

INTERACTIONAL UNFOLDING OF VOCABULARY EXPLANATIONS IN MEANING AND FLUENCY CONTEXTS

Elif TAŞKIN

eliftaskin@duzce.edu.tr

Abstract

In the field of foreign and second language education, there is great deal of research on vocabulary teaching and learning. However, there is relatively limited research dealing with the vocabulary explanations during ongoing classroom interaction. This article aims to provide vocabulary explanation sequences in meaning and fluency contexts (Seedhouse, 2004). To this end, a foreign language education classroom including 13 students was recorded for a classroom hour, and the interaction in the classroom was transcribed. The classroom interactions were analyzed by using conversation analysis methodology, and vocabulary explanation examples were described in detail. As a result of the analysis, two vocabulary explanation sequences are provided in meaning and fluency contexts based on the students' responses. Results show that when the students display understanding in their native language, the teacher asks follow-up questions before closing the turn; however, when they display understanding in the target language, the teacher closes the turn without asking further questions.

Keywords: conversation analysis, vocabulary explanation, meaning and fluency contexts, classroom interaction.

1. Introduction

There is a great deal of research on how to teach and learn vocabulary; and different teaching methodologies make use of different techniques of vocabulary teaching (Zimmerman, 1997). In terms of effective vocabulary instruction, selection of vocabulary items, sequencing them, and the presentation of these items were previously explained in details (Nation, 1990; Nation & Newton 1997). However, there are different ideas about how to teach lexical items effectively. While some scholars support the notion that intentional vocabulary teaching (the focused study of words) is more effective than incidental one (Morton, 2015; Schmitt, 2008; Tian & Macaro 2012), there are also scholars who support the benefits of implicit vocabulary teaching over explicit one (Paribakht & Wesche, 1997). On the other hand, according to Nation (2001), vocabulary learning occurs both incidentally and intentionally. While word form, collocations and word class require implicit teaching, meaning and usage of a word are picked up better when they are taught explicitly (Nation, 2001). In this paper, the patterns in-between the teacher's first initiation (e.g. asking the meaning of the word) and the explanations are analyzed using the methodology of conversation analysis (CA) to find out how vocabulary teaching occurs in meaning and fluency contexts where the teacher wants to elicit meaning from students, rather than displaying a focus on language forms and absolute correctness (Seedhouse, 2004). There are articles which focus on vocabulary explanations via verbal channel of non-verbal resources in language teaching by applying to conversation analysis (CA) methodology (e.g., Lazaraton, 2004; Mortensen, 2011; Morton, 2015). However, there is a gap in terms of when and how the teacher makes explanations by using synonyms or antonyms of the words. This article

addresses this gap by providing a micro analytic view of vocabulary explanations in meaning and fluency contexts. For the purpose, the relevant literature is reviewed in order to develop theoretical framework and provide arguments on vocabulary explanations. Then, the setting and participants is explained in data and method section. Lastly, vocabulary explanations in meaning and fluency contexts are analyzed in six extracts based on the conversation analysis methodology, and the findings are discussed to be able to provide sequences in vocabulary teaching.

2. Review of Literature

Vocabulary knowledge is an indispensable part of language learning. To be able to construct sentences in a language, individuals need to have considerable amount of vocabulary knowledge and know their meanings. In that respect, there is a great deal of research about how to teach and learn vocabulary effectively (Nation, 1990; Nation & Newton, 1997; Zheng, 2012; Zimmerman, 2013).

Zheng (2012) states that vocabulary learning strategies should be taught explicitly to increase the possibility of vocabulary acquisition in language classrooms. Based on a research study, Zheng (2012) brings forward that both learners and teachers believe that vocabulary knowledge has a significant place in language learning. In Japanese context, most students prefer explicit vocabulary teaching in language classrooms; however, there are doubts about the effectiveness of traditional vocabulary teaching (Zheng, 2012). By taking into consideration effective vocabulary learning, Zheng (2012) proposes that teaching the culture of target language increases the learning of the meanings of lexical items in the long term. On the other hand, an experimental research conducted with Chinese university students show that learners who are exposed to bottom-up vocabulary teaching outperforms the ones who get top-down vocabulary instruction (Moskovsky, Jiang, Libert & Fagan, 2015). As for vocabulary teaching, it is stated that Chinese learners prefer explicit vocabulary teaching; and it may be because of the education system there (Moskovsky et al., 2015; Zheng, 2012).

With regard to explaining word meaning, Zimmerman (2013) claims that an experienced vocabulary teacher should first explain the basic meaning of the vocabulary then go on the details. He proposes a number of ways to explain word meaning such as giving both positive and negative examples, providing synonyms and antonyms, creating a situational context and using body language. According to Nation and Newton (1997), there are three important elements in vocabulary teaching as selection, sequencing and presentation. As for presentation phase, they suggest that vocabulary should be taught implicitly with the help of communicative activities in which vocabulary is not the pedagogical goal of learning. Furthermore, Mortensen (2011) recommends that new vocabulary should be practiced with special learning activities such as gap-filling, semantic extensions and language games.

The interactional vocabulary explanation was examined by using conversation analysis methodology in language classrooms (Mortensen, 2011). As a result of the examinations, following pattern is found out (Mortensen, 2011): (a) the teacher emphasizes a specific part of the turn, (b) a student repeats this segment of the turn, (c) the teacher asks for a word explanation and (d) the students provide the word explanation. Based on the analysis of the collected data, Mortensen (2011) states that this word explanation sequence occurs naturally from the ongoing activity, and the instructor focuses on the unknown vocabulary while studying a meaning and fluency context. The phenomenon that is put forward by Mortensen (2011) is that relevant vocabulary is determined before the class, and they are studied as the continuum of a communicative activity. However, in this study, the key-vocabulary items are determined beforehand, and a sentence completion activity is designed to teach the targeted

vocabulary. The vocabulary teaching procedure shows differences in Mortensen's data and the data of this research article.

In addition to verbal explanation of vocabulary meaning, nonverbal explanations also have importance in vocabulary teaching. Lazaraton (2004) examines the effects of gestures and other nonverbal behaviors that accompany the explicit explanation of lexical items. While analyzing the gestures, Lazaraton (2004) adopts McNeill's (1992) classification of hand movements as iconic, metaphoric, deictic and beats, and she claims that gestures play a significant role in unplanned vocabulary explanation by making verbal explanation more comprehensible for the learners. Lazaraton (2004) also claims that the proficiency level of the speaker also influences the use of nonverbal communication strategies, and culture may have an effect on the preferences of gestures.

As nonverbal explanation, it is well-known that body languages may change from culture to culture. In this paper, the usage of embodied word explanation (Sert, 2015) in English learning as a second language in Turkish context will be studied with the help of some classroom extracts.

Tian and Macaro (2012) compare the effects of teacher code-switching with explanation in the target language in a lexical Focus-on-Form context. Based on the research results, they claim that vocabulary acquisition possibility increases in a lexical Focus-on-Form learning environment. In their data, the teacher makes explanations in the native language of the speakers. On the other hand, in the data collected for this paper, the teacher only uses English, yet he accepts the answers in the mother tongue of the students after asking the meaning of a word. Therefore, instead of teacher code-switching, forms of teacher induced codeswitching (Sert, 2015; Ustunel & Seedhouse, 2005) will be exemplified in some extracts. By doing so, in the conclusion part, the effects of these two different type of codeswitching strategies will be discussed.

Morton (2015) investigates vocabulary explanations in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) settings and points out that explicit vocabulary explanation raises the comprehension of the L2 vocabulary learning of the students. In CLIL context, teachers make the lexical items noticeable for the learners, then students claim understanding. However, teachers do not end the vocabulary explanation after the claim of understanding and explain the meaning of vocabulary items with the help of a context (Morton, 2015). Content learning provides a context to explain the meaning of the vocabulary, so the teacher does not need to look outside for contextualization (Morton, 2015). Another important aspect of vocabulary explanation in CLIL context is that instructors should balance the time focusing on content and language. Therefore, it is stated that teachers should not allocate much time focusing on vocabulary explanation because their primary focus is on the content (Morton, 2015). It is the job of the teachers to smoothly shift the focus of the lesson from content to form to make explicit vocabulary explanation (Morton, 2015).

Waring, Creider and Box (2013) describe that there are two different types of vocabulary explanations as 'analytic' and 'animated'. Verbal and contextual explanations are categorized as analytic explanations while multimodal resources such as gestures and body language are classified as animated explanations (Waring et al., 2013). Based on their data, they focus on the importance of sequence in vocabulary explanation and contextualization of vocabulary items. Their explanations unfold in the following sequential order:

- (1) set word in focus (e.g., repeat, display on the board);
- (2) contextualize WORD (e.g., use in a sentence);
- (3) invite (via Understanding Display Sequence) or offer explanation;

(4) close the explanation with a repetition (e.g., repeat, summarize).

(Waring et al., 2013)

Drawing on the sequence, the teacher makes the word salient for the students; and then uses the word in a sentence to help the students infer the meaning of the word from the context. To check whether the students know the meaning of vocabulary, the teacher deploy understating display sequence (UDS). In other words, the teacher may ask the class if they know the vocabulary item or the students show their understanding after the teacher gives an example sentence (Waring et al., 2013). However, vocabulary explanation does not end even after learners display understanding. The explanation is closed by teacher explanation that includes repeating or summarizing the explanation (Waring et al., 2013). In Morton's study (2015), vocabulary explanation is closed by the teacher proving a context to explain the meaning of the vocabulary. In these two different data, it can be seen that turns are closed by the teacher in vocabulary explanation contexts, yet there are differences in the turn final sequence. The final phase in the data of Morton (2015) is the second phase in Waring et al.'s (2013) data. However, as it is stated before there is not much research on the use of synonyms and antonyms in vocabulary explanation. Therefore, this research article will shed light on the effects of the use synonym and antonym and provide a sequence by explaining the patterns in-between teacher's first initiation and the explanations.

3. Data and Method

Data of this study come from an English preparatory class at a school of foreign languages in a state university. Data was collected during a reading and writing course, and as a course material, they were studying "Northstar 3 Reading and Writing" skills book. There were 13 students (from 18 to 20 years old) in the class, and they were all prospective English language teachers. Preparatory class was obligatory for these students who got below 65 in the proficiency in English test. During the recorded lesson, they were covering the unit 4 "Language and Power". The instructor of the lesson is an experienced language teacher who works in the field for more than 10 years. The instructor who graduated from a university where English is as the medium of instruction only uses the target language in the class as a language policy (Seedhouse, 2004).

The classroom teaching was recorded by a video camera and transcribed by using the Jeffersonian transcription conventions (2004). This article focuses on the vocabulary explanation patterns in a meaning and fluency context. Therefore, all the vocabulary-relevant segments were compiled and analyzed in terms of the patterns in-between the teacher's first initiation (e.g. asking the meaning of the word) and the explanations.

The analyses are conducted by using a conversation analysis (CA) methodology. CA is social science research methodology which studies the naturally occurring interaction by transcribing and analyzing the audio or video recordings (Seedhouse, 2005). In the field of applied linguistics, conversation analysis methodology has been used to uncover the classroom interaction in language teaching and learning (e.g., Kitzinger, 2013; Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Seedhouse, 2004; Waring, 2008). CA treats social interaction as the primary data to develop an emic perspective by focusing on how sequences are generated (Seedhouse, 2006). The goal of this study is to scrutinize the classroom interaction during the process of vocabulary teaching and provide a pattern for how vocabulary teaching is sequenced in meaning and fluency context. While doing so, the conversation analytic methodology is used to investigate the patterns in-between teacher's first initiation and the explanations over the course of vocabulary teaching, for the interactions occurred naturally in the classroom environment.

4. Analysis and Findings

The patterns in-between the teacher's first initiation and the explanations will be investigated throughout six extracts analyzed for the purpose of this paper. The extracts come from the beginning of the lesson while they study the vocabulary items of the specific unit before starting to reading. The instructor hands out the worksheet, and they start to study the vocabulary items one by one before giving time to the students to complete the gaps.

4.1. Analytic Explanation After Display of Understanding Through Code-switching

In the first extract, the teacher asks the meaning of the first vocabulary item in the worksheet, and vocabulary explanation sequence is closed by the teacher explanation of vocabulary item with exemplification.

Extract 1: "assertive"

01 T: do you know ↑assertive. what does it mean <↑assertive>.
 02 Bus: iddialı
 (*Sp.determined*)
 03 (1.0)
 04 Bus2: yes.
 05 T: (1.0)
 06 yeah. sort of.
 07 (1.4) yeah.
 08 (1.2)
 09 have your ever heard of this term ↑asser↓tive?
 10 Bus2: [yes.
 11 Emi: [no
 12 T: uh huh somebody ↑who always something to happen strictly
 13 (2.0)
 14 for example, you will do the homework tonight ↑other↓wise
 15 don't come to the lesson tomorrow. I am assertive
 16 here okay. ı am definite about it. I am strict about it.

In this sequence, the vocabulary explanation pattern starts with the teacher's turn. In line 01, T asks the meaning of 'assertive', and in line 02, Bus provides the second pair part of the adjacency pair by providing a response in Turkish (her L1), which forms a teacher induced code-switching (Sert, 2015; Ustunel & Seedhouse, 2005). After one second of silence, Bus2 confirms Bus's candidate answer with a minimal confirmation token in English. Following one second of silence in line 5, the teacher accepts the answer. In line 09, T upgrades the question which receives contradictory answers from two students in the following two turns and explains the meaning of the words. After 2 seconds of silence, the teacher creates a context including exemplification of the vocabulary item.

In extract one, the vocabulary explanation is done by the teacher in line 12, yet he does not close the turn after the explanation. After teacher explanation, there is no display of understating of the students. Therefore, *word* is contextualized (Waring et al., 2013) by the teacher to make the meaning of the vocabulary clear for the students, and also the synonyms of the vocabulary item are provided by the teacher in the context.

In extract 2, students show the displays of understanding through code-switching, yet the claim of understating in L1 is not treated as sufficient for closure of the sequence.

Extract 2: "excessive"

01 T: ↑excessive
 02 SS: aşırı ((Sp.excessive))
 03 T: yeah. extreme. what is the antonym of excessive?
 04 (1.8)
 05 antonym, just the [opposite meaning.
 06 Aysn: [just
 07 Bus: not enough
 08 T: moderate
 09 (2.1)
 10 whereas men talk moderately, women talk excessively. you
 11 see the difference now
 12 (1.0)
 13 just the opposite
 14 (1.7)
 15 ↑moderate amount of (), ↑excessive amount of ().
 16 okay. these are different things.

In this sequence, students provide the meaning of the vocabulary in L1, yet the turn is again completed by the explanation of the teacher. In line 01, T produces the target word with an emphasis, and in line 02, some of the students display understanding through code-switching. In the third turn of the interaction, T produces an acknowledgement token in line 03 which is followed by a synonym of the word. After providing the synonym of the target vocabulary item, T asks the antonym of it in line 03. This is followed by a long silence, and T repeats the request for antonym and provides the meaning of antonym in the same line. In line 07, Aysn produces a knowledge display (not enough); however, T neither acknowledges nor rejects the knowledge. T provides the antonym of the target word in line 08 and continues to expand the word explanation in lines 09-16. There are long silences during the teacher's explanation turn. For instance, there is 2.1 seconds of silence after T provides the antonym of the word. In line 10 preceded by a long silence, T provides the adverb form of the target word in a context and ask for the display of understanding. Despite long silences, SS do not show any sign of understanding, and T provides a different sentence including the targeted vocabulary items. In line 16, the vocabulary explanation sequence is closed with emphasizing that the targeted words have different meanings by the teacher.

According to Seedhouse (2004), teachers accept the display of knowledge of the correct answer while studying the meaning of vocabulary item. In the extract 2, T acknowledges the answer in the native language of the speakers, yet he does not end the explanation until the line 16.

In the following extract, the vocabulary explanation pattern resembles the sequence in extract 2. SS provide the explanation in L1, and T explains the meaning of vocabulary in a context and asks the antonym of the target word.

Extract 3: “dehydration”

01 T: okay. a::nd: the other one is dehydration.
 02 Aysn: dehydration
 03 Daml: su kaybı ((Sp.dehydration))
 04 Bus: suyu boşaltmak. ((Sp. to drain))
 05 içindeki suyu atmak. ((Sp. to lose too much water))
 06 T: yeah. loss of- loss of too much water in the body. It can
 07 lead to really risky and dangerous health conditions.
 08 okay. dehydration. do you know ↑overhydration?
 09 ↑overhydration, just the opposite of dehydration.
 10 Bus: şey. su alma, içmek sürekli.
 11 ((Sp. well. get water, drink water constantly))

12 T: ↑excessive ↑excessive accumulation of water in the body.
 13 both of them are negative. but which one is more
 14 dangerous in health terms. >which one is more
 15 dangerous.<
 16 SS: dehydration
 17 Aysn: both
 18 T: dehydration is really more dangerous (.) they say.
 19 ↑overhydration only leads to posining but dehydration
 20 can (you know) lead to strokes.

As in extract 2, T asks for the meaning of the word with emphasis on it, and SS provide answers in L1. After the teacher pronounces that word, Aysn repeats the word in line 2. In lines 3-5, two students provide display of understanding through code-switching. In line 6, T utters an acknowledgement token (yeah) and goes on explaining the meaning of the vocabulary item. Unlike extract 2, this time T provides the antonym of the word and asks SS if they know the meaning (“do you know overhydration?”) in line 08. In line 10, Bus provides the second pair part of adjacency pair by providing an L1 response, yet T does not provide an evaluation to the answer of Bus. In line 12, T explains the meaning of vocabulary item. After the explanation, T asks an open-ended question (“which one is more dangerous?”) in lines 13-15. In line 16, SS provides the correct answer but one of the students utters a wrong answer in line 17. When the teacher turn is analyzed, it is seen that T does not give any reaction to the answers of the students. T closes the vocabulary explanation turn by giving an answer to his question between lines 18-20.

4.2. Analytic Explanation After Display of Understanding in the Target Language

In the following two extracts, students provide the display of understanding in the target language, and the vocabulary explanation sequence shows differences from the previous three extracts.

Extract 4: “profanity”

01 T: the other word is <profanity>. profanity, you know?
 02 Bus: bad thing
 03 T: ↑bad words.
 04 Bus: [yes.
 05 T: [yeah. bad things. bad words. i will do something to your
 06 (we have video recording) i will do something to your
 07 mother. i will do something to your sister. i will do
 08 something to your father. okay. er:: these are profanity
 09 words. okay?

In line 01, T asks the meaning of ‘profanity’, and in line 02, Bus provides the second pair part of adjacency pair by providing an explanation. T confirms the answer of Bus by restating the phrase with suprasegmental modification on the word in line 03. Following T’s turn, Bus utters an acknowledgement token which is overlapping T’s acknowledgement token (yeah). In line 05, T repeats the answer of Bus (bad things) and his own answer (bad words) as an acknowledgement of his prior turn and emphasizes the meaning (Mortensen, 2011). T expands his turn by giving some example sentences to explain the meaning of ‘profanity’ and ends the contextualization with ”okay”.

In the following extract, one of the students provides the synonym of the word which the teacher asks the meaning, and vocabulary explanation is ended with the repetition of the synonym by the teacher.

Extract 5: “work out”

01 Aysn: "when a human body can excrete er:: one liter of water
 02 during regular workouts,"=
 03 T: =what does it mean a workout here?
 04 Emi: er::
 05 Nih: exercise
 06 T: exercise huh exercise you can.

In extract 5, Aysn reads a sentence from the worksheet, and T cuts the sentence after the word 'workouts'. In line 3, T asks the meaning of 'workout', and Nih provides the synonym of the word in line 05. In the third turn, T repeats the answer of Nih and ends the vocabulary explanation turn by using the synonym in a sentence.

As it is seen above, the teacher does not ask any questions after Nih provides the synonym or provides a context for the vocabulary. There may be two reasons for this vocabulary explanation sequence. First one is that Nih shows understanding in the target language by providing the synonym of the word. The other possible reason may be that this time, the teacher asks the vocabulary explanation during an ongoing activity. In other words, 'work out' is not one of the vocabulary items that the teacher determines to study before the class.

4.3. Analytic Explanation for Culture Specific Vocabulary

In the following extract, the teacher asks the difference between 'sex and gender' which have the same meaning in the native language of the students. To be able to make the meaning clear for the students, T contextualizes the words (Waring et al., 2013).

Extract 6: "sex and gender"

01 T: >What's the difference between ↑sex and ↑gender?<
 02 Bus: gender hani cinsiyet her ikisi de=
 03 ((Sp. gender, both of them))
 04 T: =what's sex?
 05 Bus: şey, o ayrımı, hani, ayrımcılık
 06 ((Sp. well, it's the difference, well, discrimination))
 07 SS: no
 08 T: no
 09 Nih: synonym?
 10 T: no::: ehh
 11 Sule:they are same
 12 T: okay. when you translate them into turkish (.) actually
 13 there is no ehh s- ehh difference. but in english they
 14 are different things.
 15 Nih: yes.
 16 T: sex is the biological being. ↑gender is the culture and
 17 social being. okay?
 18 Elif: okay.
 19 T: >for example< do you buy ↑blue clothes or ↑pink clothes
 20 for boys (0.2) little boys?
 21 Bus2: blue
 22 T: blue
 23 Daml: this is gender
 24 Bus2: gender
 25 T: yeah, this is because of their gender. but on the
 26 ultrasound when the mother is pregnant on the fourth
 27 month or on the fifth month I don't remember exactly. the
 28 doctor checks the baby's sex or gender on the ultrasound?
 29 Bus2: sex.
 30 SS: sex.

- 31 T: sex. yeah. here the doctor is looking at the ↑biological
 32 being.
 33 Emi: yes.
 34 T: yeah. sex. but gender is cultural. okay?
 35 Bus2: okay.
 36 T: it's social. these are the differences. okay?

In line 01, T asks the difference between ‘gender and sex’, and in line 02, Bus provides the second pair part of adjacency pair by providing an L1 response to ‘gender’, which forms a teacher induced code-switching. (Sert, 2015; Ustunel & Seedhouse, 2005). After Bus’s turn, in line 04, T asks the meaning of ‘sex’ this time which is not explained in the previous turn by Bus. In line 05, Bus again provides a response in her native language. However, both the students and the teacher reject the answer in lines 06-07. After the rejection of the answer by Bus, Nih asks the teacher if they are the synonyms in line 09 yet the teacher answer with a negative response token (no). Even after the teacher disapproves the answer, Sule utters a sentence (they are same) to ask whether they mean the same thing in line 11. In lines 12-14, T provides an explanation that these words have the same meaning in their native language, yet they mean different things in the target language. T explains the meaning of vocabulary items in lines 16-17, and Elif provides an acknowledgment token (okay) in line 18. However, T does not close the vocabulary explanation turn and asks a question in lines 19-20 (do you buy blue clothes or pink clothes for boys, little boys?). In line 21, Bus provides the answer (blue), and T repeats Bus’s answer in the following line. After the answer of the question which is directed to make the difference between gender and sex clear, Daml provides an utterance (this is gender.), and Bus repeats the target word in line 24. The answers of the students are approved by the T with an acknowledgement token (yeah) in line 25. When the meaning of gender is exemplified, T creates a new context for the students to get the answer ‘sex’ this time in lines 25-28. The expected answer is provided by Bus in line 29 and SS in line 30. After the answers of the SS, T repeats the answer and provides an acknowledgement token (yeah). T goes on the explanation by uttering a sentence including the meaning of ‘sex’ in line 31. In line 32, Emi provides an understanding which is followed by an acknowledgement token by the T. In the same line, T explains ‘gender’ this time. In line 35, Bus provides an understanding (okay), and T closes the vocabulary explanation sequence by emphasizing that ‘sex and gender’ have different meanings in English.

In extract 6, students show display of understanding in L1 similar to first three extracts, yet this time students do not provide the correct meaning. The problem in extract 6 may be the effect of L1 linguistic knowledge over L2 on the vocabulary meaning. When one looks at the extracts that students provide an answer in L1, it can be seen that teacher has the same teaching policy, always in the target language (Seedhouse, 2004).

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The analysis of vocabulary explanations showed some similarities in terms of sequence organization in vocabulary explanation in the CA studies by Mortensen (2011) and Waring, Creider, and Box (2013). Teachers focus on a word at turn initial position, and they ask for the meaning. Furthermore, both of the CA studies provide four sequence organization in vocabulary teaching, and based on the analysis in this paper the following two sequences can be provided:

First sequence is provided when the students display of understanding through code-switching (e.g. extracts 1-2-3);

- (a) The teacher asks the meaning of the WORD;
- (b) Students display understanding through code-switching;

- (c) The teacher upgrades the question or asks the synonym or antonym of the question;
- (d) The teacher closes the explanation including exemplification.

Second sequence is seen when the students provide the display of understanding in the target language (e.g. extracts 4-5);

- (a) The teacher asks the meaning of the WORD;
- (b) A student provides the word explanation in the target language;
- (c) The teacher closes the explanation with a repetition and context.

When we take into consideration these two different vocabulary explanation sequences, it can be said that teacher closes the explanation without asking further questions when the students provide an explanation in target language. In the second extract, the teacher acknowledges the display of understanding in L1, yet he goes on vocabulary study by asking further questions to the students. Seedhouse (2004) states that teachers accept the display of knowledge of the correct answer in third interactional position. However, as it can be seen in the second extract, the teacher does not end the vocabulary explanation turn even if the students provides an acknowledgement token to the answer in L1. After producing an acknowledgement token, the teacher goes on the vocabulary explanation by contextualizing the word with an example. In terms of turn final position, the extracts which are used for this article show similarities to Morton's (2015) data since the turns are generally ended by the teacher providing a context for the relevant vocabulary items. In the study of Morton (2015), the teacher does not need to create a context to explain the meaning of vocabulary item, since he analyzes the vocabulary explanation in Content and Language Integrated (CLIL) classrooms. When it comes to the contextualization of vocabulary items in this research study, it can be seen that the teacher creates a context to be able to explain the meaning of vocabulary items by himself, since the teaching methodology in the class is not the same as Morton's data. On the other hand, the similarity between these two studies is that the teacher explains the lexical item by focusing on the form and makes use of context to increase the possibility of vocabulary acquisition.

When we look at the extract 6 "sex and gender", the reason behind contextualization of vocabulary items can get meaning. In the extract, the difference between two lexical items which have the same meaning in the native language of the students while having two different explanations in the target language are studied by providing explanations including exemplifications. In terms of cultural aspect of vocabulary learning and teaching, Laufer and Girsai (2008) put forward that the teachers help students get the interlingual differences while studying vocabulary explanations when the students provide an L1 response. The similarity in their study and in this study is that vocabulary learning takes place in a form-focused classroom, yet the methodologies show differences. While they apply to contrastive analysis, conversation analysis is used for this study. Larrotto (2011) also claims that knowing the meaning of a lexical item is not enough; learners should be able to use the target vocabulary in sentence construction. When the analyses are investigated, it can be seen that the teacher shares the same teaching strategy with these scholars, since he always tries to provide a context to explain the meaning of the vocabulary.

Another point in this paper is that the teacher asks or provides the synonym (Chaudron, 1982; Flowerdew, 1992) and antonym of the lexical items. When one looks at the first five extracts, it is seen that the teacher always does the explanation with the help of synonyms or antonyms. In that way, while studying vocabulary explanations, the teacher may increase the vocabulary knowledge of the students by providing synonyms of the lexical items.

Findings of this study expand the existing literature on vocabulary teaching and learning by showcasing two different vocabulary explanation sequences which show some similarities to the studies Mortensen (2011) and Waring et. al. (2013). There are also examples how the teacher can use synonym and antonym to explain the meaning of the lexical items. Furthermore, the analyses show that the teacher provides a context to the student instead of offering a dictionary definition. The contextualization of vocabulary items shows differences between Morton's study (2015) and this paper; in the previous one there is the context for the students to benefit from while explaining the meaning of vocabulary items, yet in the study, the teacher provides the context during the vocabulary explanation sequence by himself. Therefore, the impromptu contexts provided by the teacher may give an idea to the teachers who study vocabulary teaching. In terms of methodology, conversation analysis (CA) is really useful to provide a natural data to study language learning through interaction (Pekarek Doehler, 2010, Seedhouse, 2005). However, the data for this study were gathered by recording the class of just one teacher, so it would be better to record and analyze the classes of teachers who use the same teaching material to be able to see how they provide word explanations in the same context. By doing so, there may be found out different vocabulary explanation sequences, and they help the novice teachers adopt an effective vocabulary teaching sequence. Moreover, the study may be developed with longitudinal data to explore the vocabulary explanation patterns more. Therefore, there is a lot more way to uncover the vocabulary explanation patterns of different teachers in different contexts, even in different cultures.

References

- Chaudron, C. (1982). Vocabulary elaboration in teachers' speech to L2 learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 4(2), 170–180.
- Flowerdew, J. (1992). Definitions in science lectures. *Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 202–221.
- Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 229-256). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Laufer, B., & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: a case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 694–716.
- Lazaraton, A. (2004). Gesture and speech in the vocabulary explanations of one ESL teacher: A microanalytic inquiry. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 79–117.
- Mortensen, K. (2011). Doing word explanation in interaction. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp.135-163). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Morton, T. (2015). Vocabulary explanations in CLIL classrooms: A conversation analysis perspective. *The Language Learning Journal*, 43(3), 256-270.
- Moskovsky, C., Jiang, G., Libert, A., & Fagan, S. (2015). Bottom-up or top-down: English as a foreign language vocabulary instructions for Chinese university students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(2), 256-277.
- Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. New York: Newbury House.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, P., & Newton, J. (1997). Teaching vocabulary. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.) *Second language vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 238-254). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. (1997). Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary acquisition. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 174-200). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language, learning and documenting learning in conversation analytic SLA research. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising learning in applied linguistics* (pp. 105-127). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schmitt, N. (2008). Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 329-363.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 38(4), 165-187.

- Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Tian, L., & Macaro, E. (2012). Comparing the effect of teacher codeswitching with English-only explanations on the vocabulary acquisition of Chinese university students: A lexical focus-onform study. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(3), 367–391.
- Ustunel, E., & Seedhouse P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 302-325.
- Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(4), 577-594.
- Waring, H. Z., Creider, C. C., & Box, C. D. (2013). Explaining vocabulary in the second language classroom: a conversation analytic account. *Learning, Culture, and Social Interaction*, 2, 249–264.
- Zheng, S. (2012). Studies and suggestions on English vocabulary teaching and learning. *English Language Teaching*, 5(5), 129-137.
- Zimmerman, C. B. (1996). Historical trends in second language vocabulary instruction. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 5-19). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zimmerman, C. B. (2013). Teaching and learning vocabulary for second language learners. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton, M. A. Snow, & D. Bohlke (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 288-302). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Appendix:

The Jefferson Transcription System

The transcription system uses standard punctuation marks (comma, stop, question mark); however, in the system they mark intonation rather than syntax. Arrows are used for more extreme intonational contours and should be used sparingly. The system marks noticeable emphasis, volume shifts, and so on. A generally loud speaker should not be rendered in capitals throughout.

[]	Square brackets mark the start and end of overlapping speech. They are aligned to mark the precise position of overlap as in the example below.
↑ ↓	Vertical arrows precede marked pitch movement, over and above normal rhythms of speech. They are used for notable changes in pitch beyond those represented by stops, commas and question marks.
→	Side arrows are used to draw attention to features of talk that are relevant to the current analysis.
<u>Underlining</u>	indicates emphasis; the extent of underlining within individual words locates emphasis and also indicates how heavy it is.
CAPITALS	mark speech that is hearably louder than surrounding speech. This is beyond the increase in volume that comes as a by product of emphasis.
ˆ↑I know it,°	ˆdegree' signs enclose hearably quieter speech.
that's r*ight.	Asterisks precede a 'squeaky' vocal delivery.
(0.4)	Numbers in round brackets measure pauses in seconds (in this case, 4 tenths of a second). If they are not part of a particular speaker's talk they should be on a new line. If in doubt use a new line.
(.)	A micropause, hearable but too short to measure.
((staccato))	Additional comments from the transcriber, e.g. about features of context or delivery.
she wa::nted	Colons show degrees of elongation of the prior sound; the more colons, the more elongation.
hhh	Aspiration (out-breaths); proportionally as for colons.
.hhh	Inspiration (in-breaths); proportionally as for colons.
Yeh,	ˆContinuation' marker, speaker has not finished; marked by fall-rise or weak rising intonation, as when delivering a list.
y'know?	Question marks signal stronger, 'questioning' intonation, irrespective of grammar.
Yeh.	Full stops mark falling, stopping intonation ('final contour'), irrespective of grammar, and not necessarily followed by a pause.
bu-u-	hyphens mark a cut-off of the preceding sound.
>he said<	ˆgreater than' and 'lesser than' signs enclose speeded-up talk. Occasionally they are used the other way round for slower talk.
solid.= =We had	ˆEquals' signs mark the immediate 'latching' of successive talk, whether of one or more speakers, with no interval.
heh heh	Voiced laughter. Can have other symbols added, such as underlinings, pitch movement, extra aspiration, etc.
sto(h)p i(h)t	Laughter within speech is signalled by h's in round brackets.