responses. At the beginning of a 0.7-second silence, TEA gazes at Group 5 and opens her palm up. After the gap of silence, TUR provides the correct response one more time in line 11. Even though one of the members of the feedback provider group (TUR) attempts to provide the preferred response three times in lines 07, 08, and 11, the teacher educator does not display orientation to any of these responses. As she gazes at Group 5 while producing her utterances, one can claim that the teacher educator wants to elicit the preferred response from the members of the test writer group (i.e., Group 5). It becomes more apparent in line 12 that TEA repeats the correct response while she still gazes at Group 5, raises her eyebrows, and nods. After a gap of silence, TEA continues to read aloud the instructions of question three with a stress on the missing grammar item (`in`) in line 14, which announces the second grammatical problem in the item. TEA initiates a confirmation check (`dimi`) in Turkish with a smiley voice at the beginning of the next turn (line 16). In the same turn, after a brief gap of silence, TEA starts elaborating on the grammatical problems in the focal item. First, she smiles and starts approaching the test writer group. After stating that the problematic question is a writing question, the teacher educator refers to a group of non-present students in interaction (i.e., the use of 'your students'), to announce the epistemic roles/responsibilities of teacher trainees as language teachers (evaluating their students according to the grammaticality of their sentences in a writing test). Then, she multimodally problematizes Group 5's

instructions by showing their exam paper to Group 5 and raising her eyebrows while announcing that the instructions are full of grammar mistakes. In doing so, the teacher educator problematizes the focal item since the teacher trainees have trouble in displaying their epistemic access to the metalinguistic knowledge and have constructed ungrammatical test items, whereas they expect their students to display their epistemic access to the correct grammar and write grammatically correct sentences. In Extract 4 and 5, the sequential unfolding of the teacher educator's problematizations of ungrammatical test items is similar. After announcing the grammar mistakes in the problematic items, the teacher educator ascribes an epistemic responsibility to the test writer group by referring to a non-present group of students and thereby positioning the test writers as English teachers. In doing so, the teacher educator orients to the student-teacher category and highlights the category-bound epistemic roles of the teacher trainees. In both of the extracts, the epistemic responsibility ascribed to the test writers is constructing grammatically correct test items because they assess their students' metalinguistic knowledge in the test. However, the test writers have trouble in displaying their epistemic access to metalinguistic knowledge, and thus they are held accountable by the teacher educator.

Extract 5 illustrated another instance of educator-initiated problematization sequences. After initiating the problem in line 01, the teacher educator asked a question to elicit the grammar problem in the focal item (line 02). It is understood in lines 04-14 that Group 5's instructions for the focal question (i.e., question three) were problematic due to grammar mistakes. Starting in line 16, the teacher educator provided a criticism sequence regarding Group 5's problematic instructions in the exam paper. Similar to the previously displayed instances of problematization sequences (see Extract 2, 3, 4), the teacher educator constructed her critical feedback on the teacher trainees' teacher identities. Starting in line 19, the teacher educator oriented to the test writer group's teacher identity by invoking a non-present group of students and thus positioning the test writers as English teachers. Since Group 5 constructed an ungrammatical test item, they were held accountable for not displaying their epistemic responsibilities. It may be argued that the

teacher educator's invocation of the student-teacher category as an interactional resource helps the teacher trainees develop a better understanding of their future epistemic roles/responsibilities or obligations as prospective language teachers and facilitates their professional knowledge development regarding testing and evaluation in English. With that, I now turn to the next extract (Extract 6) which presents the final example of educator-initiated TIP sequences.

Extract 6

Extract 6 illustrates the final instance of educator-initiated problematization sequences. In this extract, the participants give feedback to Group 5's vocabulary test. In this test, the students are expected to match the vocabulary items with the definitions. In the extract, TEA is the teacher educator, CAN and BER are the members of Group 3, ECE and ATA are the members of Group 4 (feedback provider), TUR is a member of Group 2 (feedback provider), BUR and MEL are the members of Group 5 (test writer), and ESI is a member of Group 1. The extract presents a feedback sequence regarding the problematic construction of the definition of "beverage". After the teacher educator announces the problematic item, a member from the feedback provider group takes the floor and delivers their feedback regarding two problems of the test item. These problems are about the test writer group's incorrect definition of the word "beverage" in the test. After listening to the teacher trainees, the teacher educator problematizes the mistakes in the item by employing teacher identity as an interactional resource and constructs her feedback on the trainees' epistemic roles and responsibilities as prospective language teachers.

```
01    TEA: peki şimdi +asıl beverageda bittim+
           look at this what is that beverage
                    +gazes at group 5 ----+
02    CAN: hehheheh
03        (0.5)
04    TEA: [devam edin]
           go on
05    ECE: [♥evet hoca↑]m
```

yes madam

♥gazes at tea ---> line 08

06   ATA: **hocam**

07   ECE: **♣orda özellikle şey yaptık**

          we especially look at that

          ♣raises her hand ---> line 09

08   TEA: **+ha↑ lütf+en+♥**

          yes please

          +points at ece

          ---------->♥

09   ECE: **♣araştırmasını yaptık**

          we did the research

       ->♣

10   TUR: **a drink [other t]han**

11   ECE: **[a drink]**

     (0.4)

12   ECE: **özel- öncellikle a drink diyo ama cevabı beverage<u>s</u>:**

         first of all it says a drink but the answer is beverages

14   **s takısı (.) ikincisi a drink other than**

        s suffix   secondly

15   **water cambridge (.) dictionaryde baktığımızda↑ in- şey de**

        water when we look at the cambridge dictionary the thing

16   **su da (0.2) içinde beveragein ˚içinde˚ sayılıyo**

        water is also counted as beverage

17   BUR: **ahhahah**

18   MEL: **˚gerçekten mi˚**

        really

19   TEA: **[çünkü bev]erage (.) +beverage nedi↑[r hadi ben siz+in]**

        because beverage   what is beverage let's i yours

20   ATA: **[#içilebilir bir şey]**

                      something drinkable

21   ECE: **[içilebilir bir şey]ler**

                    things that are drinkable

              +tea turns to and points at group 5

                #tea makes a shush g

```
22    TEA: [ssssshh#
         ------→#

23    ATA: [° a quick drink°

24         (0.5)

25    TEA: +$ben sizin definitionınızı merak ediyorum group five
             i wonder your definition as group five
              +gazes at group 5 ---> line 34

26         olarak beverage definitionınızı$
             your definition of beverage

27         (0.4)

28    MEL: ☻yani↑ meşrubat tarzı (0.6) su da (0.2) su da var aslında
             well like soft drink water water is also included
             ☻gazes at tea ---> line 28

29         içinde ama onu nasıl definitionını yazacağımız[ı ☻da bilemedik
]
             but it how we couldn't know how we would write its definition

30    ESI:                                    [something that is

31    ESI: drinkable
             ---------------------------------------->☻

32         (0.5)

33    TEA: ama (0.2) beverage (0.4) *yani↑ (0.8) viski olabilir mi
             but beverage    i mean    can it be whiskey
                                       *opens her palms --> line 34

34         (0.6)

35         rakı olabilir mi
             can it be raki

36          (0.4)

37    BER: tatlı içecekler mi hocam+*
             is it sweet drinks madam
             ---------------------->+
             ---------------------->*

38    TEA: #HAAAH# +(0.4) both- ha bir de aynı zamanda da
                                     and at the same time
             #shifts her gaze to ber#
                  +gazes at group 5 --  > line 44
```

39   (0.2)

40   TEA: **beverage denildiği *zaman da**
         when it is called beverage
                              *makes a deictic gesture --> line 39

41   **böyle özellikle american englihsde kullanıldığında**
         when it especially when it used in american english

42   **fizy drinks anlamına geliyor***
         it means fizy drinks
         ------------------------->*

43   MEL: **hmmmm**

44   (1.0)

45   TEA: **anladınız mı**
         did you understand

46   MEL: **evet**
         yes

47   TEA: **ya↑ni (0.2) o- o yüzden soda da giriyo mesela onun içine+**
         well that's why soda is also counted as beverage for example
          -->+

48   **hatta bi tane amerikalı arkadaşımla işte bu beverage işte ha**
         in fact with my american friend i mean this beverage i mean

49   **mesela şeyi de söyliyim size**
         for example let me tell you the thing

50   **laf lafı açtıkça (0.2) #türkçede err çorbanızı naparsınız**
         one thing led to another in turkish what you do with your soup
                              #scan the learners --> line 54

51   (0.5)

52   ALL: **içeriz**
         we drink

53   (0.5)

54   TEA: **ingilizcede**
         in english

55   ATA: **having**

56   SER: **e:at**

57   TEA: **#+e:at+[edersiniz mutlaka↑**

```
                eat you do definitely
        ->#+raise her eyebrows
```

58   ATA: [$eat mi$ (.) salladım

                          i made it up

59   TEA: sadece ve sadece eat your soup denilir

        only and only eat your soup it's called

60   sadece bir durumda exceptional var to drink your soup

        there is only one exceptional case

61   hani böyle kabın içerisinde filmlerde görüyorsunuz ya

        like this   in a cup   you see it in the movies

62   ALL: hmmmm

63   TEA: ((inaudible)

64   ATA: japonların yaptığı gibi

        like japans do

65   TEA: yo#k amerikan englishde de #veya işte (0.2) yine britishde de

        no in american english or here (0.2) still in british also

           #gazes at ata-----------#

66   +you only drink your soup whenever it is in a cup and you don't

        +gazes at group 5 --> line 66

67   use ((inaudible))

68   (0.4)

69   #tamam mı↑+ bu#t (0.2) türkler bunun çok hatasını yapıyo

        okay   but the turks make a lot of mistakes here

        --------->+

        #raises her index finger

70   TEA: drink your sou+p

                        +gazes at group 5 ---> line 73

71   (0.8)

72   TEA: [sınavlarda]da görüyorum

         i see it in the exams as well

73   ATA: [yapıyoruz]

74   (0.6)

75   TEA: ondan sonra kalakalıyoruz tabii ki

        and then we are shocked of course

76   (0.9)+

        ---->+

77   ATA: çok kültür+el bir şey ya

        it is something too cultural

```
                          +tea gazes at ata line 78
```

78   TEA: (0.4)

79   TEA: **#ama kültürel ama ingilizce öğretmeni olduğunuz için#**

       but cultural but since you are english language teachers

```
          #opens her palms, raises her eyebrows, nods--------#
```

80   ATA: **˚tabi˚**

       of course

81   (1.0)+

82   TEA: **ve bu foods and drinks sürekli öğretildiği için öğrencilere**

       and because these foods and drinks are constantly taught to students

83   (0.3)

84   **bu tip şey+leri en azından bilmemiz lazım yani err**

       about these things at least we should know i mean

```
              +gazes at group 5 --> line 95
```

85   **kitaplarda var- var olan konularla ilgili şeyleri**

       things about the subjects that exist in the books

86   **bilmemiz lazım (0.2) burda da şimdi beverage denildiğinde şimdi**

       we should know   here now when it's called beverage now

87   **laf lafı açtı**

       one thing led to another

88   **tekrar konuya ger- geri dönücek olursak sizin kitaptaki**

       let's get back to the subject again   in your book

89   **beverage definitionı ne çünkü anlaşılıyor ki**

       what is the definition of beverage because it is understood that

90   **british culture ve american cultu☺re yani british english**

       british culture and american culture i mean in british English

```
                              ☺mel nods --->
```

91   **ve american englishdeki☺ beverage understandingi çok farklı**

       and in american english the understanding of beverage is too different

```
      -------------------->☺
```

92   MEL: **hıhımmmm**

93   TEA: **tamam mı (0.3)☺ sizin kitabınıza bir bakmanız lazım**

       okay   you should have a look at your book

```
                ☺mel nods --->
```

94   **british definition mı american definition mı**

       is it british definition or american definition

95   (0.2)

96   TEA: **and then to test accordingly☺ bec☺ause this**

```
      ------------------------->☺   ☺mel writes on notebook
```

97   **is what you're teaching to students**

```
      ------------------------------>>+
```

-------------------------------->>☺

In line 01, the teacher educator initiates the discussion with a teasing statement and announces the problematic vocabulary item (*okay now i'm done with the beverage*). TEA's statement is treated as laughable by CAN in line 02. After 0.5 seconds of silence, TEA allocates the turn to the feedback provider group (Group 4) to elicit their comments on the test item. In line 05, ECE gazes at TEA and chooses herself as the next speaker. ATA also bids for a turn in line 06, but ECE nominates herself as the next speaker by raising her hand and stating that they checked for the problematic vocabulary item (line 07). In line 08, TEA allocates the turn to ECE with a go-ahead (*yes please*) and by pointing at her. ECE starts delivering feedback for the problematic item in line 09. However, TUR self-selects and starts reading Group 5's problematic definition of the word "beverage" in an overlapping turn with ECE in line 10. In lines 11-16, ECE announces two problems about the test item. The first problem is that the focal word is given in the plural form (beverages) in the exam paper, while the explanation of the word defines a single vocabulary (*first of all it says a drink but the answer is beverages*). The second problem is that the given explanation for the word "beverage" is not the correct definition for this word. (*secondly water when we look at the cambridge dictionary the thing water is also counted as beverage*). After the announcement of these problems, a member of the test writer group (BUR) laughs in line 17, and another member of the test writer group (MEL) provides a surprise marker (*really*) in line 18. These lines indicate that Group 5 does not have epistemic access to the correct definition of the word "beverage". In line 19, TEA starts explaining the meaning of "beverage", but then she attempts to elicit the meaning of "beverage" from Group 5 with a question (**+beverage nedi**↑**[r**) and by turning to and pointing at Group 5. In the same line, TEA states that she wonders Group 5's definition of "beverage", but her utterance is interrupted by the members of Group 4 (ATA, ECE) giving the same candidate response (*something that is drinkable*) to TEA's question (line 20-21). In line 22, TEA utters a shushing sound combined with a shushing gesture. It should be noted that TEA starts making the gesture when she is interrupted by ATA in line 20.

TEA's utterances and multimodal actions make explicit that she tries to elicit the definition of "beverage" from the test writer group not from the other trainees. In line 23, ATA provides another candidate response that is also not oriented by any of the participants. After 0.5 seconds of silence, TEA gazes at Group 5 and completes her utterance indicating that she wonders their definition of "beverage". After 0.4 seconds of silence, MEL states that beverage is used for soft drinks, and that although water is also included in this category, they did not know how to write the correct definition for "beverage". After MEL's explanation for their problematic construction, ESI (a member group 1) provides a candidate definition that is not oriented by the teacher educator. After 0.5 seconds of silence, TEA questioning Group 5's epistemic status by asking whether specific alcohols can be counted as beverages in lines 33-35. In line 37, BER (a member of group 3) provides a correct definition for "beverage" (*is it sweet drinks madam*). In line 38, TEA acknowledges BER's response with a confirmation token (HAAAH) and then starts an explanation sequence regarding the meaning of "beverage". In lines 40-42, TEA refers to the use of "beverage" in American English (*when it especially when it used in american English it means fizzy drinks*). In the next line, MEL displays understanding with an acknowledgment token (hmmmm). After 1.0 seconds of silence, TEA provides an understanding check (*did you understand*) in line 45, and MEL displays her understanding in the next line. In line 47, TEA provides an example for a beverage. In what follows, she starts referring to her personal experience about the use of "beverage"; however, she changes the topic of her utterance in line 49, and she attempts to elicit the Turkish collocation for "çorba içmek" with a question (*in turkish what you do with your soup*) and by simultaneously scanning the teacher trainees in line 50. In line 52, all trainees provide a relevant response (içeriz tr. *we drink*) to the educator's question. When TEA elicits the preferred response from more than one participant in line 52, she attempts to elicit the English collocation for "çorba içmek" in line 54. Two responses are provided by ATA (having) and SER (eat) in lines 55-56. TEA confirms SER's response by

repeating the word "eat" and providing a confirmation token in line 57. In the next line, ATA

provides a surprise marker by questioning the correct answer and reveals that he made his

answer up. In lines 59-61, the educator provides a further explanation related to the

collocation of "soup" by expanding on her previous utterance. In these lines, the teacher

educator states that soup normally collocates with "eat", but there is one exceptional use.

In line 62, all trainees acknowledge the educator's explanation and in line 64, ATA provides

an example. In lines 65-67, the educator does not accept ATA's contribution explicitly and

continues to explain the exceptional use of "drink" with "soup" in both American and British

English (`you only drink your soup whenever it is in a cup and you don't use`

`other devices`). It should be noted that even though the main problem in the test is not

about the English collocations, the teacher educator gazes at the test writer group as she

provides her explanations regarding the use of "to drink soup". What is more, in line 69,

TEA highlights that the two verbs which collocate with "soup" (i.e., eat and drink) are often

misused by Turkish EFL speakers as she still gazes at the test writer group and raises her

index finger towards them. In line 70, TEA repeats the exceptional collocate of "soup" and

in line 72, she highlights that she observes this mistake in test writing processes as well. In

line 74, ATA confirms TEA's statement about the Turkish EFL speakers' misuse of "to drink

soup". In line 75, TEA provides a mocking utterance stating that such mistakes confuse

people and maintains her gaze at the test writer group in the following 0.9 seconds of

silence. In the next line, ATA states that the difference between "to eat soup" and "to drink

soup" is too cultural. TEA shifts her gaze to ATA, and then she proposes a counterargument

by drawing on teacher identity as an interactional resource in line 79. This utterance

indicates that although the use of collocations is closely related to English culture (*but it's*

cultural but), the teacher trainees are expected to have this cultural knowledge since

they will become English teachers soon (*since you are english language teachers*).

Although the participants are pre-service teachers who have not completed their

undergraduate education yet, they are positioned as English teachers by their educators in

interaction and an epistemic responsibility, to have access to the cultural use of English

collocations, is ascribed to them. In line 80, ATA displays alignment with the teacher educator's orientation to teacher identity. The teacher educators' utterances in lines 82-86 make it more explicit that the trainees should know about the topics which are always taught and included in the textbooks such as foods and drinks due to their epistemic responsibilities as English teachers. Since the test writer group had trouble of displaying their epistemic access to the correct definition of "beverage", the educator rolls back the main problem and she highlights that beverage has different meanings in American and British English (in lines 88-91). In line 92, MEL acknowledges the educator's explanation accompanied by nodding in line 93. In what follows, the educator provides advice to the test writer group in lines 93-94 and then refers to their epistemic responsibility as test writers in lines 96-97. These lines indicate that the teacher trainees should look at the textbooks to control the meaning of "beverage", and then construct their test items accordingly. What is more, in lines 96-97, the teacher educator invokes the participants' teacher identity one more time by bringing the student category into the interactional ground. In doing so, the teacher educator orients to the test writers' tester and teacher identity by reminding them of their dual roles which require them to write their tests according to what they teach. In doing so, she positions the teacher trainees as English teachers and highlights the epistemic responsibilities they have in their prospective teaching careers. Since the pre-service teachers did not display their epistemic responsibility as assessors and teachers, they are held accountable.

Section 4.1 presented 6 instances of teacher educator-initiated test item problematization episodes. The sequential analysis of these episodes shows that the teacher educator initiated a problematization sequence regarding the ungrammaticality of the focal test items. These problematization sequences were either initiated or elaborated with Orientation to Teacher Identity (OTI). OTI was achieved in two different ways in the extracts. The first way of orienting to the teacher trainees' teacher identities was explicitly calling them as English language teachers or announcing that they are going to be English language teachers. The second way of OTI was invoking a non-present category of students in interaction, and thus positioning the teacher trainees as English language

teachers. In both ways, the teacher educator made explicit that the teacher trainees were expected to have/display epistemic access to the metalinguistic knowledge due to the fact that they are prospective English language teachers and they have to display their epistemic roles/responsibilities as English language teachers by constructing grammatically correct test items.

Teacher Trainee-Initiated Problematization

This section will illustrate the trainee-initiated problematization (TP) sequences. In trainee-initiated TP sequences, the initiation of the problem is carried out by one of the members of feedback giver groups.

Extract 7

Extract 7 presents the first instance of the trainee-initiated problematization sequences. The episode occurs approximately 2 minutes after Extract 2. The test under examination is written by Group 1 as an achievement test for 5ᵗʰ grade. In the extract, TEA is the teacher, BUR is a member of Group 5 and ATA is a member of Group 4, both of them are feedback provider groups.

```
     >>#BUR gazes at TEA, raises her hand --->
01    BUR: hocam
          madam
02         +(0.3)#
           ----->#
           +TEA gazes at BUR --->
03    TEA: uh huh
04    BUR: #also the (0.3) question question err:#
            #gazes at paper----------------------#
05    TEA: which question (0.2) question three↑ still+
           -------------------------------------->+
06    BUR: yes err:
07    TEA: +okay↓
           +-3--> 3: TEA shifts gaze between paper and BUR
```

```
08        (1.3)

09   BUR: can she play the (0.2) the guitar↓

10        (0.9)

11        °the° the correct form of it

12        (0.7)

13   TEA: can she pla:y↑

14        (0.2)+

          ---->+

15   BUR: the

16   TEA: +the guitar (0.2) ±yeah we talked about it

17        [that we need an artic]le

18   ATA: [article onu söyledik]

          article we talked about it

          +TEA gazes at BUR --->

                          ±TEA points at group one --->

19        (0.4)

20   TEA: oka:y↑ so i- *remember i even teased them i said in a year

                        *TEA smiles --->

21        you are going to become english language teachers <you


22        have to be very careful with the articles* right>↑+±

          --------------------------------------->*

          ----------------------------------------------->+

          ----------------------------------------------->±

23        +so that's a ±huge problem ladies

          +gazes at group one --->

                    ±raises her index finger --->

24        (0.3)

25        please↑ check your grammar± (0.5) es es- $especially when

          ------------------------->±

26        you are writing$- in the other section↑ it is very

27        important as well but ♦to have lots of grammar mistakes in

                                 ♦makes a disappointed face --->

28        grammar section (0.6) ayıp yahu↓

                                what a shame

29        (0.8)+♦

          ---->+

          ----->♦

30   TEA: +okay↓ check over and over again
```

```
        +gazes at paper --->>
```

Before the extract begins, BUR gazes at the teacher educator and raises her hand but TEA does not orient to BUR until she calls the teacher educator 'madam' in line 01. After BUR's turn bidding, TEA establishes mutual gaze (Mortensen, 2008) with BUR at the beginning of a 03-second silence. After this brief gap of silence, TEA nominates BUR as the next speaker with a go-ahead in line 03. In the next line, BUR gazes at the exam paper and starts searching for the problematic test item. In line 05, TEA asks a question to elicit the number of the test item. After a brief gap of silence in the same line, TEA provides a candidate number which is the last question being discussed (`question three↑`) and it is followed by a confirmation marker (`still`). In line 06, BUR confirms TEA's response. In line 07, TEA provides a minimal token (**`okay`**) and starts shifting gaze between the exam paper and BUR, which displays the teacher's listenership. After a gap of silence, BUR corrects the mistake in question three which is already discussed as one of the problematic questions (see Extract 2). After another gap of silence, BUR provides the missing part of the problematic sentence with a soft tone of voice, and then she explains her correction in lines 09-11. After a gap of silence, TEA initiates a designedly incomplete utterance to clarify the problem in the test item in line 13. After a brief gap of silence, BUR provides the missing part of question three (`the`) once again in line 15. In the next line, TEA gazes at BUR and acknowledges her contribution by rewording it (`the guitar`), and then she refers to a shared past event (Can Daşkın, 2017; Can Daşkın & Hatipoğlu, 2019) which displays that the problem initiated by BUR was already discussed (`yeah we talked about it`) and solved (`[that we need an artic]le`). I should note that TEA gazes at BUR, but points at Group 1 when she makes the past reference. In doing so, the teacher educator marks Group 1 as the recipient of the problematization while maintaining the interactional space with BUR. In line 18, ATA acknowledges the past learning event in an overlapping turn with TEA. It is understood in lines 01-18 that one of the sentences written by the test writer group (i.e., Group 1) is ungrammatical due to the lack of using a determiner. After a brief gap of silence, TEA initiates an understanding check (`okay`), and then she starts elaborating on

the past problematization episode. In lines 20-21, the teacher educator refers to a shared past event, and with this reference, she invokes the teacher identity of teacher trainees once again. The past reference displays that since the members of test writer groups are teacher candidates, they are expected to have/display epistemic access to the correct use of determiners. Accordingly, the teacher educator ascribes an epistemic responsibility to the teacher trainees (`you have to be very careful with the articles`). As the teacher trainees have trouble in displaying their epistemic access to the use of determiners, they are held accountable by the teacher educator in a teasing manner for not displaying their epistemic responsibility. In the next line, TEA orients to Group 1 and articulates that the problem about the use of articles is a major problem. Here is noteworthy that TEA's turn is accompanied by an embodied action (i.e., raising her index finger) until the next line, which also indicates the test item is still being problematized. In line 25, TEA starts with a politeness marker that is prosodically salient and requests Group 1 to check their grammar. After a gap of silence, TEA starts justifying her request by referring to the grammar mistakes of Group 1 in the grammar section. The teacher educator's justification of request displays that the grammar problem in question three is labeled as major in line 23 since Group 1 makes these grammar mistakes in the grammar section of the exam, and they have already lots of grammar mistakes in the grammar section. In line 28, after a gap of silence, TEA provides an explicit negative assessment with a falling intonation at the final position of her turn. In a 0.8-second of silence, TEA continues to gaze at Group 1 with a disappointed face. In line 30, TEA orients back to exam paper multimodally, and closes the sequence with a minimal token (`okay`) and with another request. The teacher educator's explicit negative assessment and her embodied actions may also indicate that constructing an ungrammatical test item is regarded as a critical problem in this context because the teacher trainees are positioned as English teachers in interaction (line 21) and have trouble in displaying the ascribed epistemic role/responsibility (line 22).

Extract 7 illustrated the first instance of trainee-initiated problematization sequences. Unlike the educator-initiated problematization occurrences, the discussion about the focal

test item was initiated by one of the teacher trainees in the feedback giver group (lines 01-06). After the teacher educator's orientation to the focal item (line 07) and BUR's announcement of the problem (lines 09-11), the teacher educator referred to a shared past event highlighting that the problem was already discussed and solved (line 16-17). In lines 20-21, the teacher educator started an elaboration sequence about the past problem with a reference to another shared past event. In this elaboration sequence, the teacher educator used the same interactional strategy/resource, an orientation/invocation of the teacher identity of the teacher trainees. After positioning the teacher trainees as English teachers, the teacher educator ascribed an epistemic responsibility pertaining to the teacher category and she held the teacher trainees accountable for not displaying their epistemic responsibilities in test item writing. In doing so, the teacher educator turned the professional criticism sequence into a teaching session by reminding the teacher trainees of their professional roles/responsibilities as English teachers. With that, I now turn to the next extract that presents the second instance of trainee-initiated test item problematization sequences.

Extract 8

Extract 8 illustrates the second instance of the trainee-initiated problematization sequence. The sequential unfolding of a trainee-initiated problematization episode includes a potential problem firstly stated by the other participants (members of feedback giver groups). Then, the teacher educator builds her criticism on the initiated problem. In the focal extract, Group 4 is the feedback giver group and Group 5 is the test writer group. ECE, ATA, and EFE are members of Group 4.

```
1      TEA: seven+ (1.4)♥ (1.6) if you try to walk under+ #a ladder
                  +gazes at the paper-------------------+ #---3 --->
                        ♥ece and efe raise their hands --->
        3: tea shifts gaze to the participants

2      TEA: #+yes♥+
          ->#-->♥
```

```
            +--4--+ 4: TEA establishes mutual gaze with ece

3      ♠+(0.6)

    ♠ece looks at the paper --->

    +TEA looks at the paper ---> line 16

4    ECE: er: for the option B (0.2) there are two negatives

5         you will not be able to become♠ ♣↑unlucky↓ (0.3) it's too

          --------------------------->♠ ♣gazes at teacher --->

6         complicated

7         (1.9)

8         we try to understand↓♣

          ------------------>♣

9          (0.3)

10   TEA: if you try to walk under a °ladder (you have to be lucky)°

11   ECE: you [will not be able to]

12   TEA:     [you will not be able] to

13   ECE: ♠become unlucky♠

          ♠------8-------♠ 8: shifts gaze to teacher

14   TEA: °you will not be able to become unlucky°

15   ATA:  ♫it's distractor♫

          ♫-------9-------♫ 9: gazes at teacher

16   TEA: it is the distractor and you will not be able to become+

          ------------------------------------------------------>+

17        +unlucky (0.3) what does that really mean to be able to

          +shifts gaze to group five --->

18        become unlucky (2.0) i- it doesn't make sense in English

19        (1.0)

20        to be able to (.) do something right↑ and to be able to

21        become unlucky (1.0) okay this is not good English (0.3)

22        you should not expose your students to such sentences or

23        such expressions (.) so therefore definitely revise it
```

```
24          right↑ (.) first it doesn't make sense and secondly

25          able to cannot be used like that+
            --------------------------------->+
```

In line 01, TEA directs the teacher trainees to the focal item stating the question number (seven) and she shifts her gaze to the exam paper. After the 1.4-second of silence, ECE and EFE bid for a turn multimodally; however, TEA does not orient to the participants since she gazes at the paper. After 1.6-second of silence, TEA starts reading the test item. At the final position of her turn, TEA scans the teacher trainees with her gaze to find a willing participant to make contributions about the focal item. In line 02, TEA establishes mutual gaze with ECE and allocates the turn with a go-ahead (yes). After the turn-allocation, TEA and ECE mutually orient to the exam paper. In line 04, ECE directs TEA to the option "b" (for option B), and then she articulates a potential problem (there are two negatives) about option "b". In lines 05-06, she reads the focal option from the paper and provides her feedback about it (it's too complicated). After a gap of silence, ECE self-selects and comments referring to her group members in line 08. After a brief gap of silence, TEA starts reading the focal test item (i.e., question seven) from the paper in line 10. In the next line, ECE repeats the problematic option in overlap with TEA's turn orienting to the problematic option (line 12). In lines 13-14, ECE and TEA rearticulate the option once again. In line 15, ATA provides a justification for the purpose of Group 5's construction of the problematic item (it's distractor). In the next line, TEA accepts the justification; however, she initiates the act of problematizing the focal option. First, she renews the option "b" and then shifts her gaze to the test designer group (Group 5). After a brief gap of silence, TEA utters a question inquiring about the linguistic accuracy of the test item in lines 17-18 (what does that really mean to be able to become unlucky). After 2.0-second of silence, she provides the actual problem in the item stating that the phrase (i.e., to be able to become unlucky) used by Group 5 is not correct to use (it doesn't make sense in English). After a gap of silence, TEA elaborates on the problem comparing the correct use of "to be able to" with Group 5's misconstruction in the exam (line 20-21). After 1.0-second of silence,

TEA utters an understanding check (`okay`) and criticizes the misuse of "to be able to become unlucky" referring to the language use (`this is not good English`). In lines 22-23, TEA provides a warning which orients to teacher identities of the participants. She brings the non-present group of students into the interaction and explicitly refers to the participants' epistemic responsibilities as teachers (`you should not expose your students to such sentences or, such expressions`). In doing so, the teacher educator uses invocation of teacher identities of the participants as an interactional resource to problematize specific test item. The teacher educator closes the sequence providing another warning of revising the problematic test item (`so therefore definitely revise it`) and repeating the reasons for her request of revising the item in lines 24-25.

Extract 8 presented another instance of trainee-initiated problematization episode. As distinct from the educator-initiated problematization sequences, the problem was announced by the teacher trainee/s from the feedback giver groups after the teacher educator's invitation to make contributions about the focal test item. In the extract, the initiation of a potential problem about option " b" was performed by ECE in lines 04-08. In lines 10-12-14, the teacher educator oriented to the problem by reading the option "b" from the exam paper. These lines led to the identification and announcement of the actual problem by the teacher educator in lines 16,17 and 18. The teacher educator deployed interactional strategies/resources that are similar with previous extracts in lines 16-25 to provide the problematization sequence. First, she mutually oriented to the test writer group, then questioned the accuracy of the option "b" (`what does that really mean to be able to become unlucky`). In what followed, she announced the problem in the item (`i-it doesn't make sense in English`). In line 21, the teacher educator problematized the option "b" with another statement (`this is not good English`).

Second, the extract showed another instance of the teacher educator's explicit reference to the test takers (i.e., students) when doing problematizing. Since the teacher trainees are prospective teachers of English, they were ascribed certain epistemic roles and

responsibilities. In lines 22-23, the teacher educator announced an epistemic responsibility of the teacher candidates by invoking the non-present category of students in interaction (`you should not expose your students to such sentences or such expressions`). It may be argued that the educator's reference to test takers helps the teacher trainees to generate a better understanding of English language teaching pedagogy and the principles to be followed in testing and evaluating language learners' English proficiency. For instance, exposing students (i.e., test takers) to wrong English expressions in the exams was strongly problematized (lines 18-23). So, the educator attributed the trainees an epistemic responsibility to display in test writing; correct use of English. Therefore, the problematization led to the educator's request of revising the problematic item. In consequence, the teacher educator's use of teacher identity as an interactional strategy/resource to problematize the test item eventually ripened the problematization episode into a teaching session for the teacher trainees to develop their professional knowledge in particular their English testing and evaluation skills. With these in mind, I now present the last instance of test-item problematization episodes in the data set.

Extract 9

Extract 9 presents the last instance of trainee-initiated problematization episode. The episode occurs approximately six minutes after the second instance of trainee-initiated educator problematization sequence displayed in the previous extract. The participants give feedback to Group 5's grammar test. EFE and ATA are members of Group 4, and BER is a member of Group 3.

```
>>efe raises his hand
1    TEA: #and +then (0.4) question ten#+

            +------------1-----------+

        1: tea shifts gaze between the paper and the participants

        #ata shifts gaze between efe and teacher#

2    ATA: *hocam (.) geçmeden önce*
```

teacher before that question

　　　　　gazes at teacher-------

3　　**EFE: ♥şey dokuzda♥**

　　　　at ninth question

　　　　♥-----5-----♥ 5: efe gazes at teacher

4　　**TEA: +of course↑ yeah+**

　　　　+-------6-------+

　　　　6: establishes mutual gaze with and points at efe

5　　**EFE: ♥for option C we can+not say♥ ♠you better not**

　　　　♥-----------7-------------♥　♠------8------>

　　　　7: efe gazes and points at the paper

　　　　8: efe shifts gaze to teacher

　　　　　　　　　　　　+tea looks at the paper --->

6　　　(1.1)

7　　**TEA: you better <u>not</u> drive carefully it is raining+**

　　　　--->+

8　　**TEA: +$hahhahhah$**

　　　　+----10 --->

　　　　10: gazes at the participants

9　　**BER: ♣you had better♣**

　　　　♣gazes at teacher♣

10　　**ATA: #it should be had better#**

　　　　#gazes at teacher-------#

11　　**TEA: hahhahah $correct$(.hhh)+±OOF OFF (.) <u>grammar</u> <u>grammar</u>**

　　　　----------------------->+±gaze shifts to paper --->

12　　**<u>grammar</u>±**

　　　　------>±

13　　　+(3.1)

　　　　+gazes at the participants --->

```
14    TEA: and you are going to become english language

15         teachers remember↑

          --------------->>
```

Before the extract begins, the participants give feedback to question number nine in the test, and EFE bids for a turn raising his hand but TEA does not orient to the turn-bidding since she shifts her gaze between the paper and the other participants. Instead, in line 01, TEA reinitiates the discussion by directing the teacher trainees to the next question (`#and +then (0.4) question ten#`). In overlap with TEA's turn, ATA shifts his gaze to his group member EFE and creates the interactional space for him in line 02 (`*hocam (.) geçmeden önce*`/*teacher before that question*). In line 03, EFE self-selects and directs the teacher educator to the previous question (i.e., question number nine). In the following line, TEA establishes mutual gaze (Mortensen, 2008) with EFE, allocates the turn with a go-ahead (`+of course↑ yeah+`) and by pointing at him. In line 05, EFE announces the unacceptability of the option "c" by stating the ungrammatical part of the item (`♥for option C we cannot say♥ ♠you better not`). The teacher educator orients to the exam paper in the middle of EFE's turn. After a gap of silence, TEA reads the option "c" from the paper in line 07. In the following line, TEA gazes at the participants and marks the option "c" as problematic with the laughter particles. In lines 09-10, BER and ATA provide correction for option "c". In lines 11-15, TEA builds upon the teacher trainees' problem initiation about the focal option. First, TEA acknowledges the problem, and thereby ATA's and BER's corrections with the laughter particles and with a confirmation token which is also accompanied by smiley voice (`hahhahah $correct$`) in line 11. Then, she inhales and utters two prosodically-salient emotive tokens (`OOF OFF`), and then announces the problematic language area in the focal item with an emphasis on each repetition (`grammar grammar grammar±`) in lines 11-12. After a gap of silence, TEA gazes at the participants and finally closes the problematization sequence with an explicit reference to the teacher trainees' English language teacher identities (`and you are going to become english language teachers remember↑`) in lines 14-15. In doing so, the teacher educator

problematizes option "c" of the focal question (i.e., question nine) since it consists of an ungrammatical sentence.

Extract 9 illustrated the third instance of a trainee-initiated problematization episode. In lines 01-05, two members of the feedback giver group (i.e., Group 4) collaboratively initiated the problem in the option "c" of question nine. After ERN's announcement of ungrammaticality for the option "c" in line 05, the teacher educator oriented to the focal option as well. The teacher educator read the option from the exam paper and she uttered laughter particles in line 07. This may indicate that the option "c" is problematic since the teacher educator's utterances led the members of feedback giver groups to correct it. BER and ATA told the same grammar unit respectively (♣you had better♣/#it should be had better#). In doing so, they marked the option "c" as ungrammatical, and thereby problematic. In line 11, the teacher educator accepted the teacher trainees' contributions with another laughter and with the confirmation token, and then she announced the problematic language area (grammar grammar grammar±). Most of the previous extracts (see Extract 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8) demonstrated that the teacher trainees had some trouble in displaying their epistemic access to certain meta-linguistic knowledge; therefore, the teacher educator's two emotive tokens (±OOF OFF) and the suprasegmental emphasis on "grammar" may indicate that the teacher educator refers to the previously discussed test items which were also problematized due to the grammar mistakes. It may be argued that making grammar mistakes while preparing tests is inadmissible in the language teacher education context, because the ungrammatical items are intensely problematized. The teacher educator's orientation to the participants' English teacher identities in the following lines makes the argument even more apparent. Since the participants are teacher trainees who are going to be English language teachers in almost one year, they are expected to have and display their epistemic access to certain category-bound knowledge. All in all, the teacher trainees were expected to construct grammatically correct test items and they were held accountable by the teacher educator for not displaying their epistemic access to the

meta-linguistic knowledge. Therefore, the option "c" was problematized by the teacher educator with an explicit reference to the teacher identities of the teacher trainees because they had trouble in displaying their professional knowledge and construct ungrammatical test items.

Section 4.2 illustrated 3 instances of trainee-initiated test item problematization sequences. As distinct from educator-initiated TIP sequences, trainee-initiated episodes shows that the announcement of the problematic test items was conducted by the teacher trainee/s. In these TIP sequences, the teacher educator displayed OTI in two different ways. First, she referred to the non-present category of students in interaction, and thereby positions the teacher trainees as English language teachers. Secondly, she announced that the teacher trainees are going to be English language teachers. In both ways, the teacher educator highlights the teacher trainees' epistemic roles/responsibilities as English language teachers and she held them accountable for not displaying these responsibilities in test writing processes.

Chapter 5

Discussion, Suggestions, and Conclusion

In this chapter, I will discuss the findings in relation to L2 teacher education, feedback-giving practices in L2 teacher education, and testing and evaluation training of L2 teacher trainees.

Prior to the discussion in detail, it is worthy of recalling the research questions that I seek out to answer:

1. How is OTI sequentially employed as an interactional resource by the teacher educator?

2. What social and institutional actions are achieved by the use of OTI in test item problematization sequences?

After discussing each research question based on the findings and literature, I will then recommend pedagogical implications and share some limitations before concluding the study.

Test Item Problematization Sequences and Orientations to Teacher Identity

This study investigated the classroom interaction of test item reviewing (IR) sessions in an undergraduate level English Testing and Evaluation (ELTE) course. The micro-analysis of IR sessions revealed the educator/trainee-initiated test item problematization (TIP) sequences when the focal teacher trainees wrote ungrammatical test items in the exam papers. In TIP sequences, the teacher educator displayed Orientations to Teacher Identity (OTI). The teacher educator enacted OTIs in two different ways: (i) explicitly calling the teacher trainees as English teachers or announcing that they are going to be English teachers and (ii) referring to a non-present category of student. Within these episodes, the teacher trainees were ascribed several epistemic responsibilities such as correct use of English, producing error-free tests items, displaying epistemic access to cultural details. The trainees' ungrammatical test items indicated their trouble in displaying the ascribed

epistemic responsibilities as prospective English teachers. The educator problematized these items by means of OTIs. Consequently, the reflexive relationship between the pedagogical purpose of the classroom and its interactional organization (Seedhouse, 2004) contained the teacher educator's OTIs deployed as an interactional resource for achieving a series of institutional actions.

First, the teacher educator's OTI occurred in and through TIP sequences in which the classroom jointly discussed why the focal item was problematic. The educator therefore bridged problematization sequences with the pedagogical goal(s) of the ELTE course that aims to increase trainees' knowledge of testing and evaluation and to experience test item preparation. Second, the educator's OTIs in TIP sequences signaled the identification of the problem(s) in the test items. In OTIs, the educator addressed the problematic item either to the item writers or to the whole class. Third, the educator drew on OTIs to bring the trainees' future teacher roles to the presence to initially be ascribed and then to emphasize their epistemic responsibilities that involve the avoidance of grammar mistakes in test items. Lastly and relatedly, the teacher trainees were held accountable for not displaying their epistemic access to the linguistic knowledge of the language about which they were preparing the test items.

The sequential position of OTIs in interaction and the social and institutional actions that are achieved by the use of OTIs varied. For instance OTIs were used as an epistemic status check (Extract 1) to elicit the trainees' epistemic access to the correct use of a particular grammar rule. The teacher trainer also drew on OTIs to provide a counter argument after the teacher trainees' justification for their grammar mistakes (Extracts 1, 3, 6). In doing so, she reminded the teacher trainees of their epistemic responsibilities as English teachers and held them accountable for not displaying their responsibilities in test writing. Table 4 below shows the sequential positioning of OTIs in interaction and the social and institutional actions OTIs achieved.

Table 4

The Sequential Positioning of OTIs

The Sequential positions of OTIs	
To initiate a problem	Extract 3
	Extract 4
To elaborate on a problem	Extract 2
	Extract 4
	Extract 5
	Extract 7
	Extract 8
	Extract 9
To provide a counter argument	Extract 1
	Extract 3
	Extract 6
To check the trainees' epistemic status	Extract 1

These varying positions indicate that OTIs were multifunctional for accomplishing pedagogical and institutional actions. In what follows, I will discuss their function and significance in relation to L2 teacher education, mentor-teacher conversation and language awareness.

L2 Teacher Education

From a socially situated perspective, interaction is significant for enhancing the understanding of how L2 teachers acquire the knowledge of language teaching since the sociocultural contexts in which the factors shaping teacher candidates' knowledge of L2 teaching become observable in and through it (Johnson & Freeman, 2001; Johnson, 2009). Examining the interactions of prospective L2 English teachers in ELTE course in which they were trained for how to assess learners' L2 English proficiency uncovered the ways in which the educator contributed to the trainees' ELTE knowledge. She drew on the trainees' teacher identities to address the problematic test items although they were at that time only teacher candidates. This points out that people's roles can be subject to an interaction "to

perform particular kinds of meaningful actions at that moment and with those people"
(Harre, 2012, p. 4) in professional interactional settings.

For pedagogical purposes, the teacher educator positioned the teacher trainees as
real teachers in various ways such as articulating the trainees' profession (English language
teachers), emphasizing their duties (why are you teaching your students incorrect English?),
and bringing non-present students to the present interaction (you have to be examples for
your students). The educator's positioning of the trainees is the consequence of
ungrammatical test items and this implies that she views the trainees as the member of L2
English teacher category. In positioning the trainees as real English teachers, the educator
assigns certain duties (Kayi-Aydar & Miller, 2018) such as having a good command of
English and displaying this knowledge in professional settings. Various OTI practices
observed in this study prove that positioning is inherently observable in teacher educator-
teacher trainee interaction. These inherent practices are performed by the teacher educator
to accomplish trainee-related and training-relevant actions. In a similar attempt,
investigating the interactional organization of real-life writing tutorials between mentors and
international students and mentors' interactional strategies when giving feedback, Leyland
(2021) displayed tutors' explicit reference to the addressee of the students' manuscripts
(i.e., the reader) who were not present in the advice-giving session. The tutors' particular
references included describing the reader's particular needs and/or characteristics. In
parallel with Leyland's study, the extract 3 demonstrated the teacher educator's reference
to the addressee of the trainees' test items. The teacher educator's reference to this non-
present category of students highlighted the problematic part of the tests and potential
challenges students may face while taking the test. Invoking a non-present category of
students helped the teacher educator orient to teacher identity. Consequently, the teacher
educator reminded the teacher trainees of their roles/responsibilities towards their students.
Accordingly, teacher educators can be instructed to take advantage of positioning as an

interactional resource in pedagogy courses for enacting actions related to trainees' professional competencies.

Furthermore, the teacher educator's OTIs followed the disputes over the grammaticality of some test items, and the ungrammatical items were corrected within these episodes. This supports the argument that teacher positioning can be an interactional tool and enhance teaching and learning (Kayi-Aydar, 2014). With this function, teacher positioning can be viewed as a feature of classroom interactional competence (Walsh, 2011) that aims at using interaction for effective teaching.

The sequential unfolding of positioning is also noteworthy as it was prefaced by a teacher or trainee problematization sequence initiation wherein the educator extended the ungrammatical item to the whole class discussion and elicited responses not only from feedback providers but also from other trainees. In this way, the teacher maximized interactional space (Seedhouse, 2004) and turned problematization sequences into a tool for enhancing reflection. In other words, positioning as an interactional resource within reflection sequences was not directed to a particular number of trainees in the same setting; rather, all trainees within that setting were held accountable for the educator's positioning as they have the same roles and duties. On the one hand, this suggests OTI practices can be deployed for enlarging reflection to a larger audience. On the other hand, it suggests some implications for deploying problematization sequences for reflective purposes in training interactions.

Mentor-Teacher Conversations for Professional Development

Reflective dialogues during the teaching process (Ishino, 2018) and in post-observation conferences (Waring, 2014) can enable teacher learning, which can also contribute professional development. Copland et al. (2009) underlie the necessity for more genuine reflection in which educators and trainees collaborate for exploring weak and strong trainee performances. The examined course reflects this understanding as test item

writer groups were provided feedback by the educator, feedback provider groups, and other trainees. In this way, the test item writer groups found opportunities to correct their mistakes in the tests before applying them to L2 learners. Therefore, this study underlies how important it is to negotiate teaching- or teacher-related practices with teacher candidates to scaffold their professional growth.

Teacher or trainee problematization sequences were other micro-moments from which genuine reflection emerged. These episodes resulted in correction of ungrammatical test items and OTI episodes. Since these episodes were initiated by the teacher educator (Extract 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), and feedback providers (Extract 7, 8, 9), test item reviewing sessions turned into a co-constructed interactional action. Reflections of some trainees who were not in the feedback provider groups support this argument (Extract 4, 6, 7, 9) as it underlies the maximized reflective space in the test item reviewing sessions. In addition to displaying lack of strict roles related to feedback providing, this values the participation of all trainees to the reflective dialogue because they also contributed to the correction of mistakes in the test items. Considering this, problematization sequences can be used for starting reflective practices in teacher educator-teacher trainee interactions that may assist teacher learning. Correction of the grammar mistakes can be given as an example to this possibility. Although this study does not provide evidence to the learning of the participants, it contributes to the literature by exploring how such possibilities can be created for teacher candidates.

Examining language test item reviewing (IR) sessions of peer in-service teachers, Can (2020) found interactional actions through which IR practices were accomplished with the teachers' orientations to the fundamentals of testing and to the roles of testers and reviewers. More specifically, she revealed a three-step procedure by which item writer and reviewer in-service teachers revise their tests. This procedure contained problematization of the item, a change suggestion, and a change review. Different from Can's (2020) study, I showed that item reviewing sessions in a pre-service teacher training setting could have

OTIs as an interactional resource for grounding the teacher educator's test item problematizations. With OTIs, the teacher educator assigned epistemic roles/responsibilities and she held the L2 teacher trainees accountable for not displaying these responsibilities in test item writing. In doing so, the teacher educator based her problematizations on L2 teacher trainees' prospective L2 teacher identities. Additionally, the educator's use of OTIs differs from the sources observed by Can (2020) in a collegial setting. The institutional context makes OTIs available to the educator because the trainees are teacher candidates. Therefore, the educator's OTIs can show her awareness of institution-relevant interactional resources and thus her professional competence. Moreover, colleagues refer to past instructional events (Can, 2020) to initiate the problematization in IR sessions. This is different in my research setting because the L2 teacher trainees wrote their tests based on their assumptions and imaginary learner profiles (Yöney, 2021). To develop practice-oriented syllabus for ELTE courses in L2 teacher education settings, the tests that the trainees write in their ELTE courses can be aligned with their real teaching practices. Mirroring the real work contexts in relation to test development and IR sessions can better prepare L2 teacher trainees to their prospective careers (Can, 2020). The last difference is that the teacher trainees did not challenge the educator's problematizations except Extract 3. This can be related to the asymmetric power relationship between the L2 teacher educator and L2 teacher trainees in the classroom.

Although this study reveals OTIs as a distinctive practice, the act of problematizing the test items has some commonalities with Can's (2020) study. For instance, the educator emphasized the testing principles in Extracts 1, 2, 3 and 6. Therefore, she managed the initiated problematization sequences similar to how in-service teachers do in language test IR sessions (Can, 2020). Also, the teacher educator continued to elaborate on the problem probably to better illustrate it even though a mutual alignment was achieved on the problematized items. Lastly, OTI was sometimes combined with orientation to the trainees' language test writer identities (Extracts 1, 2, 6).

The trainees' grammar mistakes in test items led to the problematization sequences, rendered reflective dialogues, and resulted in the teacher educator's OTIs. Therefore, L2 teacher candidates' metalinguistic knowledge of the target language needs to be addressed in their training.

Prospective L2 Teachers' Lack of L2 Knowledge and Language Awareness

Because the research methodology of this study is CA that only examines observable cases in naturally occurring data, this study does not provide explicit evidence to the trainees' knowledge of L2 English. However, the analyzed episodes were about their (mis)use of L2 English. Earlier I discussed how these episodes were treated as problematic by the educator and the other trainees and how these problems were managed by the educator for training purposes. Another point of discussion is why the educator labelled the trainees' misuses of L2 English as problematic.

Although the teacher trainees had also problems relating to testing principles, test validity and reliability or test structures, the OTIs were emerged only when they had grammar mistakes in their tests. The mistakes relating to ELTE knowledge were problematized by the teacher trainer using other resources such as reference to testing principles or reference to past learning event (Can Daşkın, 2017; Can Daşkın & Hatipoğlu, 2019). The mistakes were tolerated to some extent. This indicates that since the participants were undergraduate students who took the ELTE course, they were considered as in their training phase regarding L2 testing and assessment and not expected to produce error free test items regarding the ELTE knowledge. However, when the teacher trainees constructed an ungrammatical test item, the teacher trainer problematized those items with OTIs. She held the pre-service teachers responsible for producing grammatical test items because of their prospective English teacher careers. She criticized them by reminding of their epistemic responsibilities as L2 teachers and she never tolerated grammar mistakes in the tests. For instance, in Extract 7, the teacher educator problematized a grammar mistake in

the grammar section of the language test by referring it as 'a huge problem'. Then, she stated that to have lots of grammar mistake in the grammar section was a 'shame'. This indicates that the teacher trainees were expected to use correct grammar, their grammar mistakes were not tolerated, and they were strongly criticized by their educator.

Regarding the trainees' responsibility as prospective L2 teachers, they are expected to produce error free test items. They should be proficient L2 users and display their knowledge in professional settings such as in writing tests. The findings showed that the trainees had troubles in determiners (Extract 1, 4, 7), prepositions (Extract 5), punctuation marks (Extract 3), modal verbs (Extract 8, 9), and explanation of some words (Extract 6). The problematization sequences followed the noticing of these troubles, and the educator held the trainees accountable for not displaying their epistemic responsibility in a professional activity, while writing test items. As discussed in the previous section, the problematization sequences were initiated by both the trainees and the educator. The trainees' involvement in such sequences that led to the correction of ungrammatical test items shows their access to the relevant linguistic knowledge. These contributions fostered the trainees to co-construct linguistic knowledge, test item writing, and reflective practices for professional purposes.

In Extract 7, the problematization sequence in which the class discussed an ungrammatical test item was initiated by a group who also had an ungrammatical test item. This indicates that IR settings facilitate the identification of profession relevant troubles regarding L2 testing and evaluation. Practice-oriented courses, as in ELTE course in this study, in language teacher education programs can benefit from pair and group works with such feedback sessions in which trainees can evaluate each other's work.

In Extracts 2 and 8, the teacher educator drew on L2 English use in test items and reminded the trainees of their responsibility for using accurate English. In addition to classrooms, L2 learners can receive input from items in language tests and produce relevant outcomes. Exposing them to incorrect input in tests can cause hazardous learning

experiences. Moreover, it can pose questions related to the validity of the test and the competency of the test writer, namely the teacher. Especially in Extract 2, the teacher trainer accused the L2 teacher trainees of teaching incorrect English to their students due to the grammar mistakes in the test item. Extract 2 clearly indicates that L2 teaching and testing are interrelated and tests are considered to be a part of teaching process. Therefore, the teacher trainees have to display their epistemic responsibility of using correct grammar not only in teaching sessions but also in test writing. Moreover in Extract 6, the teacher educator stated that the teacher trainees would be English language teachers. Since food and drinks were always taught to students, they should have known cultural differences regarding these topics. Accordingly, they should be able to test what they taught to their students. These lines indicate the inseparable relationship of testing and teaching. In Extracts 4 and 5, the teacher educator used an ironic statement to emphasize that the teacher trainees could not assess their students' grammar with lots of grammatical mistakes in the exam papers they prepared. The problematization sequences built upon the trainees' grammar mistakes imply their epistemic responsibilities – that is, evaluating their students' use of grammar and noticing the grammatical problems students may encounter (Leech, 1994). These sequences can also encourage the teacher trainees to be the role models of L2 English use for their prospective students (Edge, 1988).

Although language teachers are accepted to have the L2 knowledge required for language teaching, this study does not reveal whether the trainees equipped with the target knowledge. What it, however, shows that they could not sometimes make their grammar knowledge observable or produce the correct language structures. Lack of such knowledge displays can have consequences in professional settings especially in testing settings. IR sessions in this study enabled the trainees to revise the problematic items in their tests which underlies the constructive role mentor and peer feedback in test writing. Similarly, this can be expanded to in-service L2 teachers as they also write tests. They can participate

in collaborative and reflective work settings where they can elicit feedback from their colleagues for their tests and eliminate potential mistakes.

The trainees' lack of L2 knowledge, i.e., subject-matter knowledge, while writing test items, can also raise questions about their ability to teach or test this knowledge. These knowledge types are fused into teacher language awareness (TLA) (Andrews, 2003b). TLA refers to language teachers' knowledge about the subject-matter and communicative language ability to transform this knowledge into effective input for the learners (Andrews, 2001). That is to say, teachers' effective interactional management can mediate the instruction of subject-matter or knowing the subject does not guarantee an effective instruction without an effective interactional management. Thornbury (1997) mentions several problems that might be generated from lack of TLA. It can cause an inefficiency in evaluating and adapting teaching materials, analyzing students' mistakes, and providing relevant language as input effectively. The research methodology of this study, CA, does not enable to bring evidence to the trainees' TLA. However, the findings unveil instances of trainees' lack of L2 knowledge. Therefore, the teacher educator labelled the ungrammatical test items as problematic with an orientation to the trainees' teacher identity. For instance, in Extract 1, the teacher educator problematized the trainees' non-use of determiners by saying, "*but you are going to be English language teachers so you have to be careful about them".* Also in Extract 2, the teacher educator criticizes one of the options and says, "*why are you teaching incorrect English to your students*". The educator's statements support that writing an ungrammatical test item, a lack of L2 knowledge, can lead to problems such as providing incorrect input in teaching sessions and testing and evaluation processes.

The impact of TLA on pedagogical practices is generally explored from the perspective of language teaching (e.g., Andrews, 1999, 2001), but these practices also incorporate the testing and evaluation abilities of language teachers. However, TLA in language assessment is yet to be investigated. The remaining gap can have impact on language teaching and teacher competencies. This study fills in this gap by revealing the

interactional unfolding of test item problematization episodes regarding a group of pre-service English teachers' lack of L2 knowledge in writing language tests and the educator's interactional management of these mistakes, that is, through orientation to teacher identity.

Furthermore, this study brings a social-interactional perspective to TLA which is often explained from a cognitivist domain. The trainees' lack of L2 knowledge and language awareness in test items emerged as the reflection foci in test item reviewing sessions. Despite being a cognitive term, the trainees' lack of language awareness was made socially observable by the educator and trainees for professional reasons. Similarly, previous research focused on data collection methods such as stimulated-recall (Andrews & McNeill 2005; Mullock 2006), interviews (Lo, 2019), surveys (Wray, 1993), and questionnaires (Borg & Burns, 2008). Unlike previous research, the educator and trainees' orientation to lack of L2 knowledge was discovered with the micro-analytic lens of CA. Therefore, this study emphasizes the need for more micro-analytic work on TLA. This can enhance the understanding of its features in language teachers and teacher candidates who are, according to the educator analyzed in this study, required to display their TLA as part of their epistemic roles/responsibilities.

Limitations and Suggestions

As this study has a micro-analytic perspective and is focused on the interactions of a small group of teacher educator-teacher trainee participants, generalizability of the findings can be risky. Although all teacher educators may not deploy similar practices in training teacher candidates, the analyzed sequences can shed light on what some teacher educators are likely to do (Waring, 2014). More studies can be conducted on different ELTE courses to unearth interactional actions specific to ELTE course context. The study focused on a particular interactional resource, OTI, deployed by an L2 teacher educator in IR sessions of an undergraduate ELTE course. Although the use of OTIs have potentials in L2 teacher training in relation to L2 testing and evaluation skills, the analyses are limited to this

particular practice. Therefore, OTI practices can be researched in other L2 teacher education contexts. Further studies can also investigate different L2 teacher education courses such as teaching skills and instructional design courses to find out the other context specific interactional resources deployed by L2 teacher educators or L2 teacher trainees. Lastly, this study did not provide any evidence in terms of the L2 teacher trainees' professional learning. However, it showed L2 teacher educator's interactional resources that may facilitate professional learning opportunities of L2 teacher trainees. Lack of evidence for professional learning can be considered as a limitation. Also, L2 teacher trainees' language test manuscripts were not available and therefore not examined. Thus, the mistakes in the test items might not be illustrated clearly in the analyses of the provided extracts. However, it should be noted that the problematized items were revised by the test writer groups and shared with the whole class in a presentation; but these sessions were not analyzed in this study because they were beyond the scope of this study.

Conclusion

This thesis aimed to discover classroom interactional practices occurring in an undergraduate ELTE course by adopting multimodal CA. It revealed a particular L2 teacher educator practice named as Orientation to Teacher Identity (OTI). OTIs appeared in test item problematization sequences following the announcement of the problems in the test items. The teacher educator utilized OTIs in two different ways; explicitly calling the L2 teacher trainees as English language teachers/announcing that they are going to be English language teachers and referring to a non-present group of students in interaction. By the use of OTIs, a series of interactional and institutional actions was achieved. First, the teacher educator positioned the L2 teacher trainees as actual L2 teachers and assigned a set of epistemic responsibilities to them. Due to the problematic test items, the teacher educator held the L2 teacher trainees accountable for not displaying the ascribed epistemic responsibilities. Therefore, the test item problematization sequences turned into a sequence in which L2 teacher trainees' responsibilities as prospective L2 teachers were emphasized.

By revealing OTIs, this study contributed to classroom interaction studies in L2 teacher education contexts. First of all, the study displayed how English teacher identity emerges in interaction and how a teacher educator deployed it as an interactional resource for educational purposes. In doing so, the study extended the understanding of *identity-in-context* and demonstrated that identities (i.e., teacher/student identity) were not predetermined categories but they could be ascribed to people by others along with certain identity-bound roles/responsibilities. The study also contributed to L2 testing and assessment literature by investigating the interaction emerged in IR sessions of an ELTE course. In displaying the context-specific interactional resources, the study shed light on the ways that the teacher educator evaluates the problematic test items related to L2 teacher trainees' prospective responsibilities. These IR sessions also show that teacher candidates need to have high level of language proficiency to avoid language-related mistakes in language test items. Given the importance of how interaction works in different classroom contexts, L2 teacher education settings should be explored more within a micro analytic perspective to understand how teacher educators manage interaction and achieve professional actions.

References

Abdi, K. (2011). 'She really only speaks English': Positioning, language ideology, and heritage language learners. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *67*(2), 161-190.

Amador, L., & Adams, G. (2013). Affiliative behaviors that increase language learning opportunities in infant and adult classrooms. In A. D. L. Joaquin, & J. H. Schumann (Eds.), *Exploring the Interactional Instinct* (pp. 133–167). Oxford University Press.

Andrews, S. (1999). Why do L2 teachers need to'know about language'? Teacher metalinguistic awareness and input for learning. *Language and Education*, *13*(3), 161-177.

Andrews, S. (2001). The language awareness of the L2 teacher: Its impact upon pedagogical practice. *Language Awareness*, *10*(2-3), 75–90.

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

Andrews, S. (2003b). Teacher language awareness and the professional knowledge base of the L2 teacher. *Language Awareness*, *12*(2), 81-95.

Andrews, S. J. and McNeill, A. (2005). Knowledge about language and 'good' language teachers. In N. Bartels (Ed.), *Applied linguistics and Language Teacher Education* (pp. 159–78). Springer.

Atkinson, D. (Ed.). (2011). *Alternative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*. Taylor & Francis.

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

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

Bayat, M. (2010). Use of dialogue journals and video-recording in early childhood teacher education. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, *31*(2), 159-172.

Borg, S., & Burns, A. (2008). Integrating grammar in adult TESOL classrooms. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(3), 456-482.

Bozbıyık, M., Sert, O., & Bacanak, K. D. (2021). VEO-integrated IMDAT in pre-service language teacher education: A focus on change in teacher questioning practices. In P. Seedhouse (Ed.), *Video enhanced observation for language teaching: Reflection and professional* (pp. 107– 121). Bloomsbury Academic.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.

Clayman, S. E. (2013). Turn-constructional units and the transition-relevance place. In Sidnell J., Stivers T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (1st ed., pp. 150–166). Wiley-Blackwell.

Copland, F. (2010). Causes of tension in post-observation feedback in pre-service teacher training: An alternative view. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 466-472.

Copland, F., Ma, G., & Mann, S. J. (2009). Reflecting in and on post-observation feedback in initial teacher training on certificate courses. *English Language Teacher Education and Development*, *12*(Winter), 14-23.

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

Davies, B. (2000). *A body of writing, 1990-1999*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20*(1), 43-63.

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1999). Positioning and Personhood. In R. Harré & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning Theory* (pp. 32–52). Wiley-Blackwell.

De Costa, P. I. (2011). Using Language Ideology and Positioning to Broaden the SLA Learner Beliefs Landscape: The Case of an ESL Learner From China. System, 39 (3), 347–358.

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

Dochy, F. (2009). The edumetric quality of new modes of assessment: Some issues and prospects. In G. Joughin (ed.), *Assessment, Learning and Judgement in Higher Education* (pp. 85-114). Springer.

Drew P. (2013). Turn design. In Sidnell J., Stivers T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (1st ed., pp. 131–149). Wiley-Blackwell.

Duff, P. A. (2002). The Discursive Co-construction of Knowledge, Identity, and Difference: An Ethnography of Communication in the High School Mainstream. *Applied Linguistics,* 23(3), 289–322.

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

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

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

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

Edge, J. (1988). Applying linguistics in English language teacher training for speakers of other languages. *ELT journal*, *42*(1), 9-13.

Enyedy, N., Rubel, L., Castellón, V., Mukhopadhyay, S., Esmonde, I., & Secada, W. (2008). Revoicing in a multilingual classroom. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning*, *10*(2), 134-162.

Eskildsen, S. W., & Wagner, J. (2013). Recurring and shared gestures in the L2 classroom: Resources for teaching and learning. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 139-161.

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

Fagan, D.S. (2014), 'Beyond "excellent": uncovering the systematicity behind positive feedback turn construction in ESL classrooms', *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *8*(1), 45–63.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3), 285-300.

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

Fulcher, G. (2010). *Practical language testing*. Hodder Education.

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

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

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

Garfinkel, H. (1964). Studies of the routine grounds of everyday activities. *Social Problems, 11*(3), 225-250.

Goodwin, C. (1984). Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action*, (pp. 225–246). Cambridge University Press.

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

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

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

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

Harré, R. (2012). Positioning theory: moral dimensions of socio-cultural psychology. In Valsiner, J (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Culture and Psychology* (pp. 191–206). Oxford University Press.

Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (1999). *Positioning theory*. Blackwell

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Ishino, M. (2018). Micro-longitudinal conversation analysis in examining co-teachers' reflection-in-action. *System*, *78*, 130-147.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Johnson, K. E., & Freeman, D. (2001). Teacher learning in second language teacher education: A socially-situated perspective. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada, 1*, 53-69.

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

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

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

Kayi-Aydar, H. (2013). 'No, Rolanda, completely wrong!' Positioning, classroom participation and ESL learning. *Classroom Discourse, 4*(2), 130-150.

Kayi-Aydar, H. (2014). Social positioning, participation, and second language learning: Talkative students in an academic ESL classroom. *Tesol Quarterly, 48*(4), 686-714.

Kayi-Aydar, H., & Miller, E. R. (2018). Positioning in classroom discourse studies: A state-of-the-art review. *Classroom Discourse*, *9*(2), 79-94.

Kim, Y. and Silver, R. E. (2016) 'Provoking Reflective Thinking in Post Observation Conversations'. *Journal of Teacher Education* , *67(*3) 203–219.

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

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

Komur, S. (2018). Preservice English teachers' assessment awareness: Level of readiness for classroom practice. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, *8*(1), 109-121.

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on language and social interaction*, *35*(3), 277-309.

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

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

Leech, G. (1994). Students' grammar – teachers' grammar – learners' grammar. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn and E. Williams (Eds.), *Grammar and the language teacher* (pp. 17–30). Prentice Hall.

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

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

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

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

Lo, Y. Y. (2019). Development of the beliefs and language awareness of content subject teachers in CLIL: does professional development help?. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(7), 818-832.

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

Maloch, B. (2005). Moments by which change is made: A cross-case exploration of teacher mediation and student participation in literacy events. *Journal of literacy Research*, *37*(1), 95-142.

Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2013). RP or "RIP": A critical perspective on reflective practice. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *4*(2), 291-315.

Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2017) *Reflective Practice in English Language Teaching: Research-Based Principles and Practices.* Routledge.

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

Menard-Warwick, J. (2008). 'Because she made beds. Every day'. Social positioning, classroom discourse, and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(2), 267-289.

Mondada L. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to data collection. In Sidnell J., Stivers T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (1st ed., pp. 32–56). Wiley-Blackwell.

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

Mortensen, K. (2008). Selecting next speaker in the second language classroom: How to find a willing next speaker in planned activities. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*, 195-219.

Mullock, B. (2006). The pedagogical knowledge base of four TESOL teachers. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(1), 48-66.

Okada, Y. (2015). Contrasting identities: A language teacher's practice in an English for Specific Purposes classroom. *Classroom Discourse, 6*(1), 73-87.

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

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

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

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

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising learning in applied linguistics* (pp. 105-127). Palgrave MacMillan.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2013). Conversation analysis and second language acquisition: CA-SLA. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.). *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1–7). Blackwell Publishing.

Peräkylä, A. (1997). Conversation analysis: a new model of research in doctor–patient communication. *Journal of the Royal society of Medicine*, *90*(4), 205-208.

Peräkylä, A. (2003). Conversation analysis. In C. Seale, J. Gubrium, G. Gobo & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 165–179). Sage.

Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, *37*(3), 380-390.

Pinnow, R. J., & Chval, K. B. (2015). "How much You wanna bet?": Examining the role of positioning in the development of L2 learner interactional competencies in the content classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, *30*, 1-11.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* Cambridge University Press.

Richards, K. 2006. "Being the Teacher: Identity and Classroom Conversation." *Applied Linguistics*, *27*(), 51–77.

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

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation: Volume I.* Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, *50*, 696–735.

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

Schegloff, E. A. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, *7*, 289-327.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*(2), 361-382.

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

Seedhouse, P. (2005a). Conversation Analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching, 38*(4), 165-187.

Seedhouse, P. (2005b). Conversation analysis as research methodology. In K. Richards, & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying Conversation Analysis* (pp. 251-266). Palgrave Macmillan.

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

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

Sert, O., & Jacknick, C. M. (2015). Student smiles and the negotiation of epistemics in L2 classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *77*, 97-112.

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

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

Shvidko, E. (2018). Writing conference feedback as a moment-to-moment affiliative relationship building. *Journal of Pragmatics, 127*(), 20–35.

Shvidko, E. (2020). Relating through instructing: Affiliative interactional resources used by the teacher when giving feedback on student work. *Classroom Discourse, 12*(3), 233–254.

Sidnell, J. (2013). Basic conversation analytic methods. In Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (1st ed., pp. 77–99). Wiley-Blackwell.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard R. M. (1977). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford University Press.

Skinner, B. (2012). Changing identities: an exploration of ESL trainee teacher discourse in microteaching. *Classroom Discourse*, *3*(1), 46-64.

Stiggins, R. J. (2002). Assessment crisis: The absence of assessment for learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *83*(10), 758-765.

Stivers, T. (2013). Sequence Organization. In Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (1st ed., pp. 191–209). Wiley-Blackwell.

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

Talmy, S. (2004). Forever FOB: The cultural production of ESL in a high school. *Pragmatics*, *14*(2-3), 149-172.

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

Taylor, E. (2021). Use of non-situational identities in teacher-student interaction. *Linguistics and Education*, *66*, 100997.

Thonus, T. (2008). Acquaintanceship, familiarity, and coordinated laughter in writing tutorials. *Linguistics and Education*, *19*, 333–350.

Thornbury, S. (1997). *About language: Tasks for teachers of English*. Cambridge University Press.

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

Tsui, A. (2008). Classroom discourse: Approaches and perspectives. *Applied Linguistics*, *24*, 284-302.

Tuzcu-Eken, D. (2016). Testing in English classes in vocational schools of higher education. *Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges*, *6*(1), 38-47.

Vehviläinen, S. (2009). Problems in the research problem: Critical feedback and resistance in academic supervision. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 53*(2), 185-201.

Vetter, A. (2010). Positioning students as readers and writers through talk in a high school English classroom. *English Education*, *43*(1), 33-64.

Viengsang, R. (2016). Exploring pre-service English teachers' language assessment literacy. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 6(5), 432-442.

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

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

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

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

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

Waring, H. Z. (2012). "Any questions?": Investigating the nature of understanding-checks in the language classroom. *TESOL quarterly*, *46*(4), 722-752.

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

Waring, H. Z. (2013b). Doing being playful in the second language classroom. *Applied linguistics*, *34*(2), 191-210.

Waring H.Z. (2014). Mentor invitations for reflection in post-observation conferences: Some preliminary considerations. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *5*(1), 99–123.

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

Wray, D. (1993). Student-teachers' knowledge and beliefs about language. In N. Bennett and C. Carre (Eds.), *Learning to Teach* (pp. 51–72). Routledge.

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

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

Yöney, R. Z. (2021). *Assuming Learner Behavior as an Interactional Resource in L2 Testing and Evaluation Classroom Interaction in a Teacher Education Context* (Master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.

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

Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Identity, context and interaction. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in Talk* (pp. 87–106). Sage.

APPENDIX-A: Jefferson (2004) Transcription Convention

Symbol	Name	Use
[text]	Brackets	Indicates the start and end points of overlapping speech.
=	Equal Sign	Indicates the break and subsequent continuation of a single interrupted utterance.
(# of seconds)	Timed Pause	A number in parentheses indicates the time, in seconds, of a pause in speech.
(.)	Micropause	A brief pause, usually less than 0.2 seconds.
. or ↓	Period or Down Arrow	Indicates falling pitch.
? or ↑	Question Mark or Up Arrow	Indicates rising pitch.
,	Comma	Indicates a temporary rise or fall in intonation.
-	Hyphen	Indicates an abrupt halt or interruption in utterance.
>text<	Greater than / Less than symbols	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more rapidly than usual for the speaker.
<text>	Less than / Greater than symbols	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more slowly than usual for the speaker.
°	Degree symbol	Indicates whisper or reduced volume speech.
ALL CAPS	Capitalized text	Indicates shouted or increased volume speech.
underline	Underlined text	Indicates the speaker is emphasizing or stressing the speech.
:::	Colon(s)	Indicates prolongation of an utterance.
(hhh)		Audible exhalation
? or (.hhh)	High Dot	Audible inhalation
(text)	Parentheses	Speech which is unclear or in doubt in the transcript.
((italic text))	Double Parentheses	Annotation of non-verbal activity.

APPENDIX-B: Mondada (2018) Transcription Convention

* *	Gestures and descriptions of embodied actions are delimited between
+ +	two identical symbols (one symbol per participant)
Δ Δ	and are synchronized with corresponding stretches of talk.
*--->	The action described continues across subsequent lines
---->*	until the same symbol is reached.
>>	The action described begins before the excerpt's beginning.
--->>	The action described continues after the excerpt's end.
.....	Action's preparation.
----	Action's apex is reached and maintained.
,,,,,	Action's retraction.
ric	Participant doing the embodied action is identified when (s)he is not the speaker.
fig	The exact moment at which a screen shot has been taken
#	is indicated with a specific symbol showing its position within the turn at talk.

APPENDIX-C: Ethics Committee Exemption Form / Ethics Committee Approval

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
ueam@metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816 / 352

04 EKİM 2019

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Doç.Dr. Çiler HATİPOĞLU, Nilüfer Can DAŞKIN

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

Saygılarımızla bilgilerinize sunarız.

Prof. Dr. Tülin GENÇÖZ

Başkan

Prof. Dr. Tolga CAN

Üye

Doç.Dr. Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ali Emre TURGUT

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Şerife SEVİNÇ

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Müge GÜNDÜZ

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Süreyya Özcan KABASAKAL

Üye

APPENDIX-D: Letter on Ethics Committee Approval

T.C.
HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı   : 51944218-300
Konu   : Etik Komisyonu İzni

YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANA BİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞINA

İlgi   : 09.10.2020 tarihli ve 1278921 sayılı yazı.

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

e-imzalıdır
Prof. Dr. Selahattin GELBAL
Enstitü Müdürü

APPENDIX-E: Declaration of Ethical Conduct

I hereby declare that…

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

27/12/2022

Nakşidil Düzün

APPENDIX-F: Thesis/Dissertation Originality Report

17/01/2023

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

Thesis Title: Orientation to Teacher Identity as an Interactional Resource in L2 Testing and Evaluation Classroom Interaction in a Teacher Education Context

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

Time Submitted	Page Count	Character Count	Date of Thesis Defense	Similarity Index	Submission ID
17/01/2023	151	237,011	27/12/2022	%14	1994012599

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: Nakşidil DÜZÜN

Student No.: N19130107

Department: Foreign Language Education

Program: English Language Teaching

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

ADVISOR APPROVAL

APPROVED
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Nilüfer CAN DAŞKIN

APPENDIX-G: Yayımlama ve Fikrî Mülkiyet Hakları Beyanı

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

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

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

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

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

- o   Tezimle ilgili gizlilik kararı verilmiştir. [3]

27/12/2022

Nakşidil DÜZÜN

"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.