Available online at ijci.wcci-international.org

International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction 17(3) (2025) 932–949

IJCI
International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction

Teacher Questions for Elicitations in the EFL Classroom: A CA-Based Teacher Reflection

Cansu Aykut Kolay[a] *

[a]*Kocaeli University, Faculty of Education, Kocaeli, Turkey*

Abstract

Teachers' questioning practices are indispensable parts of language classrooms in terms of enhancing students' level of comprehension and maintaining an interactive classroom discourse. Therefore, it is of significance for teachers to be aware of what kind of questions they ask in their lessons. To this end, this study aims to shed light on a teacher's reflective practice based on a stimulated recall session. Based on conversation analysis with no previous hypothesis or research focus as for the method of data analysis, the focus of this study was determined after the reflective stimulated-recall session was over. Together with the researcher, the teacher had the chance to see a salient pattern regarding her questioning practice and reflected on this with the help of the guiding questions or prompts of the researcher. Hence, this study aimed to show what kind of an impact conversation analytic or evidence- based teacher reflection has on the teacher's recognition and evaluation of her questioning practice. Based on the teacher's reflection, several pedagogical implications have also been provided including some basic techniques to ask effective questions to elicit answers from students in EFL classrooms.

Keywords: Teacher questions; conversation analysis; teacher reflection

© 2016 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (**http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/**).

1. Introduction

Classroom interaction has long been positioned at the heart of the language learning curriculum (Van Lier, 1996). Within this dynamic pedagogical space, teachers are continually called upon to develop and refine their Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC), a concept introduced by Walsh (2006a, 2006b) to capture the ability of teachers to manage classroom talk in ways that create optimal conditions for learning. As Sert (2010) highlights, CIC encompasses multiple interconnected dimensions: maximizing interactional space, scaffolding learner contributions, repairing and modeling language, skillful elicitation, developing one's own instructional idiolect, and fostering ongoing awareness of the interactional unfolding of classroom discourse (p. 71).

* Corresponding author Cansu Aykut Kolay. ORCID ID.: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1980-6229
E-mail address: cansu.aykut@kocaeli.edu.tr

Among these, teacher questioning emerges as a central mechanism for eliciting learner engagement, monitoring understanding, promoting reflection, and shaping classroom participation (Cancino, 2020; Bond, 2007; Jafari, 2013).

Despite its pivotal role, effective questioning presents persistent challenges for teachers and requires not only technical knowledge of question types but also sensitivity to the interactional consequences of question preferences (Walsh, 2006a; Milawati & Suryati, 2019). Decisions about how to formulate questions (e.g., whether to check comprehension, stimulate critical thinking, or encourage dialogic interaction) carry significant implications for learner participation and language development (Bozbıyık et al., 2021). Thus, raising teachers' awareness of both the *form* and *function* of their questioning practices remains a key objective in language teacher development.

Reflective practice has long been recognized as a vital process through which teachers examine and improve their pedagogical actions by connecting theoretical insights with lived classroom experiences (Brookfield, 1995; Farrell, 2015; Cirocki & Farrell, 2017). However, reflective practice often have the risks of remaining superficial unless conducted in concrete, data-driven examination of actual classroom interactions (Mann & Walsh, 2017). Recent scholarship increasingly emphasizes the value of leveraging empirical classroom data, particularly video recordings, to support systematic, evidence-based teacher reflection (Bozbıyık et al., 2021).

This study makes a distinctive contribution to the existing body of literature by integrating Conversation Analysis (CA) with reflective practice, thereby advancing a highly detailed, interactionally sensitive approach to teacher reflection that moves beyond general pedagogical introspection. While prior research has extensively explored teacher questioning in various instructional contexts, few studies have systematically applied CA as both a research tool and a reflective scaffold to examine how teachers interrogate their own questioning behaviors in real-world classroom discourse. In this sense, the study addresses a significant gap in the literature by offering an empirically grounded model for how CA-informed reflective practice can directly foster teachers' interactional competence.

Drawing on Seedhouse's (2004) principle of "unmotivated looking," this study examines a teacher-led reflection session focusing on a classroom episode where a known-information question was repeatedly used to elicit student responses. Through the close lens of CA, the teacher was able to uncover not only the surface-level features of her questioning but also the subtle interactional contingencies that shaped student engagement. Importantly, the process allowed the teacher to recognize how aspects such as question phrasing, repetition, use of metalanguage, and timing interact dynamically with students' responses, offering actionable insights into more effective questioning strategies.

The unique contribution of this study lies in demonstrating that Conversation Analytic Teacher Reflection (CATR) can transform reflective practice into a deeply situated, micro-analytic professional development activity. By equipping teachers with

tools to analyze their real-time classroom discourse, CATR fosters a deeper understanding of the interactional architecture of teaching and allows teachers to refine not only their questioning but their broader classroom management and pedagogical decision-making processes. In doing so, this approach strengthens the empirical grounding of reflective practice and offers a replicable model for teacher education programs seeking to move beyond generalized reflection towards actionable, discourse-level awareness.

1.1. Relevant related literature

1.1.1. Teacher questioning as an elicitation technique

In classroom settings, teachers spend a remarkable amount of time asking questions which generally corresponds to 40 to 50 per cent of their teaching (Blosser, 2000; Bond, 2007; Cotton, 2007; Creese, 2005). Questions are regarded as effective elicitation techniques as they have the power to provoke students' thinking and enhance their participation in lessons (Alsubaie, 2015). Elicitations through teacher questions can serve different purposes, such as checking students' comprehension (Waring, 2012) and contributing to students' turns (Walsh, 2006b). Teachers' questions, therefore, are among the significant factors determining teachers' control over classroom discourse (Walsh, 2011). As Walsh (2011) emphasizes, the way teachers manage interactional space in the classroom directly influences learners' opportunities for participation and learning, which makes question design and delivery a core component of classroom discourse management.

However, when teachers do not carefully select the questions they ask or lack knowledge regarding different question types, classroom interaction may be hindered (Milawati & Suryati, 2019). Therefore, teachers need to have a strong command of the type of questions they intend to ask (Wragg & Brown, 2001). In this respect, Tsui (1995) notes that the type of a question can be determined by the kind of response it elicits from students and how it shapes classroom interaction. One of the most widely accepted categorizations of questions is the distinction between display and referential questions (Long & Sato, 1983). Referential questions are also referred to as real questions (Searle, 1969), information-seeking questions (Mehan, 1979), and open questions (Dalton-Puffer, 2006); they typically activate higher-order thinking skills (Bloom, 1956). In contrast, display questions, alternatively termed exam questions, known-answer questions (Rusk et al., 2017), closed questions (Dalton-Puffer, 2006), or known-information questions (Mehan, 1979; as cited in Bozbıyık et al., 2021)—generally require retrieval of previously presented material with limited mental processing (Shen & Yodkhumlue, 2010; Tan, 2007). Accordingly, Dalton-Puffer (2007) asserts that answers to such questions are often notoriously restricted, sometimes consisting of a single word (p. 69), as they can be answered through lower-level cognitive processes (Bloom, 1956).

Overreliance on display questions may limit student engagement, since these questions often solicit brief or formulaic answers rather than encouraging extended discourse (Bozbıyık et al., 2021). As Kumaravadivelu (2003) argues, excessive use of such

questions may hinder students from expressing their own ideas, thus reducing opportunities for communicative interaction. Nevertheless, these questions still serve valuable functions when teachers intend to assess what students already know (Rusk et al., 2017). In line with this, Chin (2007), drawing on evidence from science classrooms, emphasizes that while certain types of questions may check factual recall, teachers who skillfully employ open-ended questioning techniques are better able to stimulate productive thinking, foster deeper cognitive engagement, and support the development of students' reasoning abilities. Thus, the selection and sequencing of questions are crucial to achieving a balance between assessing knowledge and promoting thinking.

Furthermore, classroom interaction is inherently dialogic and dynamic, which requires teachers to adapt their questioning in response to learners' contributions and needs (Mercer & Howe, 2012). Mercer and Howe (2012) highlight that effective questioning can mediate cognitive processes and build collective knowledge when teachers manage dialogue sensitively, inviting student contributions and elaborations. Therefore, understanding not only the types of questions but also their interactional consequences becomes essential for fostering a meaningful learning environment.

The interactional dynamics underlying teacher questioning can also be better understood through the lens of Conversation Analysis (CA), which offers a fine-grained approach to investigating how classroom talk unfolds (Seedhouse, 2004). Seedhouse (2004) argues that the "interactional architecture" of language classrooms is shaped by the close alignment between pedagogical goals and emerging interactional sequences. In this architecture, teacher questions play a central role in organizing turn-taking, shaping learner responses, and constructing opportunities for learning. Consequently, teachers' awareness of these micro-level interactional features can contribute significantly to more effective classroom management and learning facilitation.

1.1.2. CA-based reflective practice

In addition to possessing pedagogical and content knowledge, language teachers must be ready to address context-specific and often unpredictable demands that emerge during classroom interaction. This situational sensitivity can be fostered through reflective practice (RP) (Farrel, 2016). Reflective practice provides teachers with opportunities to systematically examine their own instructional behaviors and improve classroom interactions (Ekin et al., 2021). Defined as "the ability to analyze an action systematically and to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the action in order to improve practice" (Copland et al., 2009, p. 18), reflective practice aims to develop "thinking teachers" (Wright, 2010, p. 73) who continuously evaluate and adjust their teaching.

Although reflective practice is widely valued in TESOL, Walsh and Mann (2015) caution that it needs to be "systematic, detailed and based on data-led approaches" (p. 2). One evidence-based approach involves the use of stimulated recall sessions (Lyle, 2003), where teachers review video recordings of their own lessons, engage in discussions with colleagues, and critically analyze their teaching. Through such reflective dialogues,

teachers can revisit classroom events, articulate their pedagogical reasoning, and gain valuable insights into interactional dynamics (Walsh & Mann, 2015).

Moreover, integrating Conversation Analysis into reflective practice offers an even more rigorous framework for teacher reflection. CA not only allows teachers to closely examine their own interactional moves but also provides empirical grounding to validate or challenge teachers' self-observations (Lazaraton & Ishihara, 2005). While the potential of CA for enhancing teacher development is increasingly recognized, the precise methods for embedding CA into teacher education and ongoing professional development remain an area of active inquiry (Hale et al., 2018). Nevertheless, as Walsh (2011) underscores, a detailed awareness of classroom discourse, facilitated by tools like CA, enables teachers to become more responsive to learners' needs and to fine-tune their questioning strategies accordingly.

2. Method

2.1. Data and context

The data were collected from the video recordings of a 2-hour long online post-observation meeting based on a one-hour long face-to-face reading lesson conducted by the participant teacher. The participant teacher has a two years of teaching experience at the time the data were collected. Having a C1 level of proficiency in English, she received her B.A. and M.A. degrees in the department of English Language Teaching (ELT). The institution in which the data were collected is the English preparatory school of a foundational university located in the Marmara Region in Turkey. The students in the video-recorded lesson were L3 level students corresponding to pre-intermediate proficiency of English. The focus of the video-recorded lesson was reading skill, but the reading passage was based on a specific grammar structure: Comparatives and superlatives. Therefore, the teacher was trying to activate students' background knowledge regarding the target grammar structure by asking a certain known-information question (Mehan, 1979) and giving some prompts to make them remember. Subsequently, an online stimulated recall interview (SRI) with the teacher was conducted for teacher reflection. SRI is helpful in terms of getting insights about the "teachers" perspectives on their actual teaching practices practice (Gass & Mackey, 2000; Meade & McMeniman, 1992) and enhance their 'reflective thinking' (Kim & Silver, 2016).

While the overall data may appear limited in duration, it aligns with the methodological traditions of Conversation Analysis (CA), which emphasizes "close, detailed analysis of naturally occurring interactional data, often derived from short excerpts of video or audio recordings" (Sidnell, 2010, p. 3). CA studies typically prioritize depth over breadth, focusing on the fine-grained organization of talk-in-interaction rather than large datasets (Ten Have, 2007; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Therefore, even relatively brief recordings can yield substantial analytic insights when examined through the rigorous, turn-by-turn lens of CA.

2.2. Data analysis

CA was implemented as the method of data analysis of this study (Sacks et al., 1974) to gain a deeper understanding of the discourse of the post-observation reflection session. Both the lesson and reflection session were transcribed in accordance with the transcription conventions (Jefferson, 2004) and verbal and non-verbal (e.g., pitch, intonation, gestures, laughs) aspects of discourse were taken into consideration during the process of data transcription. Starting with an "unmotivated looking" which means being open to explore emerging phenomenon instead of having preconceived hypotheses (Seedhouse, 2004), the researcher analyzed the videorecording of the lesson and detected an area of salience regarding the use of a specific known-information question. By this way, the researcher could have the chance to be more prepared about what questions to ask and what to focus on in the post observation session. Followingly, in the SR reflection session, both the researcher and teacher especially dwelled upon the use of the specific known-information question used by the teacher for the purpose of eliciting the target grammar structure from the students. Building upon this, the teacher's ow personal motives and intentions while performing that specific behavior could have been observed, also called "emic perspective" (Pike, 1967). At this point, the teacher's own comments and interpretations were of significance since it was observed that further discussions and the discovery of unnoticed parts could be done thanks to those contributions (Pomerantz, 2005).

3. Results

Based on two extracts from the post-observation reflection session, the way the teacher realizes the underlying reason why her known-information question did not work and alternative solutions to this problem that she discovered through SRI will be demonstrated in this section.

3.1. Extract 1

01		bu(.)rada öğrenciden beklediğin cevap ↓neydi
		what was the answer that you expected from the student he(.)re?
02	T:	=superlative
03	R:	=ama öğrenci ne ↓yaptı
		=but what did the student do?
04	T:	=cümleyi söyledi direk (.)
		=he directly told the sentence (.)
05	R:	[yani ↓evet] (0.2) what do we call sorusunun
06		cevabı-
		[I mean ↓yes] (0.2) the answer of the question
		what do we call-
07	T:	[hı hı değil (.) kesinlikle]
		[huh huh it is not (.) definitely]
08	R:	Japan is sunnier than England (.)

öğrencinin verdiği cevaptan çıkarım yapabilir miyiz anlayıp anlamadığına ↑dair

can we deduce whether the student understood or not from his ↑answer?

T: ↓yani (0.1) benim sorumu anlamamış (.)

↓i mean (0.1)he did not understand my question(.)

orada problem £STRUCTURE£ kelimesinde asıl

the real problem is the word £structure£ itself

R: [↑değil mi] (.) structure kelimesini bilmediği-

isn't it? (.) it is because he does not the word-

T: =yani: (.) structure ↑ne?

I mean: what is ↑structure?

hani (0.2) ↑structure aslında baktığında

£metalanguage£ yani (.)

well (0.2) ↑actually structure is £metalanguage£

>zaten soruyu baştan sormamam↑lazımdı (.)

i shouldn't have asked the question in the first place

sorsam ↑bile (.)

↑even if I asked (.)

o structure kelimesinin olmaması ↓gerekiyor (.)

the word structure ↓is not supposed to be there(.)

çünkü structure ↑ne (.) >öğrenci burada sentence diye anladı belki<

because ↑what is structure? (.) >the student might have confused the word structure with the word sentence<

R: aynen (.)sorunun wordinginde bir problem: (0.1) olabilir

exactly (.) there might a problem in terms of the wording of the question

R: peki (0.2) üçüncüye aynı soruyu soruyor↓sun

well (0.2) you are ask↓ing the same question for the third time

(.) ve üçüncüye fark↓lı: (0.1) ya da yanlış cevap alıyorsun ↑değil mi (.)

(.) and you are getting a diffe↓rent (0.1) or wrong answer for the third time, aren't you(.)

peki burada ne yapabilir↑din

well what could have you done here

T: =yani burada o (.) şey hani (0.2)

= i mean here (.) well (0.2)

kendim söyleyebilirdim öğrenciye ↓sormadan

I could have told on my own without asking to the students

29 R: [yani direk]

[you mean directly]

30 T: yani (.) gördüm ki problem var ↓zaten (.)

yes (.)I saw that there is a problem already (.)

31 öğrenciler anlamadı

32 (.) o structure kelimesini (0.1)

the students did not understand the word structure

33 çünkü öğrencinin bildiğini varsayıyoruz ↑ya

↑you know we assume that the students already know the target structure

34 bura↑da (.) >comparative superlative duymuş zaten

35 öğrenci< (.) niye istiyorsun ↑ki

he↑re (.)>the students knew what comparative superlative mean< (.) why do you ↑still want to hear that

36 (0.1) kafaları karıştı burada öğrenci↓nin (.)

37 o soruda (.) structureın ismi ↑neydi

(0.1) the students got confused (.)when they heard this question(.)what was the name of the structure

In line 02, the T explains her actual expectation while asking the known-information question (i.e., What do we call this structure?). After talking about what the student actually did as a response to the question in line 04, the R attempts to ask another question about the answer to the known information question in line 06. It seems that T's answer overlaps the R' question at that point which shows that the T apparently thinks that there is something wrong in that specific question and answer cycle. In line 11, the T admits the students misunderstanding of the question and elaborates on the reasons. In line 12, the T starts to comment on the root of the problem (i.e., the use of the word 'structure'), which is supported by the R in line 13. Eventually, in line 16, the T utters the exact source of problems (i.e., the use of metalanguage) and continues to talk about the points that should not have been done. In lines 17 and 19, the T states that the question should not have been asked or it should not have included the word 'structure'. Following T's response, the R reformulates T's answer in line 22 and tries to get further reflection from T by asking about the things that could have been done instead in lines 23-26. In line 28, the T states that she should have directly said the structure instead of trying to elicit it since she states that students have the necessary background knowledge concerning the target structure but the way she asked the questions made the things complex in lines 29-37.

3.2. Extract 2

01	R:	bu soruyu tekrar sormuş oldun (.) yani altıncı defa sormuş oldun (.) **you asked this question again (.) I mean for the sixth time (.)**
02		err:: (0.2) planladığın gibi
03		gitti ↑mi bu soru cevap session↓ları **↑did this question answer session go as you planned**
04	T:	£hayır£ **£no£**
05	R:	=neden iyi gitmediğine dair fikrini belirtir ↑misin **=can you share your opinion regarding why it did not go well**
06	T:	(0.3) ben doğru soruları soramadım bu bir (.) **(0.3) i did not ask the right questions (.) firstly**
07	R:	[doğru sorular nelerdi ↑peki **[↑well what were the right question**
08	T:	((*seems confused*)) (0.5) yani::: (0.3)
09		what do we call this structure de:::ğildi (.) **well:: (0.3) it was not what do we call this structure**
10		do you know this (0.3) this (0.2) sentence
11		mesela:: **maybe:: do you know this (0.3) sentence**
12		ne diyebilir↑dim (0.3) structure yeri↑ne **what could have I sa↑id (0.3) ins↑tead of the word structure**
13		do you know this topic gibi bir şey olabilir
14		bel↓ki **may↓be something like do you know this topic**
15		(.) this ↑grammar structure belki:::
16		daha mantıklı ola↓bilir (.) sadece structure
17		yerine **(.)this ↑grammar structure maybe::: it could be more logi↓cal instead of only structure**
18		>hatta this ↑grammar da diyebilirim ki sade↑ce
19		(.) sadeleştiriyoruz sonuçta **>even I can on↑ly say this grammar (.) we are simplfying it after all<**
20		do you know this ↑grammar (.)
21		what is ↑this (.) mese↓la daha basit olurdu (.)

do you know this ↑grammar (.)what is ↑this
(.)would be easier ↓for example
22 öğrenciden çıkardı muhtemelen
probably it could be elicitated from the students
23 (0.4) >ya kırk kere tekrar etmemem
24 ↓gerekiyordu (.) bir iki kerede alamadıysam (0.1)
25 üçüncüde dördüncüde kendin ver yani structureı(.)
26 bu da ↓olabilirdi<
=exactly (.) >I shouldn't have repeated like for
the fortieth time (.) if I could not get the
answer in one go or two goes (0.1) just give the
answer in the third or fourth goes (.) this could
have been done<
27 R: bu kadar tekrar etmeni::n sebebi(0.3) nasıl
28 diyeyim (0.4)
the reason why you repeat::ed this much (0.3)
how can I say (0.4)
29 T: [yani] şöyle amacım var ya benim orada (0.2)
[well] you know I have a purpose over there (0.2)
30 hani bir hedefim var (.)
I mean I have a target (.)
31 sonuçta ders planı hazırladım (.)
I prepared a lesson plan after all (.)
32 amaçlarım var ↑ya
↑you know I have objectives
33 onlara uymaya çalıştım (.)
I tried to abide by them (.)
34 yani:: şunu yapacağım bunu yapacağım diye
35 strict olmak istedim (0.2)
I mean:: I wanted to be strict (0.2) as like I am
gonna do this do that
36 o yüzden sıkıntı yaşadım burada muhtemelen
that is why I probably had difficulty here
37 (0.2) yani burada şey yapamadım
(0.2) well here I couldn't do this
38 aslında yani ama kafamda bir şey oluşturmuşum
actually I created something in my mind
39 (0.1) oradan çıkamadığım için
40 sürekli aynı soruyu tekrar etmi↓şim
I repeated the same question (0.1) because I
could not stray from the thing in my mind
41 (.) £evet bu yapıyı o kelimeyi öğrenciden
42 almalı↓yım£ demişim
(.) £yes I told myself that I needed to elicit
this structure from the students£
43 ve almak için de aynı soruyu £defalarca
44 sormu↓şum£ ((*nodding her head to admit*))
and I asked the same question over and over again
to get it

45 (0.6) orada muhtemelen za:man kaygısından (0.2)
46 da: başka bir şekilde ifade edemedim (.)
(0.6) there I could not express it in a different way because of time concerns (.)
47 aynı şeye takılıp £kaldım£
£I was dwelled on£ the same thing

Extract 2 includes T's reflection after she asked the same question for the sixth time and hardly got the desired answer from one of the students. In lines 02-03, the R asks whether the question answer cycles went as planned by the T or not and the T states it did not in line 04. Following T's response, the R asks the T to list all the reasons why it did not work by taking all the six occasions when the question was asked in line 04. In line 06, the T admits that she could not ask the right questions to get the desired elicitations. The R tries to encourage the T to give more details about the 'right' questions to ask in line 03. In line 08, the T repeats her opinion that the word 'structure' should have been removed from the question. The T continues to talk about alternative questions instead of the one that did not work (i.e., What do we call this structure?) between lines 11 and 21. Even though she stated that she should not have used metalanguage in the question, she said that even the word 'grammar' could be used in line 15, which is a contradictory comment with the reflection observed in the previous extract. This shows that the T gives priority to students' comprehension of the question. Therefore, how the question is formulated is of significance if the aim is to enhance students' comprehension to get the desired elicitations. Between lines 23-26, the T emphasized the fact that the question was over repeated by her and telling the name of the target structure directly instead of trying to elicit would be the best choice over there. In line 27, the R tries to focus more on the issue of over repetition there, but her turn was interrupted by the T as she wanted to talk about the reasons why she made those repetitions. Between lines 29 and 44, the T points out that the effort to stay stuck to the lesson plan restricted her as she thought that she had to verbally elicit the target structure from the students, that is why she insisted on the same question that much. As the final remarks, the teacher states that time restrictions also had an impact on the repeated use of this question between lines 45-47.

4. Discussion

Within the framework of this study, the participant teacher's recognition and evaluation of her questioning practice were analyzed through a conversation analytic teacher reflection session. Overall, it was observed that the teacher raised her awareness regarding the practicality of the question she asked at the end of the stimulated recall interview. Similarly, when teacher reflection is done based on visual evidence such as video, it is possible to observe that teachers can improve their awareness concerning the language that they use in classrooms, including the questions they ask (Bozbıyık et al., 2021). The focal question analyzed in this study (i.e., *What do we call this structure?*) was a lower-order level question in accordance with Bloom's taxonomy, in which knowledge,

comprehension, and application are classified as lower-level thinking skills (Bloom, 1956).

The focus of this study was to investigate a teacher's reflection on an episode in which she asks the same known-information question repeatedly. Regarding her intention to ask the specific known-information question (Mehan, 1979), she admitted that she wished to "reactivate students' previous knowledge (Wong, 2010, p. 42)" or raise students' awareness concerning the target grammar structure as they had already learned it earlier. This intention resonates with Wragg and Brown's (2001) assertion that teachers often employ such questions to monitor students' prior knowledge rather than to elicit novel information.

However, beyond this specific instance, reflective practice supported by conversation analysis (CA) holds broader practical implications for classroom teaching. In particular, CA allows teachers to closely examine the real-time contingencies of interaction, which are often shaped not only by pedagogical intentions but also by students' immediate responses and classroom dynamics (Seedhouse, 2004). For instance, in this case, the participant teacher recognized that she repeatedly asked the same question without modifying her phrasing, which limited students' opportunity to comprehend and respond adequately. The awareness of this interactional pattern, facilitated by CA, can lead teachers to develop more flexible and adaptive questioning strategies in future lessons.

Moreover, as the teacher reflected on her use of the term "structure," she acknowledged the unintended difficulty it may have caused for students unfamiliar with such metalanguage. This observation aligns with Shen and Yodkhumlue (2010), who emphasized that using technical or unfamiliar terms in questions can hinder student understanding. In broader teaching scenarios, teachers frequently encounter similar challenges when employing linguistic forms that exceed learners' current proficiency levels. As Mercer and Howe (2012) point out, the dialogic nature of classroom interaction requires sensitivity not only to the content but also to the language used to mediate that content, particularly in contexts where students are still developing their academic language proficiency.

In addition, CA-informed reflection highlights the importance of rephrasing as a pedagogical strategy. Research indicates that teachers tend to rephrase lower-level questions more often, especially when initial responses are inadequate or absent (Milawati & Suryati, 2019). This rephrasing serves a scaffolding function, allowing teachers to guide students toward correct answers without overtly supplying them (Walsh, 2011). For instance, in science classrooms, Chin (2007) observed that teachers who skillfully reformulate their questions in response to student hesitation foster more productive thinking and deeper cognitive engagement. Thus, CA-based reflective practice can help teachers recognize when their initial questions may require immediate reworking to sustain interactional momentum and support student learning.

Student feedback also constitutes a valuable dimension of reflective practice. In many cases, students report experiencing frustration or anxiety when teachers persist with repetitive questioning without adequate clarification. Mercer and Howe (2012) suggest that dialogic pedagogies which incorporate student perspectives lead to more meaningful and cognitively demanding classroom discourse. In the present study, while students' direct feedback was not collected, the teacher herself inferred that repeated questioning without adjustment might have placed unnecessary pressure on her students, particularly under the constraints of time and curricular pacing.

As a different finding, Shen and Yodkhumlue (2010) claimed that teachers sometimes avoid repeating questions due to time limitations or the breadth of curricular content. However, in the post-observation reflection session, the participant teacher expressed that time pressure and strict adherence to curricular objectives ironically led her to repeat the same question multiple times, believing this repetition would expedite student recall of the target structure (i.e., comparatives and superlatives). This illustrates another critical implication of CA-informed reflection: it enables teachers to critically evaluate how external constraints—such as curricular demands—intersect with moment-to-moment interactional decisions, sometimes producing unintended consequences (Seedhouse, 2004). Developing such meta-awareness can empower teachers to balance instructional goals with responsiveness to student needs more effectively.

In sum, conversation analytic teacher reflection not only helps educators analyze specific episodes of interaction but also supports the development of adaptive questioning practices, enhanced sensitivity to language use, and an increased openness to student perspectives. These insights ultimately contribute to richer, more dialogic, and cognitively stimulating classroom environments.

5. Conclusions and Implications

The findings of this study have shown that CA can be a valuable tool in teacher education for raising teachers' awareness of their own language use and interactional decision-making in the classroom. The conversation analytic teacher reflection conducted in the present study revealed that ineffective use of known-information questions may stem from multiple factors. Specifically, the participant teacher identified two primary issues contributing to the breakdown of student responses: question wording and lack of flexibility in question delivery. These findings underscore several pedagogical implications directly relevant to teacher education and professional development programs.

First, teachers should be trained to carefully attend to the linguistic formulation of their questions. As the data illustrate, even minor lexical choices, particularly the inclusion of unfamiliar or abstract metalanguage, can negatively obstruct students' access to knowledge they otherwise possess. Therefore, question design training should not only emphasize the cognitive level of questions (as framed by Bloom's taxonomy, 1956), but also the importance of comprehensibility and student-friendly language during

the formulation of questions, particularly in EFL contexts where linguistic load can easily interfere with cognitive processing.

Second, the study highlights the pedagogical value of flexible questioning practices, such as rephrasing and scaffolding, especially when initial questions fail to generate responses. Rephrasing allows teachers to offer multiple linguistic pathways toward the same learning objective, increasing students' opportunities to engage and succeed. This flexibility supports the broader principles of Classroom Interactional Competence (Walsh, 2006a; Sert, 2010), which advocate for teachers' adaptive responsiveness to learners' emergent needs during interaction. Incorporating rephrasing strategies into teacher training (e.g., using authentic classroom data and micro-analytic tools like CA) may empower teachers to become more sensitive to the interactional contingencies of real-time questioning, thus enhancing the fluidity and effectiveness of classroom discourse.

Third, the findings suggest that reflective practice informed by Conversation Analysis offers a uniquely detailed perspective that traditional reflective approaches often overlook. Encouraging teachers to engage with video-recorded classroom episodes through CA-based reflective discussions can develop not only their questioning techniques but also their broader interactional awareness, including turn-taking management, repair strategies, and scaffolding moves. Teacher education programs might therefore integrate CA-informed reflective practice modules, where teachers collaboratively analyze short but richly detailed interactional episodes from their own classrooms to gain deeper insights into their teaching.

Finally, beyond individual teacher development, such micro-analytic reflection may inform institutional professional development frameworks by shifting the focus from generalized feedback to fine-tuned and discourse-sensitive feedback that is directly grounded in teachers' actual classroom language. This may foster a culture of continuous, evidence-based professional growth that is sensitive to the interactional realities of language teaching.

References

Alsubaie, S. (2015). An analysis of classroom discourse: Elicitation techniques in EFL classrooms *International Journal of English Language Teaching, 3*(8), 29-39.

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals by a Committee of College and University Examiners (Handbook I: Cognitive Domain). New York: Longmans Publishing. Blosser, P. (2000). *How to Ask the Right Questions*. USA: National Science Teacher Association.

Bond, N. (2007). Questioning Strategies That Minimize Classroom Management Problem. *Kappa Delta PI Record, 44*(1), 18-21.

Bozbıyık, M., Sert, O., & Dilek Bacanak, K. (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 Development,* (1st ed., pp. 97–116), Bloomsbury Academic

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). Becoming a critically reflective teacher. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cancino, M. (2020). Increasing EFL Learner Participation through Eliciting Language: Insights from Conversation Analysis. *Journal of Language and Education, 6*(2), 66-80.,

Chin, C. (2007). Teacher questioning in science classrooms: Approaches that stimulate productive thinking. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44*(6), 815-843.

Cirocki, A., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2017). Reflective practice for professional development of TESOL practitioners. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL, 6*(2), 5– 24.

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

Cotton, K. (2007). Classroom Questioning. [Paper presented in Northwest Regional Education laboratory], Kansas.

Creese, A. (2005). Teacher Collaboration and Talk in Multilingual Classroom. Canada: Cromwells Ltd.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2006). Questions as strategies to encourage speaking in content-and- language-integrated classrooms. In E. U. Juan & Martínez-Flor (Eds.), *Current Trends in the Development and Teaching of the four Language Skills*, (pp.187-213), Newyork: Morton De Gruyter.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Ekin, S., Balaman, U. & Badem-Korkmaz, F. (2021). Tracking telecollaborative tasks through design, feedback, implementation, and reflection processes in pre-service language teacher education. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 1-30.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). Promoting teacher reflection in second language education: A framework for TESOL professionals. New York: Routledge.

Farrell, T. S. C., (2016). TESOL, a profession that eats its young! The importance of reflective practice in language teacher education. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 4(3)*, 97-107.

Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research.* Lawrence Erlbaum

Hale, C. C., Nanni, A. & Hooper, D. (2018). Conversation Analysis in Language Teacher Education: An Approach for Reflection Through Action Research. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education (HUJE), 33(*Special Issue), 54-71.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

Jafari, J. (2013). *The role of elicitation questions in language learning: A function-based framework*. Anchor Academic Publishing.

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). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003) *Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

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.

Long, M., & Sato, C. (1983). Classroom Foreigner Talk Discourse: Forms and Functions of Teachers' Questions. In H. Seliger, & *M. Long (Eds.), Classroom-Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 268-286). Rowley, MA: Newsbury House.

Lyle, J. (2003). Stimulated recall: a report on its use in naturalistic research. *British Educational Research Journal, 29*(6), 861–78.

Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2017). *Reflective practice in English language teaching: Research-based principles and practices*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Meade, P., & McMeniman, M. (1992). Stimulated recall—An effective methodology for examining successful teaching in science. The Australian Educational Researcher, 19(3), 1–18.

Mehan, H. (1979). What Time Is It, Denise?: Asking Known Information Questions in Classroom Discourse. *Theory Into Practice, 18*(4), 285–294.

Mercer, N., & Howe, C. (2012). Explaining the dialogic processes of teaching and learning: The value and potential of sociocultural theory. Learning, *Culture and Social Interaction, 1*(1), 12–21.

Milawati, M. & Suryati, N. (2019). EFL Teacher's Oral Questioning: Are Her Questions and Strategies Effective?. *Dinamika Ilmu, 19*(1), 37-55.

Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structures of human behavior* (2nd ed.). The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Pomerantz, A. (2005). Using participants' video stimulated comments to complement analyses of interactional practices. In H. Molder & J. Potter (Eds.), *Conversation and Cognition* (pp.93-113), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rusk, F., Sahlström, F., & Pörn, M. (2017). Initiating and carrying out L2 instruction by asking known-answer questions: Incongruent interrogative practices in bi- and multilingual peer interaction. *Linguistics and Education, 38*, 55–67.

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

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Sert, O. (2010). A Proposal for a CA-Integrated English Language Teacher Education Program in Turkey. *Asian EFL Journal (Special Issue on English Language Teacher Education and Development: Issues and Perspectives in Asia). 12*(3), 62-97.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Shen, P. & Yodkhumlue, B. (2010). Teacher's Questioning and Students' Critical Thinking in College EFL Reading Classroom. Paper presented on the 8th International Postgraduate Research Colloquium: Interdisciplinary Approach for Enhancing Quality of Life IPRC Proceedings, 44-53.

Tan, Z.T. (2007). Questioning in Chinese University EL Classrooms: what lies Beyond It? *RELC Journal, 38*(1), 87-103.

Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. Sage.

Tsui, A.B.M. (1995). *Introducing classroom interaction. London*: Penguin English.

Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, Autonomy and Authenticity*. New York: Longman.

Walsh, S. (2006a). Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom. *ELT Journal, 60*(2), 133-141.

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

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

Walsh, S., & Mann, S. (2015). Doing reflective practice: a data-led way forward. *ELT Journal, 6*(4), 351-362.

Waring, H. Z. (2012). Yes-no questions that convey a critical stance in the language classroom. *Language and Education, 26*(5), 451–469.

Wong, R. (2010). Classifying Teacher Questions in EFL Classroom: Question Types and Their Proper Use. *TESOL in Context, 20*(1), 37-57.

Wragg, E. C & Brown, G. (2001). *Questioning in the Secondary School*. New York: Routledge.

Wright, T. (2010). Second language teacher education: Review of recent research on practice. *Language Teaching, 43*(3), 259–96.