



Classroom Interactional Teacher Language Awareness: Expert Talk Contextualizing Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Mandana Zolghadri^{1*}, Mahmood Reza Atai², Esmat Babaii³

¹Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics, Department of Foreign Languages,
Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran, mandanazolghadri@yahoo.com

²Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of Foreign Languages,
Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran, atai@khu.ac.ir

³Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of Foreign Languages,
Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran, babaii@khu.ac.ir

Abstract

The study investigated a second language teacher educator and teacher learners' awareness of *classroom interactional competence* (CIC) to communicate pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) on a teacher education course in Iran. Therefore, the teacher educator's classroom discourse was scrutinized using classroom observation triangulated with interview data with the educator to characterize the interactional features of his talk-in-interaction with respective discourse *modes*. The resulting 43 interactures represented four interacture types which mediated *Effective Eliciting*, *Shaping Learner Contribution*, *Facilitating Interactional Space Focused on the Learner*, and *Facilitating Interactional Space Focused on the Teacher*. The corresponding *mode* analysis revealed frequent mode *integrity* incorporating *classroom context* mode with a pivotal role in all except *Facilitating Interactional Space Focused on the Teacher* interactures. Later, the taxonomy was incorporated into CIC TLA questionnaires. 32 teaching candidates, and the educator completed respective ethnographically-developed questionnaire versions indicating their awareness of the teacher educator's choice of CIC *interactures*. Besides, the interview data concerning the TLA deliberation was triangulated with a Spearman rho correlation results of the perceived CIC strategy frequencies. Consequently, the confirmatory evidence for the significant degree of correspondence ($\rho = 0.67$, $n = 33$, $p < 0.01$) between the educator and teacher learners' awareness revealed the student teachers' heightened declarative TLA. The findings urge language teacher educators to tune interactures in *type*, *mode*, and *intensity* to the professional content and the TLA they negotiate with teacher learners thereby.

Keywords: Appropriation, Conversation Analysis, Interactures, Second Language Teacher Education, Teacher Language Awareness

Received 29 August 2019

Accepted 06 October 2019

Available online 17 October 2019

DOI: 10.30479/jmrels.2019.11494.1428

1. Introduction

Classroom interaction has generated considerable research into second language teaching (SLT) (Jenks & Seedhouse, 2015; Markee, 2015; Walsh, 2006) and second language teacher education (SLTE) (Sert, 2015; Johnson & Golombek, 2011; Walsh, 2013). The investigations are motivated by the interface between interaction and learning (Walsh, 2013). Walsh (2006) posits interaction at the heart of language learning in dialogic, engaging, participatory classrooms under the rubric of *classroom interactional competence* (CIC). CIC is, therefore, defined as, “Teachers’ and learners’ ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning” (Walsh, 2011, p. 158). This definition parallels van Compernelle’s *interaction competence* as “mediated joint activity” (2015, p. 171) into which interlocutors’ contribute semiotically.

This conceptualization of classroom interaction echoes the urgent call by Seedhouse: “for teachers to implement pedagogical intentions effectively [...] it is important to develop an understanding of the interactional organization of the SL classroom” (1997, p. 574). Likewise, in education, teachers’ appreciation of talk for guided knowledge construction and their skillful orchestration of classroom interaction to that end realizes *Accountable Talk* (Michaels, O’Connor, Hall & Resnick, 2002, as cited in Sohmer, Michaels, O’Connor, & Resnick, 2009, p. 106). Addressing the issue, Sohmer et al. pinpoint the structure of teacher talk, inter alia, shaping desired academic knowledge. The need is still pressing despite decades of the related research conducted. Johnson and Golombek (2018), viewing classroom interaction in the Vygotskian sociocultural tradition, highlight the issue for SLTE. They call for attention to teachers’ *talk-in-interaction* and the rationale for their choices. Thus CIC through teacher-talk-in-interaction for teacher professional practices warrants scrutiny (Walsh, 2013).

After characterizing *communicative interactional competence*, Walsh (2013) promotes CIC to the status of the *fifth skill* in the communicative curriculum. By definition, CIC, within the framework of Self-Evaluation-of-Teacher-Talk (SETT), is materialized in classroom micro-contexts called *modes* through interactional features called *interactures* (Walsh, 2006). Nevertheless, he argues that the teaching performances and competencies comprising CIC vary across contexts. This concern for flexible and variable features of CIC is in marked contrast with the earlier conception of interactional competence being context-bound (e.g., Young 2008). The significance of CIC and its woolliness urge scholars into gaining evidence for the *ecological* (van Lier, 2013) validity of CIC practices and processes in specific language teaching contexts and *located* SLTE (Kumaravadivelu, 2012).

The CIC concept has stimulated research in diverse teaching contexts within SETT framework. According to Walsh (2006), the framework, originally derived from tertiary level English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom discourse, has been modified in the pedagogic *goal* components (see Appendix) in the investigation of primary science, and secondary English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. The classrooms have been either teacher-directed, or learner-directed, either at university, or Non-English medium secondary schools. As an extended conceptualization of CIC, however, Sert (2011) has proposed a teacher management skill related to it accommodating its realizations.

To date, the evidence has been compelling for a conversation analysis using SETT to characterize teacher discourse in other contexts (Walsh, 2011). Previous response to this need includes the findings of a longitudinal research on Turkish pre-service EFL teachers showing the development of their CIC in English and its outcome (Sert, 2015). The analysis of classroom interactions, observation and self-reflection data indicated how a teacher learner's SL CIC enhanced shaping learner contributions, with effective use of hand gestures, teacher-learner echo, and longer student turns. As a result, Sert advocates reflective teacher education research on SL classroom interaction. Besides, Sert recommends tracing the processes of increasing SL teachers' interaction effectiveness in *developing* their teaching knowledge and practices.

Dynamic realization of CIC in the context of SLTE, therefore, seems tenable, following Walsh's (2012) recommendation. While research has already probed into the *teacher's* perspective (e.g., Walsh, 2013), future CIC probes with a wider perspective incorporating the *teacher educator's* company may demystify the role of the teacher educator's CIC in teacher knowledge transformation through the expert-novice social interaction (Thorne & Hellermann, 2015). This follows Johnson and Golombek's (2018) directions for research on the quality of SLT educator-learner engagement. This will detail the quality of the mediational means *shaping* teacher learning and their plausibility.

Hence CIC seems to have the potential for being investigated within the realm of TLA (Walsh, 2003). The interface between teacher educators' *knowledge about language* and *pedagogical practice* (Andrews & Svalberg, 2017) can, therefore, offer considerable space for teacher learner awareness. The communicative character of the educator-talk-in-interaction reminds one of Johnson (2009) appreciating TLA of communicative strategies. Engaged with the pedagogical content, teacher educators require TLA in the enactment of the curriculum, and content mediation for particular teacher learners (Andrews, 2007; Andrews & Lin, 2018). Along the same lines, through talk-in-interaction, the experts use professional pedagogical knowledge in

sophisticated interactive decisions. This will result in recurrent CIC patterns typically absent from the novice CIC since they are preoccupied with classroom management and instructional content (Farrell, 2009). However, Jackson and Cho (2016) reported conditions conducive to novice teacher *noticing* through repeated *interactures*. This coupled with reflection could facilitate narrowing the declarative-procedural TLA gap (Andrews, 2007).

Therefore, to “reclaim the relevance” (Johnson, 2015, p. 526) of the teacher educator-talk-in-interaction *in* and *for* TLA development, the present research followed Johnson and Golombek’s (2018) principles. It portrayed the PCK utilized in naturalistic expert-guided mediation leading to teacher learner PCK. The study adopted integrated ethnomethodological and sociocultural perspectives (Thorne & Hellermann, 2015). To achieve the purpose of the study, based on the defining features of CIC (Walsh, 2006), namely, *Effective Eliciting* (EE), *Shaping Learner’s Contribution* (SLC), *Facilitating Interactional Space Focused on the Learner* (FISFL) and *Facilitating Interactional Space Focused on the Teacher* (FISFT) these research questions were addressed:

1. What interactures in the teacher educator’s classroom talk-in-interaction indicated his *interactional awareness* contextualizing pedagogical content knowledge?
2. Is there any statistically significant correspondence between the teacher educator’s awareness about the deployed interactional CIC strategies in his talk-in-interaction and the teacher learners’ declared awareness of them?

The null hypothesis suggested no significant correspondence between the teacher educator and the candidates’ declared CIC awareness.

2. Literature Review

Among the studies on *interactional competence* in SLTE, Walsh’s investigations (2003, 2006, 2011, 2012, 2013) inspired the researchers to conduct this study. Walsh has highlighted (2006) CIC features contributing to *space for learning*: Firstly, teachers’ CIC incorporates interactional strategies adapting their discourse to their current pedagogic *goal* and *learners*. Secondly, CIC creates space for interaction. Thirdly, teachers’ CIC enables *shaping* learner contributions by scaffolding, re-iterating, paraphrasing, effective eliciting like seeking clarification, modeling, or repairing learner input in decentralized classrooms. Teacher’s *shaping* learner contributions, called in the Vygotskian citation by Jarvis and Robinson (1997, p. 214) “appropriation”, underscores interaction maximizing *learning* opportunities (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). The macro-strategy conceptualizing *teaching* acts has, therefore, been realized co-constructively in CIC as,

following Walsh (2012), it acknowledges learners as active agents of learning.

SL(TE) teachers' access to their interactional class architecture within Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) (Walsh, 2006) reveals *appropriate* teacher talk-in-interaction characteristics. The framework relates pedagogic *purpose* to teachers' discourse, enabling them to identify "recurrent segmental patterns or structures" (Drew, 1994, cited in Walsh, 2006, p. 91) in their interaction. Each classroom micro-context, *mode*, has distinctive interactional features, termed *interactures* (Walsh, 2011). Interactures capture the fluidity of the context, and reflect co-construction of meanings and actions via interaction. SETT, therefore, has surpassed the Interaction-Response-Feedback (IRF) frame (Adger, 2001) in longer classroom discourse analysis. Moreover, SETT is less restrictive than IRF for its greater socializing potentials as it credits both the teacher and the learner in interaction (Sohmer et al., 2009; Thorne, & Hellermann, 2015). SETT, therefore, has more credibly featured interactional teacher language.

Despite its context-specificity, CIC has features shared by all contexts (Walsh, 2012). If *context* embodies "the physical, geographical and temporal setting of the interaction besides the specific ... mode, of the moment" (Walsh, 2012, p. 12), context flexibility allows manipulation of available interactional and linguistic resources for particular instructional goals. In the same vein, characterization of social interaction in an SL classroom in Sert's (2015) study complemented the CIC features originally identified, fine-tuning its characteristics (Walsh, 2013). The complementary social interaction features included: successful talk and code-switching management, awareness about learner unwillingness to communicate, and effective gestures.

The CIC extension to teacher learning as a social activity advocates a reflective focus on classroom interaction as "a *third strand* in SLTE curricula" (Walsh, 2013, p. 136) along with the oft-cited teaching methodology and SL knowledge (e.g., Freeman, 2018; Graves, 2006). This offers *interactional processes* as a springboard for *integrating* declarative and procedural dimensions of CIC with content knowledge of teaching (Andrews & Lin, 2018). Spoken classroom interactions guided by teacher educators' expert knowledge, Johnson (2015) holds, mediate collective teacher knowledge construction which is "both dialectic and dialogic" (Johnson, 2015, p. 135). Mediated dialog and guided reflection, therefore, shape teachers' fine-grained understandings of classroom practices and processes. To this end, responsive SL teacher educators as language aware *users* of professional expertise are expected (Johnson & Golombek, 2016) to share their *awareness* of *appropriate* teacher talk-in-interaction which highlights the integrity of TLA (Lindahl, 2016). This TLA reconceptualization,

concurrent with Glasgow (2008), elucidates classroom *pragma-linguistic awareness* contribution to SL teacher cognition (Andrews & Lin, 2018; Li, 2015). Using expert teacher's *Accountable Talk* (Shomer et al., 2009), this TLA should be externalized and explicated through interaction portraying ways to *appropriate* both content and language in teaching (Johnson & Golombek, 2018).

For fresh insights into TLA dynamics of CIC intentions and practices, SETT offers a viable option (Walsh, 2013). The analysis captures snapshots of teachers' lessons to build profiles of their CIC to be consulted. The resulting awareness, "a more conscious use of language" (Walsh, 2006, p. 135), may enable teacher candidates to notice (Jackson & Cho, 2016) their language use in classrooms. This TLA may reside in reflection on, and feedback to a teacher's interactional practices to enhance learning opportunities. Such engagement in teaching activities, in line with Li (2015), shapes the competence for designing and carrying out future actions. From a Vygotskian sociocultural perspective, therefore, Johnson (2015) contends that viewing teaching "*performance preceding competence*" (Cazden, 1981 as cited in Johnson, 2015, p. 518) has a developmental value.

The Vygotskian sociocultural tradition on SL teacher learning centers around the dialogic interactions mediated mainly by the teacher educators (Johnson, 2009). Teacher educators, therefore, will be accountable, Johnson (2015) argues, for the quality and character of the interactions. When SLTE content and processes offer intentional, well-organized instruction, the collaborative teaching-learning relationships accommodate teachers' conceptual development. From this perspective, the interactions offer pedagogic tools which promote conscious awareness. They portray the teacher educator's functional appreciation of academic concepts relative to their response to teacher learners' emergent needs (Johnson, 2015). That is why Johnson recommends access to the expert's understanding of the interactive pedagogical resources to make the instructional content relevant and accessible.

Socioculturally, Johnson holds, PCK is not stable, but "emergent, dynamic, and contingent" (2015, p. 519) on teachers' knowledge of the particular learners, contexts and purposes. Corresponding to *appropriated* mediational tools, following Ellis, Edwards, and Smagorinsky's (2010), Johnson adds, SLTE teaching activities interrelate learners, context, content and pedagogical purpose and result in PCK development. Consequently, Johnson speculates that the content is likely to emerge out of engagement with teacher learners.

To Johnson (2015), learning teaching is deliberate, and goal directed guided by teacher educators' expertise. Gradual progression towards

plausible instructional practices and higher professional expertise requires greater attention to the design, enactment, and consequences of SLTE pedagogy in light of eight principles, according to Johnson and Golombek (2018). The propositions assume teacher educators accountable for their decisions to *shape* teacher thinking and acting. Acting *dialogically*, to Johnson and Golombek, is synchronous with thinking *dialectically*, theorizing reflectively about how to transform teacher thinking and activity, and justifying sensibly the (un)expected consequences of practices. They argue, this scheme informs SLTE pedagogy and guides its transformation. Upon second thought, all these facets of SL teacher educators' activity underscore their CIC. Therefore, the quality and characteristics of a teacher educator's strategic talk-in-interaction with the teacher learners warrant due consideration.

3. Method

3.1. Participants

Two intact groups of student teachers, selected through convenience non-random sampling, participated in the preliminary phase of the study. The teacher learners had enrolled for a Teacher Education Course (TEC) run by the same instructor at a Language Institute in Karaj, Iran. The 105-minute classes met twice a week for a 20-session course. The participants received a TEC certificate for their attendance upon completion of a final assignment designed, delivered and evaluated by the teacher educator.

The summer's class comprising 28 and the spring's having 10 students were heterogeneous. Among the TEC class members, 20 agreed to participate. Besides, 12 former TEC students agreed to cooperate for they appreciated their unique experience of the course. The TEC candidates differed in gender, age range, level of education, major of their study as well as the length and range of their teaching experience. The co-researcher participating in this study as a student and an observer had 20 years of English teaching experience and was a PhD candidate in TEFL.

Demographics indicated that among the participants there were 26 females, and they were mostly younger than 30 (65.6%). The majority of the group majored in English (English non-TEFL: 50%, TEFL: 31.3%, vs. non-English: 15.6%). And, two students lacked higher education. Those with higher education were evenly distributed as BA students, BA holders, or above. As for teaching experience, the group comprised of novices mainly (46.9%); however, the percentage of experienced teachers having above 5 years of teaching experience was quite considerable (37.5%). Among those who taught, the largest number (9) had experienced teaching at language institutes.

Further, using Lindhal's (2016) extended TLA framework, the participants of the study were characterized. On the three-dimensional TLA, the teacher learners were more homogenous: As *Users*, they all met the entry requirement of certified advanced level of general academic English proficiency. As *Analysts*, despite the chances for more metalinguistic *knowledge about language* (KAL), none were classroom *interactionally aware* (Walsh, 2003). As *Teachers*, the candidates' voluntary participation in TEC indicated a perceived gap in pedagogical knowledge and/or expertise even with satisfactory levels of disciplinary knowledge. As for CIC, they needed heightened declarative and procedural awareness.

To narrow the *User* and *Teacher* gap, the teacher educator's TLA was noteworthy. As a *User*, his English-medium postgraduate education and ELT experience up to the advanced level evidenced the expected procedural language awareness (LA). As an *Analyst*, the educator had developed in-depth metalinguistic awareness through critical reading of internationally renowned publications on TLA, and was a strong advocate of explicit *interactional awareness* in SLTE. As a *Teacher*, his 19 years of experience as a nationally certified teacher educator for the Ministry of Education complemented his Master's degree in TEFL. With 30 years of EFL tenure teaching for the ministry and 21 years of temporary teaching experience in ELT and SLTE for language institutes with expertise and reflectivity he had maintained professionalism for years. Therefore, the teacher educator, aged 50, was qualified to raise *interactional awareness* through SLTE talk-in-interaction. His discourse was perceived to have the power to facilitate the *learning* of very heterogeneous groups of teacher learners by *scaffolding* among other interactures (Walsh, 2013). So the educator's discourse in the context of the TEC warranted attention.

3.2. Design

The case study employed a mixed methods design in two successive phases. Addressing the first question, a qualitative ethnographic field study was conducted. Therefore, the researchers' emic perspective allowed continuous time sampling via constant observation, participation, and interview within the naturalistic TEC setting. The second question triggered a further emic study without intervention to the field, or manipulation of interaction awareness. At the onset, the teacher educator and the teacher learners' TLA had marked differences. Therefore, implicit and explicit chances for classroom interaction awareness via the teacher educator's talk-in-interaction were available declaratively and/or procedurally through the course. The chances for declarative TLA deliberately targeted the *User*, *Analyst*, and *Teacher* dimensions, in expert exploitation of located interactures. The *User* dimension was fulfilled by the expert's choice of the medium of instruction, and procedural use of interactures. The *Analyst*

dimension incorporated metalinguistic awareness about the communicative context, and contextualizing classroom discourse. The *Teacher* dimension explicated the other two facets in the educator's pedagogical content knowledge proceduralized to contextualize the SLTE content. The resulting heightened TLA in the teacher learners was estimated quantitatively by investigating the correspondence of their declared classroom interaction awareness with that of the teacher educator as the criterion measure. The finding was triangulated with confirmatory qualitative data.

3.3. Materials and Instruments

3.3.1. Classroom Observation

The co-researcher observed fifteen class periods of the TEC courses selected making 17.2 hours of video recordings. The video-recorded sessions were so scheduled that they could cumulatively give a holistic view of the teacher educator's strategic decisions, modifications, and manipulations of classroom interactions over the course of a typical TEC. The video-recordings were planned to cover complete class periods.

3.3.2. Questionnaires

Two versions of an ethnographic questionnaire developed by the researchers were used to reflect the participants' awareness of the interactional strategies typically deployed by the teacher educator during classroom talk-in-interaction—one was designed to be completed by the teacher educator; the other, by the teacher learners. In the teacher educator questionnaire, he was addressed from the *first* person singular point of view. The questionnaire was constructed using the SETT framework (Walsh, 2006, 2011) and represented the four defining features of *Classroom Interactional Competence: Effective Eliciting, Shaping Learner's Contribution, Facilitating Interactional Space Focused on the Learner* and *Facilitating Interactional Space Focused on the Teacher*. Corresponding to each CIC feature, a set of *interactures* were identified to construct the 43 questionnaire items. The questionnaires comprised three sections: section A elicited demographic information; the focus of section B (26 items) was *learning* (and the *learner*), while section C (17 items) focused on *teaching* (and the *teacher*) strategies. The items were scored on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = never to 5 = always, which indicated the perceived frequency of each interacture. Appended to each section B and C statements was one open-ended question designed to allow the respondent to freely add to the inventory any other noticeable strategies implemented. Among the 43 questionnaire items, the estimated Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency reliability was ($r = .9$).

3.3.3. Interview

Reiterative data analysis yielded a set of ten open-ended questions which guided a structured written interview with the teacher educator. The questions were meant to elicit the teacher educator's conception of TLA in general, and *classroom interaction awareness* in particular. This included his definition of TLA, appraisal of TLA for SLTE, assessment of own TLA, estimation of the typical TEC candidate TLA, deliberation, if any, of classroom interaction awareness, and strategic CIC decisions for planned TLA as well as incidental decisions creating and maintaining space for the learning of pedagogical content knowledge. The last question consisted of five sub-questions aiming at a more guided survey of the educator's CIC awareness. Thereby, the teacher educator was asked to declare his perception of the commonest mode(s), as well as the most frequent interculture(s), and to evaluate the extent he believed his classroom discourse satisfied the TEC objectives and allowed space for teacher learning.

3.4. Procedure

3.4.1. Data Collection and Analysis

Systematic classroom observation for the present study was initiated around mid-May, 2016. Data collection, however, was limited to class audio recording before the researchers could obtain written consent for video-recording from the officials. Regular class periods were videotaped afterwards to provide evidence for the researchers' hunches about the discourse strategies that the teacher educator was using in classroom interaction, and were believed to help the students' learning and grasp of professional content knowledge of language pedagogy which was to be negotiated through the course.

Prior to the systematic analysis of the recorded episodes, they were randomly viewed and re-viewed by the researchers. The revision aided the purposive selection of the recorded excerpts and guided the purposive sampling of interactions from the initial, medial, and terminal phases of the course. Thus three 25-minute episodes, each belonging to one of the successive course phases were selected. The video extracts underwent an in-depth analysis guided by SETT (see Appendix) later. The episodes were transcribed using conventional notations of van Lier's proposal in 1988 (as cited in Walsh, 2006, p. 165).

The transcription system was used to represent classroom exchanges as naturalistically as possible. To this end, special notations were utilized to identify exchanges containing sources of unintelligibility such as background noise, simultaneous speech or other types of interference. The transcriptions were done and coded by the co-researcher in company with a TEFL

professional as an expert in qualitative data coding after briefings. During the data coding, identifying modes of discourse and setting clear boundaries in between, and distinguishing their interactional features proved challenging at times. More consistency was, nevertheless, sought through successive dialogs between the coders after they individually coded sections of the data. After the initial item writing, two TEFL experts independently reviewed the items to ensure item clarity and removed potential ambiguities. The revision was informed by both reviewers' familiarity with the TEC instructor, and his teaching ideology. Based on the reviewers' comments, the researchers made minute changes in the questionnaire.

The repeated reading and re-reading of the transcripts gave fresh insights into how the course goals were unfolded through the teacher talk and how his interactional strategies facilitated the process. The emerging patterns of interaction evidenced the teacher's CIC whose exponents formulated an inventory of 43 statements. The interactures were incorporated into two parallel forms of a questionnaire, one addressing the teacher educator, and the other, targeting the teacher learners. The questionnaires prompted their perceptions of the educator's interacture implementation frequency in two sections (B and C) with distinctive foci on the *teacher learner* and the *educator*.

In practice, the questionnaire development was aided by the co-researcher's own prior experience of the TEC context (Gieve, & Miller, 2006), was negotiated by the same expert in TEFL involved in data coding, and was guided by close cross-referencing to the inventory of interactures in SETT (Walsh, 2006). Meanwhile, the interactures presented generically in the framework were localized to provide a better realization of the interactional exchanges on the TEC. To capture possible missing corners, an open-ended question was appended to the each of the questionnaire sections B and C for any additionally perceived interactures which had remained unstated. After the revision, three representative respondents completed the questionnaire. Since no major problem was detected during this piloting phase, the revised version of the questionnaire was sent to the actual participants. Both questionnaire forms were distributed and collected by e-mail. Over 50 contacts were made this way, but only 32 replies were received within a week.

Subsequently, the questionnaire served the purpose of this research from two perspectives. After identifying the teacher educator's interactures, the SETT grid advanced the researchers' understanding of the extent to which his classroom discourse was *mode convergent*, where pedagogic goals and the educator's discourse were congruent and created space for learning (Walsh, 2013). This involved fine-tuning the educator's CIC features to the context of TEC informed by the findings of studies (e.g., Sert, 2015)

advocating emerging complementary features such as teacher's effective code-switching, and gestures. Consequently, the *modal* characteristics of the educator's multimodal discourse were identified. To conduct the *mode* analysis, the co-researcher focused on the content of each interstructure statement first and contextualized it through visualizing its likely pedagogical goal(s). Each statement was read and re-read several times to identify the individual or multiple distinctive mode(s) set to accomplish the instructional goal(s).

The resulting tabulated mode description of the educator's CIC later underwent his close inspection after the briefing. The inter-rater consistency percentage agreement measures for the interstructure types and their sum were acceptable (EE= 88.8%, SLC= 96.1%, FISFL =91.4%, FISFT= 96.4%, and CIC= 94.5%). Further, mining the interview response transcript allowed member checking and increased the internal validity of the findings. To this end, the 3470-word long interview transcript written in English was scrutinized by the co-researcher. The responses to the interview questions were received by email within a month. To access the data, the researchers had reached the teacher educator's consent for interactive exchange of the required information at his convenience. As the necessary guidelines were provided; therefore, the responses were completed in four successive steps—goal orientation, vital clue provision, response completion, and confirmation check. As a result, the educator's cognition-*in*-interaction was accessed which *theorized* his pedagogical interaction (Waring, 2016).

The results, when scrutinized, revealed patterns of interstructure-mode correspondence aimed to realize respective SLTE goals. Meanwhile, the degree of congruence between the teacher educator's selected content, language, and pedagogy was detectable. The following results report the extent to which the educator's classroom discourse was found to be *mode-convergent* besides his typical and idiosyncratic practices.

Relying on the convergence, to satisfy the second research purpose, the correspondence between the teacher educator and the teacher learner questionnaire responses was calculated using SPSS software. With a focus on the respondents' perception of the educator's CIC, the correlational analysis results indicated the teacher learners' increased CIC awareness. The findings are subsequently reported. Moreover, the teacher educator's relevant interview responses were consulted to provide further validity evidence for the indices of his CIC.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Results

In response to the two research questions, the analyses of the data yielded the following results:

Firstly, the question of what interactional features externalized the teacher educator's contextualized *interaction awareness* yielded the taxonomy of interatures operationalizing his CIC. Since the inteacture inventory was later incorporated into the questionnaires, the findings are presented in Tables 1-5 regarding their corresponding questionnaire items.

For *effective eliciting*, the teacher educator used a range of micro-contexts, but almost always switched to *classroom context* mode. The only interacture applied to all classroom contexts irrespective of the TEC content was revealed in the interview to be questioning basic SLT concepts. However, *effective eliciting* in the classroom context was mediated very frequently by TEC *materials* or only occasionally by the SLTE *skills and system* mode to elicit *cognitive* and/or *affective* responses. According to the educator, the elicitation contributed to the flow of input presentation and practice through the classroom interaction and was being shaped by it. Interestingly, on occasions, the interacture elicited *reflection* on the SLTE content, rather than simply some language content, and the teacher learners' responses—whether reflective, otherwise cognitive, or affective—provided significant space through classroom interaction towards the pedagogic SLTE goals. In this vein, multi-modal elicitation served multiple purposes simultaneously. Nevertheless, the educator's eliciting seemed potentially *effective* because his discourse and the purpose were congruent hence his mode choice was likely to facilitate learning of teaching.

Among the interactional features characterizing the teacher educator's eliciting, *questioning* was noteworthy. He used *referential* and *display* questions strategically for a variety of pedagogical goals. Occasionally, both question types commonly mediated teacher reflection. Questions which generated reflection in the teacher learners met this pedagogical goal; they, therefore, proved effective at times. At other times, however, reflection served another pedagogical purpose. Then reflection enhanced teacher learners' chances for noticing SLT concepts or key terminological form, negotiating feedback, or their (re-)conceptualization of SLT. More distinctively, while it was mainly *referential* questioning which served meaningful interaction, posing *display* questions interactively realized their potential although they have been traditionally criticized (van Lier, 2013) for eliciting contrived communication. Table 2 shows the major pedagogical goals that the teacher educator's questioning, as a sub-type of *effective*

eliciting, aimed to achieve. The interview data indicated that juxtaposition of display questions and a follow-up elicitation strategy like encouraging lip-reading and the frequency of display questioning were quite deliberate.

Table 1

Effective Eliciting Type-Mode Correspondence in Educator's Discourse

Item	Effective Eliciting Interactures	Mode			
		Managerial	Materials	Skills and System	Classroom Context
B1	The teacher asks questions which make us think about basic concepts we often take for granted.		*		×
B2	The questions the teacher asks give us hints and help us come up with answers without much teacher bias or preference.		*		*
B3	The teacher repeats the same question several times.			*	*
B4	The teacher provides answers to his own questions using a quiet voice so that we could read his lips attentively and get the answer with joy and a sense of achievement.		*	*	√
B5	The teacher asks questions about our personal/ educational life experience.		*		*
B7	The teacher asks questions whose answers he knows.		*		*
B22	The teacher encourages our active participation by waiting for us to provide answers to questions raised.		*		*
B23	The teacher encourages our active participation by asking more original questions whose answers he does not know.		*		*
B26	The teacher encourages our active participation as he emphasizes 'what' we mean, not 'how' we say what we mean.		*		*

Note. *= The co-researcher-educator's convergent ratings; ×= Divergent ratings indicating the co-researcher's opinion; √= Divergent ratings indicating the educator's opinion

Table 2

The Teacher Educator's Questioning as Effective Eliciting and the SLTE Pedagogical Goal

Questioning Type	Pedagogical Goal
Referential Questioning	to give the teacher learners space for self-expression
	to provide scaffolding for conceptualization of current SLT content
	to guide the teacher learners' unbiased conceptualization
	to allow the teaching candidates space to identify their teaching selves
Display Questioning	to encourage meaningful communication
	to direct the teacher learners' attention to the input
	to do confirmation check guiding own management of the activity/mode
	to provide scaffolding for the enunciation of SLT terminology
	to provide scaffolding for the manipulation of the new SLT concepts
	to evaluate the teacher learners' contribution guiding follow-up activities

Generally, *shaping learner contribution* in the teacher educator's classroom talk involved an interaction between *classroom context*, *materials*, and *managerial* modes while *skills and system* mode was rarely run to this end. To enhance teacher learner contributions to the flow of classroom interaction, various *managerial* strategies were implemented to contextualize the TEC *materials*, in a condition whereby the educator's discourse appropriated the pedagogy to the content hence the teacher learners. Interestingly, the teacher educator's self-assertions through the interview supported viewing his discourse as an asset to distribute his managerial power among the class members though the class was mainly run in lecture mode. This demanded frequent inter-modal transition or simultaneous multi-modal discourse function with skillful manipulation of managerial mode.

To avoid maintenance of a single extended turn, which might have suppressed the teacher learner contribution, the teacher educator guided more interactive information exchange than what is customary in *managerial* mode. To this end, the interactive SLTE information exchange was *contextualized* by certain *managerial* interactional features. Therefore, interaction turn management was accomplished by the teacher educator's strategic *silence*. Accompanied by appropriate discourse markers, his silence, which encouraged teacher learner contribution, featured in: leaving the floor to volunteers to talk, inviting the more hesitant by an extended wait-time, promoting learner-constructed SLTE content, giving prominence to the SLTE content rather than the medium, appreciating the student teacher's repertoire of personal/SLT professional *skills and system* to be shared, and

seeking the mediation of *materials* triggering teacher learner thinking and talking. At times, however, the teacher educator held the floor outspokenly raising the teacher learners' awareness of interactional issues that were assumed to enable them to express themselves effectively. At other times, the educator guided learner contribution to SLT knowledge construction through skillful orchestration of meaningful classroom interaction which was mediated cognitively and/or affectively.

Table 3

Shaping Learner Contribution Type-Mode Correspondence in Educator's Discourse

Item	Shaping Learner Contribution Interactures	Mode			
		Managerial	Materials	Skills and System	Classroom Context
B6	The teacher asks original questions whose answers he does not know for he is anxious to get students' answers.	*	*		*
B8	The teacher gives importance to 'what' we mean in our comments and not the way they are said.	*	*		*
B9	The teacher waits some seconds to get answers to the questions raised in the class.	*	*		*
B10	The teacher gives us the chance to be the first one who starts talking.	*	*		*
B12	The teacher gives us the chance to share our opinions, scientific ideas, and experiences of life.		*		*
B20	The teacher encourages us to participate in the class activities and make contributions.	*	*		*
B21	The teacher encourages all of us to take turns in class discussions and not to be passive.	√	*		*
C33	The teacher directs students who are volunteers to take turns to talk.	*	*	*	*
C35	The teacher tries to repair communication problems having us correct ourselves or get help from other students before he attempts to correct them.	*	*		*

Note. *= The co-researcher-educator's convergent ratings; √= Divergent ratings indicating the educator's opinion

Facilitating interactional space focused on the learner in the teacher educator's classroom talk-in-interaction under scrutiny proved a highly variable, multi-modal feature of classroom interaction. To this end, the teacher educator's discourse acted in *managerial* mode mostly and always involved *classroom context* mode. This increased the likelihood of contextualizing the managerial actions and decisions as well as the corresponding SLT *skills and system* and/or the *materials* considerations. Mode integrity as such was maximal on two occasions which allocated two contrastive shares in the talk to the teacher educator: when the educator left the floor to the learners working in groups and when he held the floor appropriating the content to the learners. Nevertheless, in both cases the interactures denoted *Accountable Talk* (Michaels, O'Connor, Hall & Resnick, 2002, cited in Sohmer, Michaels, O'Connor, & Resnick, 2009, p. 106) in-interaction.

These instances of contextualized talk-in-interaction, among others, brought the teacher educator into relatively transitory SLTE acts to facilitate interaction and maintain the learning space. The choice of the TEC syllabus content and sequencing was among the more consistent action plans. In this regard, the *skills-and-system-oriented* materials and assignments were indispensable assets whose value depended mainly on their implementation in *managing* learning of interactive SLT via classroom discourse. Very often, the teacher educator used his own discourse as a *materials* resource which was constantly adapted in response to the on-going feedback from *classroom context* mode and simultaneous *managerial* screening. Therefore, the decisions to dramatize the content, and to change his voice quality were noteworthy attempts to adapt the cognitive load of the input, and enhance the learners' affective engagement with the multi-sensory, highly interactive input. The frequent shifts from monologic lecture mode to dialogic discussion with the student teachers, from expository monotone to outbreaks of humorous chunks or to the occasional assignment of group work were accountable. Through the change, individual teacher learners, despite their substantial differences, had a say to contribute to the SLTE content and pedagogy. Therefore, the occasions offered instances of multi-modal discourse effectiveness in the teacher educator's strategies to facilitate interactional space for the learners.

Table 4

Facilitating Interactional Space Focused on the Learner Type-Mode Correspondence in

Item	Facilitating Interactional Space Focused on the Learner Interactures	Mode		
		Managerial	Materials	Skills and System Classroom Context
B11	The teacher speaks in a way that makes it easy for us to understand and respond.		*	*
B13	The teacher gives us assignments to work on in groups/pairs and controls how well the group/pair is working.	*	*	*
B14	The teacher talks much of the class time, but we do not get bored or lose attention.	*		*
B15	The teacher follows a specific syllabus and fixed lesson plans during the course.		√	*
B16	The teacher spends some class time to solve a problem which troubles several students.	√	*	*
B18	The teacher may reject a planned group-work activity in favor of completing the task by individuals personally.	*	*	*
B19	The teacher respects the way each of us prefers to learn by not forcing a specific learning style.	√		*
B24	The teacher encourages our active participation as he accepts a variety of answers.	*	*	*
B25	The teacher encourages our active participation as he invites us to work and interact with each other in pairs or groups.	*		*
C28	The teacher plays with his voice to avoid monotony and impress the listeners.	*		*
C36	The teacher uses humor to create fun in the classroom as a relief to the class and prepares us for the remaining tough discussions.	*		*
C39	The teacher uses dramatization either played by himself or together with us to help us visualize the issues discussed in the class.	*	*	*
42	The teacher tries to simplify theoretical issues so as to adjust them to our knowledge level.	*	*	*

Educator's Discourse

Note. *= The co-researcher-educator's convergent ratings; √= Divergent ratings indicating the educator's opinion

The analysis of *facilitating interactional space focused on the teacher educator* showed that the most substantial mode realizing it was *managerial*. Unexceptionally, the managerial mode guided the teacher educator's *inter-modal* classroom talk-in-interaction and acted in the *meta-modal* meta-cognitive monitoring continuously shaping the learning space. Nevertheless, the *managerial* overarching concerns frequently addressed the requirements of *classroom context* mode even though the context was implicit in the statement of the interaction. In contrast, *materials* and *skill and systems* modes were equally distributed and immediately facilitated the creation of the learning space. Thereby the educator was an active agent and the dominant interaction partner.

To satisfy this role, the teacher educator deliberated types of interactional features including *verbal* and *visual* signs alternatively or in combination. In order to create the desired learning effect, for example, the teacher educator presented SLT issues verbally in *lecture* mode or decided to shift to *narrative* mode. On demand, however, he implemented visual strategies which were utilized to maximize the integrity of the message and contribute to its interactiveness. Noteworthy in the teacher educator's talk-in-interaction was also his language-aware manipulation of the components of the language system contributing to classroom discourse. Specifically, his lexical choices, thematization, and even his choice of the language medium of instruction could not have been haphazard.

In response to the second research question, the strength of the correspondence was calculated between the teacher educator's perception of the frequencies of the interactions he had implemented and the teacher learners' perceptions of these occurrences. To this end, using the data from the two questionnaire ranked scales in independent observations of the rather small respondent groups made the choice of Spearman's Rank Order Correlation (ρ) appropriate. As displayed in Table 6, the result of the analysis indicated that the Spearman correlation coefficient value was $\rho = 0.67$ ($n = 33$, $\rho < 0.01$). This showed a significant correspondence between the teacher educator and learners' awareness of CIC interactional strategy frequencies deployed in the teacher talk-in-interaction. The null hypothesis, therefore, was rejected.

Table 5

Facilitating Interactional Space Focused on the Teacher Type-Mode Correspondence in Educator's Discourse

Item	Facilitating Interactional Space Focused on the Teacher Interactures	Mode			
		Managerial	Materials	Skills and System	Classroom Context
B17	The teacher takes advantage of every opportunity to present issues.	*			*
C27	The teacher is aware of which words to use to express what he means most effectively.	*		*	*
C30	The teacher can organize what he means using appropriate transition/ discourse markers.	*		*	*
C31	The teacher puts emphasis on important parts or themes of his message by fronting them in sentences.	*		*	*
C32	The teacher uses gestures and facial expressions to help communicate what he means more clearly.	*		*	*
C34	The teacher listens carefully to us when we talk and provides appropriate comments to the speakers.	*	*		*
C37	The teacher narrates stories on his teaching experience.	*	*		
C38	The teacher relates class discussions to his personal life experience.	*	√		*
C40	The teacher considers what to write on the board, where, and how to clearly visualize relationships between the materials there.	*	*		
C41	The teacher prefers to use our mother tongue as the medium of instruction in the class.	*	*		*
C43	The teacher has his own teaching beliefs and tries to practice only what he strongly believes in his classes.	*			

Note. *= The co-researcher-educator's convergent ratings; √= Divergent ratings indicating the educator's opinion

Table 6

The Correspondence between the Educator and TEC Students' Awareness of CIC

		FISF LEARNER	FISF TEACHER
Spearman's rho	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.671 **
	FISFLEARNER		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	33	33
	Correlation Coefficient	.671**	1.000 0
	FISFTEACHER		
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	
N	33	33	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.2. Discussion

Addressing teacher awareness of classroom interaction, an issue understated in SLTE (Perkins, 2018), the researches initially portrayed a teacher educator's CIC awareness in his talk-in-interaction. This first step to teacher professional development (Walsh, 2013) entailed scrutinizing the *context* of SLTE (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). The exploration of the contextualized CIC awareness-raising deployed the SETT framework. SETT revealed the educator's interactures and the extent to which his classroom discourse was *mode-convergent* (Walsh, 2011).

The first research question, therefore, was aimed to explore the interactional features in the educator's talk-in-interaction and their (in)congruence with the SLTE pedagogic goals. The question presupposed coincidence of efficient learning with *classroom interactional competence* (Walsh, 2006). Derived from Soraya (2017), interactive SL learning is at the heart of classroom interaction and at the center of the curriculum. Therefore, developing interactional TLA *in* the interaction process (Walsh, 2011) required principled *integration* of SLTE content and pedagogy (Freeman, Orzulak, & Morrissey, 2009). This reflected the educator's awareness of such integrity *in* and *about* classroom discourse appropriation (Andrews & Lin, 2018).

In response, Johnson and Golombek's (2018) proposals justified the teacher educator's TEC classroom interactures. The interview data

supplemented the observational evidence for his awareness of the learner characteristics maximizing learning opportunities thereby (Walsh, 2013). This followed previous CIC teacher research suggestions for adjusting the modes, pedagogical goals, and the interactional features (Perkins, 2018; Sert, 2015). In theory, the educator's dynamic responsiveness followed the principle of *contingency* (Waring, 2016). A former contingency SETT analysis to characterize CIC in higher education SLT indicated the predominance of *material* and *managerial* modes in class lectures (Soraya, 2017) by frequent display questions and extended teacher turns. These were to improve the students' background for critical thinking and fluency rather than language skills or components. The maladjustment of the modes and features with the objectives lied in teachers' *unawareness* of the need to bridge students' limited interactional competence or in teachers' inadequate CIC. These findings stimulated the present reflective, micro-analytic SLTE research to raise interactional TLA (Sert, 2019) in theory and practice.

In this vein, Perkins (2018) previously tackled the interface between theory and practice of CIC and SLTE in a teacher development workshop for classroom interaction TLA. Qualitative evaluation of the workshop effectiveness revealed an increase in teachers' awareness of the concept and the significance of interaction appropriation. However, the interactional features used were occasionally inappropriate—the metalanguage was ambiguous and the discussion questions were complicated. The findings underlined interacture adaptation to facilitate teacher learner contributions into their awareness. Alternatively, in the present study, interactional manoeuvres beyond *interactive* questioning from a variety of CIC features mediated SLT metalanguage construction. These decisions could be justified in light of Johnson and Golombek's (2018) principles. Enacting his declarative and procedural interactional TLA, the teacher educator explicated the *means and* the ends to avoid the potential metalinguistic ambiguity and the procedural pedagogical confusion that challenged Perkins.

Among the mediational discourse strategies operationalizing the SLTE principles (Johnson & Golombek, 2018), the range of interactures indicated responsiveness to teacher CIC-awareness needs. The educator's interrogation through judicious referential and display questioning, and inquiry about the student teachers' personal and professional life were deliberate. Questioning externalized their everyday conceptions of classroom interaction and internalized the relevant academic concepts. Relying on mode affordances, the educator simplified complicated theoretical issues, and used dramatization, sense of humor, and changing voice quality for gradual scaffolding. Mediation via opinion negotiations, scientific conceptualization, and sharing life experiences further enabled expert scaffolding. Further inspection for the respective mode(s) characterized the educator's CIC

awareness raising strategies in-depth. The modal interacture features, though peculiar to the context of the TEC, were explicable within SETT (Walsh, 2013) and provided evidence for extending the framework.

Facing Walsh's (2013) prospects of combining modes, mode *integrity* commonly occurred in TEC discourse. Interestingly, the educator's talk-in-interaction was set in *classroom context* mode as the majority of the interactures represented each main CIC feature. The remaining interactures involved contextualization not exclusive to TEC. This approach to contextualizing *Accountable Talk* corresponded with the educator's social constructivist teaching methodology. Nevertheless, the *inter-modal* strength varied relative to the contribution of *classroom context* in discourse. Therefore, *simultaneous* mode functioning, rather than mode *switching*, using Walsh's terminology, functioned in the *effective eliciting* and *shaping learner contribution* plus *facilitating interactional space focused on the learner*. In contrast, *facilitating interactional space focused on the teacher* involved mode *side-sequencing* hence mode *switching*. Thereby *classroom context* mode played a subsidiary role while *managerial* mode in isolation or in combination with skills and system mode and/or material mode took precedence. This allowed the management of interactional space and TLA raising. Theoretically, management of multiple pedagogical purposes in a single turn reflected the principle of *complexity* (Waring, 2016).

Applying complexity enabled mediation of the space for learning which challenged previous research. While Soraya (2017) had warned SL teachers against undue predominance of *material* mode plus *managerial* mode in communicative classes at the expense of *skills and system* mode or *classroom context* mode, the TEC content *material* and *managerial* modes were given more balanced shares in respective interactures. Balanced mode distribution, in fact, worked against the problem with extended teacher turns (Soraya, 2017), which minimized the students' contributions. It also decreased metalinguistic complexity, reducing chances of dragging discussions, skipping learner confusion, or inappropriate display questioning, which concerned Perkins (2018). Actually, sensitivity to the teacher learners' CIC concerns directed working strategies and satisfied the principle of *competence* (Waring, 2016) which completed the triadic theorization of the SLTE pedagogical interaction.

To demonstrate the teacher learners' development of interactional LTA via the teacher educator's talk-in-interaction, following Johnson and Golombek (2018), the second research question was formulated. The probe focused on CIC proceduralization in SLTE classroom discourse. It extended McCarthy and Walsh's (2003) concern for SL teachers' classroom discourse as a resource for raising learners' discourse awareness. In response, a significant correspondence between the teacher educator and teacher

learners' awareness about the CIC strategies was sought. In theory, CIC resides in communication and attributes knowing, learning, and acting to the human owners of the knowledge, the agents of learning, and the actors in interaction. So within its interactive context, the present study represents *ecological* research (Given, 2008). Therefore, the congruence observed within the networks explaining *situated learning* provided validity evidence for CIC awareness that supported an "ecological theory of knowing" (2008, p. 239).

The teacher educator provided scaffolding "locally helpful understandings", to fulfil an indispensable SLT duty (Antonietta & Celani, cited in Gieve, S., & Miller, 2006, p. 225) i.e., the *appropriation* of learning (Leont'ev, 1981, cited in Walsh, 2006, p. 151). The process involved shaping consciousness by sharing content knowledge of interactional SLT and strategic professional knowledge with the learners towards interactive knowledge transformation (Sohmer, et al., 2009). Achieving this feat relied on the educator's *interactional awareness* and reflected the magic of his "*instructional idiolect*" (Walsh, 2006, p. 138). Beyond this *intrapersonal* dimension, however, the teacher's interactional awareness reached its *interpersonal* domain (van Lier, 2013), and raised the teacher learners' consciousness of the interplay between interactive classroom language, learning opportunities, and pedagogic purpose.

Interactional awareness varies in level among different teachers and on occasions, to Walsh (2011). Teachers vary in their ability to modify their role at different lesson stages, between a full-frontal role to a withdrawn position following the lesson agenda. The teacher educator's interactional awareness was reflected in attempts to facilitate interactional space, a major feature of CIC in the framework. It created interaction opportunities in which the *teacher* played a central role or those in which the *learner* was more prominent. Whatever the choice, its effectiveness according to Walsh (2006), was an index of teacher's personal and stylistic speech characteristics. This argument was supported with evidence of the educator's personal and conversation style qualities on the questionnaire, through the observation, and via the interview. Arguably, the teacher learners' heightened interactional TLA through exposure to the educator's accountable talk facilitated their professional development (Walsh, 2003).

5. Conclusion and Implications

This study applied *classroom interactional awareness* concept (Walsh, 2003) to SLTE. It primarily portrayed and theorized a teacher educator's dialogic and dialectic paths to the development of teacher learner CIC awareness. The study exploited the SETT framework (Walsh, 2006, 2013) credited in research on interaction-based reflective SLTE (Mann &

Walsh, 2017; Sert, 2019). Informed by Waring (2016), it evidenced local *contingency* in classroom discourse and the *competency* for managing the modal *complexity* of pedagogic interaction towards learning. Thus it acknowledged the integrity of professional content, language and pedagogy. The probe appreciated multifacets of the educator's interactive discourse shaping learning teaching (Sert, 2019). Further, the study addressed participants' declarative interactional TLA (Walsh, 2003) of the constructive pedagogical discourse practices. The observed consistency between the student teachers' declared awareness and the criterion set by the educator was illuminating. It indicated that the teacher's awareness of effective strategies could minimize chances for the discrepancy between teacher's intentions and learners' interpretations (Kumaradivelu, 2003) irrespective of pre-existing flaws in their language or content knowledge backgrounds.

In response to the need that Sert (2019) addressed to go *beyond* classroom interaction research findings, this sociocultural conceptualization of TLA attempted to transform the SLTE curriculum by promoting the educator role to the mediator of teacher development (Johnson & Golombek, 2018). Consequently, the probe raised practitioners' awareness of the classroom interaction contribution to learning. It also provided tools to integrate classroom interaction into teacher education and presented developmental evidence for the gradual change in interactional TLA. Arguably, this declarative TLA underlies further professional development towards proceduralized CIC awareness (Andrews & Lin, 2018). To Walsh (2006), the abstract teacher learners' declarative awareness could be gradually proceduralized into CIC skills for mediating SL learning. Additionally, following Sert, this micro-level interactional SLTE analysis offers the potential for future SLTE research synthesis combining insights from conversation analytic action research and teacher research, reflective practice, and teacher cognition.

However, several limitations to this study should be acknowledged. First, a major concern reflects its case study focus on a single teacher educator's talk-in-interaction in an SLTE context involving non-native English speakers. However, SETT may involve SLT educators and teachers working collaboratively tracing professional development. Therefore, this study can be replicated to reveal how teachers' co-construction of classroom discourse informs SLTE. Moreover, future research might identify and raise awareness of the more obtrusive mode *divergent* SLT(E) classroom discourse. Besides, deeper micro-analysis or macro-analysis of the interactive patterns and their gradual unfolding for PCK appropriation warrants consideration. Otherwise, future research may replicate the same procedures in alternative instructional environments. It is worthwhile to consider how differential interactional TLA characteristics concerning the

User, Analyst, and Teacher dimensions might have impacts on the choice of interactures, their interpretation, and acquisition in classroom interaction process, or as its outcome. Alternatively, future researchers may exploit more data triangulation to enhance research credibility and/or involve more participants to improve the validity of the correlational results. The findings will further illuminate the SLTE scene with the magic of *language-aware teacher educators'* discourse.

References

- Adger, C. T. (2001). Discourse in educational settings. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 503–517). USA: Blackwell.
- Andrews, S. J. (2007). *Teacher language awareness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andrews, S., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2018). Language awareness and teacher development. In P. Garrett & J. M. Cots (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language awareness* (pp. 57–74), NY, USA: Routledge.
- Andrews, S. J., & Svalberg, A. M-L. (2017). Teacher language awareness. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter & S. May (Eds.), *Language awareness and multilingualism* (pp. 219–231). New York: Springer.
- Ellis, V., Edwards, A., & Smagorinsky, P. (Eds.). (2010). *Cultural-historical perspectives in teacher education and development*. London:Routledge.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2009). The novice teacher experience. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 182–189). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freeman, D. (2018). Arguing for a knowledge-base in language teacher education, then (1998) and now (2018). *Language Teaching Research*. Online publication. doi: 10.1177/1362168818777534
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. (1998). Re-conceptualizing the knowledge-base of teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3), 397–417.
- Gieve, S., & Miller, I. K. (Eds.). (2006). *Understanding the language classroom*. Great Britain: Palgrave.
- Given, L. M. (Ed.). (2008). *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vols. 1–2). California: Sage.
- Glasgow, G. P. (2008, July). Teacher language awareness [Review of the book *Teacher language awareness*, by S. Andrews]. *ELT Journal*, 62(3), 322–324.
- Graves, K. (2009). The curriculum of second language teacher education. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp.115–124). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for teaching*.

New Heaven: Yale University Press.

- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). *Language teacher education for a global society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing*. New York: Routledge.
- Li, L. (2015). *Social interaction and teacher cognition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lindahl, K. M. (2016). Teacher language awareness among pre-service K-12 educators of English language learners. In J. Crandall & M. Christison (Eds.) *Teacher education and professional development in TESOL: Global perspectives*. (pp. 127–140). New York: Routledge.
- Jackson, D. O., & Cho, M. (2016). Language teacher noticing: A socio-cognitive window on classroom realities. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(1), 29–46.
- Jarvis, J., & Robinson, M. (1997). Analyzing educational discourse: An exploratory study of teacher response and support to pupils' learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(2), 212–228.
- Jenks, C. J., & Seedhouse, P. (Eds.). (2015). *International perspectives on ELT classroom interaction*. UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, K. E. (2015). Reclaiming the relevance of L2 teacher education. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(3), 515–528.
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (Eds.). (2011). *Research on second language teacher education: Sociocultural perspective on professional development*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2016). *Mindful L2 teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on cultivating teachers' professional development*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2018). Informing and transforming language teacher education pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 1–12. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818777539>
- Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2017). *Reflective practice in English language teaching: Research-based principles and practices*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Markee, N. (Ed.). (2015). *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction*. UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- McCarthy, M., & Walsh, S. (2003). Discourse. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Practical English language teaching* (pp. 173–195). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Perkins, L. (2018). *Developing classroom interactional competence through a teacher development workshop* (Unpublished master's thesis). King's College, London, UK.

- Seedhouse, P. (1997). The case of the missing “no”: The relationship between pedagogy and interaction, *Language Learning*, 47(3), 547–583.
- Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: 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. 216–236). New York: Routledge.
- Sohmer, R., Michaels, S., O’Connor, M. C., & Resnick, L. (2009). Guided construction of knowledge in the classroom: The troika of talk, tasks and tools. In B. Schwarz, T. Dreyfus & R. Hershkowitz (Eds.), *Transformation of knowledge through classroom interaction* (pp. 105–129). London: Routledge.
- Soraya. (2017). Classroom interactional competence of English classes in higher education. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 158, 628–638. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2991/iccte-17.2017.15>
- Thorne, S. L., & Hellermann, J. (2015). Sociocultural approaches to expert-novice relationships in second language interaction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The Handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 281–297). MA, USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- van Compernelle, R. A. (2015). *Interaction and second language development: A Vygotskian perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- van Lier, L. (2013). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2003). Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom through teacher self-evaluation, *Language Awareness*, 12(2), 124–42.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualizing classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 6(1), 1–14.
- Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Waring, H. Z. (2016). *Theorizing pedagogical interaction: Insights from conversation analysis*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Young, R. (2008). *Language and interaction: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

Appendices

Appendix 1: SETT Framework

Table 1. *SETT Framework Revised*

<i>Mode</i>	<i>Pedagogic goal</i>	<i>Interactional features</i>
Managerial	To transmit information	A single, extended teacher turn which uses explanations and/ instructions
	To organize the physical learning environment	The use of transition markers
	To refer learners to materials	The use of confirmation checks
	To introduce or conclude an activity	An absence of learner contributions
	To change from one mode of learning to another	
Materials	To provide input or practice around a piece of material	Predominance of IRF pattern
	To elicit response in relation to the material	Extensive use of display questions
	To check and display answers	Content-focused feedback
	To clarify when necessary	Corrective repair
Skills and Systems	To evaluate contributions	The use of scaffolding
	To enable learners to produce correct answers	Extended teacher turns
	To enable learners to manipulate new concepts	Display questions
	To provide corrective feedback	Teacher echo
	To provide learners with practice in sub-skills	Clarification requests
Classroom Context	To display correct answers	Form-focused feedback
	To enable learners to express themselves clearly	Extended learner turns
	To establish a context	Short teacher turns
	To promote dialog and discussion	Minimal repair
		Corrective feedback
	Referential questions	
	Scaffolding	
	Clarification requests	

Source: Walsh, S. (2006, p. 94)

Bibliographic information of this paper for citing:

Zolghadri, M., Atai, M. R., & Babaii, E. (2019). Classroom interactional teacher language awareness: Expert talk contextualizing pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies*, 6(4), 1-29.