Exploring EFL Teachers' Classroom Interactional Awareness at the Tertiary Level

Dine Radia[1,*], Menezla Nadia[2],
[1] Djillali Liabes University, Sidi Belabess (Algeria),radia.dine@univ-sba.dz
[2]DjillaliLiabes University, Sidi Belabess (Algeria), nadia.menezla@univ-sba.

Abstract: Interaction is a vital construct in the social fabric of the classroom. The ability to instigate, maintain and foster such an endeavor is a necessity that researchers and practitioners are constantly seeking to promote. In this regard, developing a classroom interactional competence lies at the heart of fostering a dialogic pedagogy. The latter is a prerequisite in the learner-centered teaching/learning trend. Nevertheless, there have been scant studies that attempted to tackle the status quo of classroom interactional competence especially in the Algerian context on the grounds that classroom interactional competence is a byproduct of classroom ethos. Thus, the present research is attempt to shed light on classroom realms by investigating teachers' attitudes and practices regarding classroom interactional competence in the Algerian context. To this end, three teachers fromthe university of Dr. Moulay Tahar (Saida) constituted the research subjects. Accordingly, a qualitative approach was opted for: a/classroom observation in which data was analyzed according to Walsh's conversation analytical tool SETT (self-evaluation of teacher talk). Furthermore, a teachers' interview was conducted with the selected teachers for the sake of obtaining a deeper understanding of their schemata and attitudes regarding classroom interactional competence. Resultsshowed a discrepancy between teachers' professed attitudes and actual practices

Keywords: classroom interactional competence, Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk,Teacher based research. classroom ethos

*Corresponding author, e-mail:radia.dine@univ-sba.dz.

1- Introduction

Modern language paradigms have witnessed a major tendency towards communicative based teaching. The idea of form learners' who are not only able to communicate in the target language but to develop interactional awareness and competence was the leitmotif of today's research scope. Hence, foreign language teaching methods were oriented to meet this end and a focus from "what" to "how" to teach was placed at center of educational research. In this light, Many researchers (Malamah-Thomas,1987; Richards, 1990; Johnson,1992; Allwright & Bailey,1996; Tsui, 1996 ; Kumaravadivelu, 1999; Walsh, 2013) and socio-constructivist theorists drew attention to the interactive exchanges in the classroom on the premise that interaction lies at the heart of teaching , some even believe that that interaction that takes place *is* learning (Van Lier, 1988 qtd in Walsh, 2013,52). Furthermore, learning was considered as a social activity which is strongly influenced by involvement, engagement and participation (Walsh, 2013, 46).

To this end, teachers who are considered as a fundamental pillar in the teaching/learning process are required to acquire, develop and update their practices vis-à-vis the construct of classroom interaction. Hitherto, developing classroom interactional competence allow teachers' to be empowered, gain insights into their classrooms and promote dialogic, engaged and safe classroom environment in which learners are actively engaged in their learning process (Walsh, 2006, 52).

Notwithstanding, Literature reviews have indicated that there were limited studies on teachers' Classroom Interactional Competence especially at the tertiary level. In this regard, it is quintessential to delve into the dynamics of classroom interaction and shed light on teachers' attitudes and practices regarding their interactional competence.

Thus, the present research attempts to answer the following questions:

1. *To what extent are teachers aware of their interactional practices in their classrooms?*
2. *How is teachers' Classroom Interactional Competence manifested in their practices?*

In an attempt to answer the aforementioned research questions, the researcher has opted a qualitative research paradigm due to the exploratory/ descriptive nature of the study. Hence, the current study contributes to our knowledge by addressing four important issues:

     a. Investigating teachers' Classroom Interactional Competence by pinpointing teachers' attitudes and practices
     b. Shedding light on teachers' background knowledge and their practices to promote Classroom Interaction.
     c. Elucidating the construct of Classroom Interactional Competence as an integral component in Classroom ethos.
     d. Raising teachers' awareness about the importance of developing their Classroom Interactional Competence and its implications on the teaching/ learning process.

1.1- Classroom as a social context:

The classroom is a "place where more than two people gather together for the purpose of learning, with one having the role of the teacher" (Tsui, 1995, 01). It is a setting in which each of its participants has his assigned role, i.e, Firstly, the learners being a group of heterogeneous body culturally, psychologically, cognitively and socially brought together for the same purpose which is learning .Secondly, the teacher being the moderator, the guide or the instructional, pedagogical and social manager of the class. These interactants manage to create a social context in which they have certain social norms to respect and follow.

Accordingly, the EFL classroom is a dynamic social context which is similar to any "real world" context in which its participants exchange opinions, feelings, concerns and

information. Similarly, Hudgins et al (1981, 01): "the process of teaching should be thought of as a type of everyday social interaction, rather than a specialized type of human behavior".

Walsh argues that instead of seeing the classroom as a single context, Classroom is constituted of (plural) contexts (Walsh, 2006, 16). These contexts are co-constructed through the process of *talk-in-interaction* which are tied to pedagogical and institutional goals of a lesson.

1.2. Classroom Interaction:

The Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics defines Classroom Interaction as "*the patterns of verbal and non-verbal communication and the types of social relationships which occur within classrooms* "(Richards, 2001, 72). It is a sociolinguistic setting in which meaning making is co-constructed and co-produced by its main participants: The teacher, the learners. This dual process of meaning negotiation and meaning making is constructed through employing a variety of verbal and non-verbal cues. Admittedly, the joint nature of Classroom interaction lays the grounds for the process of teaching/learning to take place. Thus, "*Classroom interaction serves as an enabling function: its only purpose is to provide conditions for learning* "(Malamah-Thomas, 1987, 02).

Classroom Interaction encompasses a number of aspects which shapes and determines the quality of interaction between the participants. Be it teacher fronted classroom or learner centered, aspects of classroom interaction are part and parcel of any classroom setting. These aspects include Negotiation of meaning, feedback, Repair, Recast, questioning techniques, and Turn Taking System.

Before addressing the construct of Classroom Interactional Competence, we should first take a look at one of its basic theoretical roots; the term "Interactional Competence". The latter served as a basis for developing the concept of Classroom Interactional Competence.

1.3. Interactional Competence:

This term was first coined by Kramsch, she proposed Interactional Competence as a emancipating means for optimizing learners' foreign language education (Kramsch, 1986, 370).

Interactional Competence is defined as "a relationship between participants' employment of linguistic and interactional resources and the contexts in which they are employed" (Young, 2008 qtd in Young, 2011). This posits that Interactional competence entails the employment of linguistic and para-linguistic resources in a joint-enterprise milieu. In an attempt to expand the conceptualization of the term "Interactional Competence"; Markee (2008),Young (2001) proposed a set of features of Interactional Competence : These features include linguistic features such as grammar and vocabulary .Interactional aspects such as Turn taking and Repair nonverbal cues such as gaze as well as identity resources .

1.4. Classroom Interactional Competence and its main features:

   It was Steve Walsh (2006) who first coined the term "Classroom Interactional Competence" (CIC henceforth) as an attempt to conceptualize construct that is necessary in classroom life. Classroom Interactional competence is defined as "teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning' (Walsh, 2011, 158). It highlights the interplay between teachers' and learners' roles; their use of language and interactional artifacts in determining interaction. In addition, it assumes that these interactional skills foster communicative language classrooms and optimizes learning opportunities. This is done through "teachers' successful interactional management of pedagogical activities" (Sert, 2015, 54).

 As an attempt to provide a profound understanding of CIC, Walsh identified five features of Classroom interactional competence; they basically revolve around teachers' use of language and his /her interactional decision-making conducts. In fact, these interactional features become meaningful as long as they coincide with the pedagogical goal of the moment. This

means that they are either constructive or obstructive to the teaching/learning process. Sert (2015) summarized these features as follows:

a. Maximizing interactional space:

It means that teachers provide learners with extended interactional opportunities. This can be done by reducing teacher echo, increasing learners' turns and allowing learners planning time for "rehearsal" for their participation in order to "optimize their output"(Walsh, 2006, 132) and maximize the potential for learning opportunities.

b. Shaping learner contributions:

This is done through the employment different interactional strategies such as seeking clarification, scaffolding, modeling and repairing learners' input. This process is also called *"appropriation".*

c. Effective use of eliciting:

This is considered as an integral feature in the construct of CIC. The ability to "import" opportunities into the classroom (Thompson, 1997, as cited in Walsh, 2006, 137) allows learners to optimize their language negotiation skills .Put simply, when the teacher use interactional strategies such as comprehension checks and clarification questions ,they provide learners with the opportunity to manage interaction by themselves and gives them practice opportunities .

d. Instructional idiolect:

An instructional idiolect refers to the teacher's understanding of their individual speech behavior. That is, their style of speaking, their regional accent, their voice, their tone. They are determined by teacher's "personality and teaching style" (Walsh, 2011, 140). Teachers' instructional idiolect may have a positive or a negative impact on interactional construct of the classroom.

e. Interactional awareness:

Interactional awareness is a central idea in the construct of CIC. In the classroom context, it refers to "teachers' sensitivity to their role in a particular stage of a lesson" (Walsh, 2011, 142). This may include adjustments made by teachers according to the pedagogical mode. (i.e, mode switching). Also, the interactional decisions which are suitable to the instructional moment (knowing when to withdraw from a conversation and leaving extended space for learners). The interactional awareness is an optimal strategic feature that is supportive for both teachers' and learners' interactional exchanges.

1.5. The role of Classroom Interactional Competence in the EFL classroom

Needless to say, Classroom interaction plays an integral role in the EFL classroom. In fact, a large and growing body of literature focused on the impact of interaction on the acquisition and development of language.

Interaction is considered as a the basis for foreign language learning .In fact, it is through interaction that learners are "engaged both in enhancing their own communicative abilities and in socially constructing their identities through collaboration and negotiation" (Brown & Lee, 2015, 80) .In a similar view, Chaudron (1988,10) posits that *:" Interaction is viewed as significant because it is argued that only through interaction can the learners decompose the TL structures and derive meaning from classroom events.* That is to say, interaction allows for comprehensible input, interactional feedback, and opportunities for negotiation for meaning (Gass & Mackey, 2007).

This view is shared by Hedge (2000,13) who posits that: "interaction pushes learners to produce more accurate and appropriate language, which itself provide input for other students" .Therefore, Classroom Interactional Competence can be seen as a necessary component in classroom life .It is the "engine" of classroom pedagogy; effective classroom interaction establishes linguistic and interactional rules. Thus, it creates a hospitable learning environment that prompts learners to achieve better performance in the classroom.

In this light, Classroom Interactional Competence lays the ground for learning opportunities for learners. This allows space for practice in the target language. As a result, learners can be

"more motivated to engage in further communication, and they can reach a successful communication" (Ellis, 1991).

2- Method and Tools:

The exploratory nature of this research paper postulates an employment of a qualitative approach. Such an approach allows the researchers to gain a deeper understanding of the realms of classroom interaction by examining this phenomenon in its natural setting. Put simply, it is a suitable tool that is used "to capture the reality" of classroom interaction in the Algerian context by providing "snapshots" of real classroom interactive events.

In order to execute the adopted research paradigm, a naturalisticdata driven methodology was the suitable so as to reach the aims of the study. This is done by obtaining data from the classroom by selecting two qualitative research instruments.

Three teachers from the university of Dr. Moulay Tahar (Saida) constituted the sample population of the research. For reliability and validity purposes, teachers were chosen based on a random sampling approach. The selected teachers are two females and one male teacher. Their teaching experience ranges between 3 to 16 years of. They teach different courses: Oral expression, American Literature and Sociolinguistics.

The researchers have opted for a qualitative approach in which two research instruments were utilized:

a. **Classroom Observation**:

As a primary source of inquiry, Classroom observation allows the researchers to "capture" the realities of Classroom life. It is considered as an integral part in Classroom based research. It provides the researchers access to teachers" online decision making" practices (Walsh, 2013,59). Thus, the researchers have arranged two observational sessions with the selected teachers. Regarding the classroom observation sheet, The researchers have opted for

Walsh SETT (2006),i.e., *Self-Evaluation Teacher Talk* . The latter is based on conversation analytical framework. Within this framework, classroom context is comprised of "modes" .These modes "***encompass the interrelatedness of language use and teaching purpose"*** (Walsh, 2013,73).

Following this framework, there are four modes; each mode is related to specific interactional features such as Feedback, Repair and Questions in addition to pedagogic goals**.**Thus, the teachers were observed for a period of twice a week within a period of four weeks, mainly, between March 29th to April 30th 2018. It should be noted that the sessions of classroom observation were transcribed based on Gail Jefferson's transcription code**. (appendix a)**

- **Walsh's analytical framework (SETT):**

The SETT (Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk) is an analytical tool that was introduced by Steve Walsh in 2006. In his book "Investigating Classroom Discourse", Walsh (2006, 62) postulates that the SETT was designed as a means to "help teachers describe both classroom interaction and foster an understanding of interactional processes". Thus, this analytical too offers a "fine grained, up close, *adhoc* "understanding of the interactional structure of the classroom (Walsh, 2013, 69) .Since its introduction, the SETT framework has been used in a variety of educational settings such as initial education programmes (PGCE), INSET course for experienced teachers and several institutional settings (Hougham, 2015; Ghafarpour, 2016).

Walsh (2006,2011,2013) views classroom discourse as a series of complex micro contexts, each of these contexts is related to a specific pedagogic goal and their underlying interactional features. These micro-contexts are called '*modes*" In fact, these modes delineate the relationship between discourse and behavior. They are identified in term of turn taking and topic management patterns.

There are four main modes in the SETT framework (**appendix c**); each mode is aligned with aset of pedagogic goals and interactional features.

i.   Managerial mode:

It is the introductory mode of the instruction. Generally, its aim is to organize the physical conditions for learning to take place, transmit information and introduce or conclude an activity. Hence, the managerial mode is used to set "the tone "of learning and explain its organizational structure. Ideally speaking, it occurs at the beginning of the lesson or any new activity. The managerial mode can be characterized by long extended teacher turn and an absence of learner involvement. It also can be manifested in a number of interactional features such as the use of comprehension checks, the use of transitional markers and lack of learners' contribution.

ii.   Materials mode:

In this mode, the main pedagogic goal is "to provide language practice around a piece of material" (Walsh, 2013,74). This means that learners are presented with written or audiovisual materials as an **input** to elicit, check and evaluate learners' contributions. The materials mode is characterized by the predominance of a rigid IRF structure (Initiation-Response-Feedback); the use of scaffolding, display questions and corrective feedback are highly eminent features in this mode.

iii.   Skills and systems mode:

Practice and production are the main backdrops of the skills and systems mode. Basically, learners are provided with the necessary sub-skills to produce correct forms and manipulate the target language. Thus, the interactional features of this mode are manifested in the use of direct repair, display questions clarification requests as well as form focused feedback.

iv.   Classroom context mode:

The classroom context mode is an opportunity for learners to express themselves freely. In fact, one of its main pedagogic goals is to establish a context in which oral fluency is promoted. This mode marks the transition from teacher-centered interaction to a learner-centered one. The classroom context mode is characterized by extended learner turns, repair and content feedback as well as the use of referential questions to foster a fruitful classroom interaction.

b. Teachers' Interview:

Teachers' interview is a qualitative research instruments that assist the researchers in eliciting the research's subjects' attitudes, beliefs and viewpoints. It "**allows for a more in depth exploration of issues** "(Richards, 2001, 61).

In this light, the researchers have conducted an interview with three teachers whose educational background, teaching experience and teaching styles are different from one another.

Teachers' interview was set out to understand the attitudes and beliefs of teachers regarding their CIC. The questions were divided into two main sections: The first section is dedicated towards teachers' schemata about CIC. This allows the researchers to understand thecognitive background of teachers regarding the construct of CIC. One the other hand, The second section deals with teachers' application of CIC in their practices. In other words, how is teachers' CIC manifested in the classroom from the viewpoint of teachers? (**see appendix b**)

Table (1) : Research Design

Type of Study	Research Questions	Method used
Qualitati ve study	1.To what extent are teachers aware of their interactional practices in their classrooms?	Teachers' Interview
	2.How is teachers' Classroom Interactional Competence manifested in their practices?	Classroom Observation / conversation analytical framework (SETT)

3- Results and Discussion:
This section summarizes and discusses the main findings of the study;

1/ To what extent are teachers aware of their interactional practices in their classrooms?

3.1Teachers' interview:
The interview questions were compartmentalized into two sections: each section has its goal. Section one is concerned with collecting data regarding teachers' schemata and background information about Classroom interaction in general and CIC specifically. It is an attempt to understand teachers' theoretical knowledge and attitude regarding CIC in their practice

The second section is concerned with the application of CIC features in their classrooms. It is hypothesized that even if teachers didn't possess the adequate metalinguistic awareness of their interactional practices. Features of CIC might still be integrated in their pedagogical management of interaction. Therefore, the second section asks questions which are in line with the features of CIC as proposed by Walsh (2006).

- **Teachers' schemata about Classroom Interactional Competence:**

When asked about providing a definition for the term Classroom interaction, T1 concluded that Classroom Interaction is a debate made between different members of the classroom, teachers and their learners, between learners themselves or learners and materials. He defined the term from the viewpoint of creating an environment in which students contribute in the learning process. T2 views Classroom Interaction as a strategy that teachers use to encourage learners to engage in discussions, language practice and anything that enhances their learning. Similarly, T3 emphasizes on the fact that Classroom Interaction is "the most crucial "aspect in the teaching/learning process.

The second question dealt with the term Classroom Interactional Competence, answers revealed that T1 and T3 had little or no familiarity with this term. On the other hand, T2 defined it as the ability to create an atmosphere of learning that encourages students to participate

Regarding the interactive considerations that teachers take during the lesson: T1 contended that He/she does not take it into consideration. He prefers to spontaneously create an interactive learning environment by asking questions, reformulating answers and inviting others to give their opinions. T2 believes that the nature of the subject area is important in determining the interactive considerations that he/she opt for. Nevertheless, Classroom Interaction remains a fruitful and necessary to enhance students' four skills.

T1 believes that features that determine the dynamics of CI revolve around creating a competitive environment and participation. On the other hand, T2 contends that she focuses on learners' engagement in the process while taking account of their emotional intelligence. Additionally, T3 considers teacher's presence, interest and motivation as the founding pillars of CI dynamics.

- **Teachers' application of CIC in their interactive practices**

As for the strategies that teachers take to shape learners' contributions. T1 reports that he asks them critical questions, invite learners to reflect on their classmates' answers and give their own opinions. T2 and T3 agree on the fact that shaping learners' contribution is tied with the aims of the lesson. In other words, each lesson requires a certain space of leaners' contributions and thus these teachers use strategies accordingly.

All in all, what is observed from the answers of these teachers is that they have an idea about Classroom Interaction, in the sense that it revolves around participation, debate and urging students to take initiative. What is apparent here though, is the lack of Classroom Interactional Competence strategies. (repair, recasts, turn taking, time allotment) were not mentioned. these are critical features that determine CIC.

2/How is teachers' Classroom Interactional Competence manifested in their practices?

3.2Classroom Observation:
Teacher 01:

The module under observation was "Sociolinguistics" and the topic of this session was "intercultural communication". The teacher was a male teacher; he has five years of teaching experience. He started the lesson by asking student to tell the class a joke. At first; students were hesitant to initiate the interaction. He initiated the interaction by telling them a joke first for the purpose of inciting them to participate. After that, students started discussing the meaning of the jokes and their cultural backgrounds .Furthermore, they tried to dissect the reasons underlying the intercultural differences in languages .Throughout the course, the teacher managed to maintain the flow of the interaction by using interactional techniques such as comprehension checks, requests for repair and employing referential questions. Nevertheless, the teacher's intent of maintaining the interaction granted him a larger interactional space. Hemonopolized turn allocation system and as a consequence learners' interactional initiations were sparse.

Here, it is clear that the teacher has employed the managerial mode in which the pedagogical goal was to introduce the activity. It usually applied by teachers to help learners "*find their place" (*Walsh, 2013,75).

As the lesson progresses, the application of the Materials mode and Skills and Systems mode was dominant in a disproportionate distribution. In fact, the teacher attempted to elicit responses from learners, clarify ambiguities. When communication breakdowns occur, the teacher reframed his questions. This generated more participation and engagement in the lesson. Extract 1.1 clearly illustrates the accomplishment of these two modes (Materials, Skills and Systems)

Extract 1.1
```
T: Can↑ anyone tell us↓ what↑ Doesyou:r friend means by CULTURAL gap?↓
L1: erm (0.3) he means↑ that erm (0.2) there is a difference between> for example<
Chinese people and arab people ···
                                                    [yes ?]
T: in what sense ↑ ?
L1:    (1.0)
T: I mean (0.1) what are↑ these differences that exist between Chinese and
Arabpeople ?=
 L1: hhh. Like erm  ingreeting people↑. >for example< the chinese people for exa:
:mple, doesn't.

L3: [don't]
    (0.3) don' t ta↑ke>as much time as< we do erm arabic↑ arab↑ peopletake a LOT of
time
L2 :                                    [Algerian people to be exact]
((laughter))
T :$ok  good$ .now let's ↑move to the Main aspects of intercultural
```
communication↓

As for the fourth mode; Classroom context. The teacher avoided form focused repair, he also refrained from applying negative feedback.

Teacher 02:

Regarding this Class. The teacher under observation was a female in her mid-thirties. She has been teaching Oral Expression for three years. The main topic was centered upon "popular English proverbs". The learners were provided with handouts in which a number of proverbs were listed. The learner had to guess their meaning and discuss them.

Ideally speaking, the module of Oral expression is the suitable opportunity for learners to interact and express themselves. Its main purpose revolves around fostering learners' communicative and interactional competence. Teachers' contributions should be limited and more interactional space should be provided to the learners. Nevertheless, sessions of Classroom observations revealed that the amount of Teacher Talk dominated Classroom discourse. In fact, teachers followed a rigid IRF structure (Initiation-Response-Feedback) in managing interaction with learners. The teacher tended interrupt learner's contributions and employ content-focused feedback for every learner's turn. In addition, Data shows the teacher's over use of display questions and teacher echo. As for learners'-initiated discourse; learners had a reluctant attitude regarding their contribution. They were hesitant to express themselves and to initiate discussion. Their wavering contributions revolved around clarification checks and comprehensions requests. Put simply, the interactional climate of the class was characterized by pure teacher monopoly of talk.

Following Walsh SETT (2006) framework, the researchers may contend that this class was dominated by two main modes: mostly the Managerial mode and the Materials mode. As for Classroom context, interactional opportunities were little. Despite the teachers' attempt to promote dialogue and discussion, learners' responses did not reflect a "healthy" interactional environment.

Teacher03:

Concerning this class, the course of American Literature was delivered by a female teacher. She has sixteen years of teaching experience. The novel of "The Great Gatsby "was the main topic tackled during this session.

She started the lesson by showing them clips from the movie adaptation of the novel. It was clear that learners were significantly motivated to discuss the content of the novel. Here, the Managerial mode was apparent at this level: the teacher organized the physical learning environment, introduced the lesson and referred to materials by employing a number of interactional features, she also stimulated learners' motivation by the provision of videos as

a psychological inciter of learner's engagement and involvement. Secondly, the Materials mode is also prominent; the teacher's pedagogical goals were aligned with the interactional features employed (the use of scaffolding, confirmation checks, referential questions and Clarification requests).

What is evident in this data is that all teachers have attempted to create learning opportunities. The difference between them lies in the extent to which pedagogical goals and interactional features are aligned. That is to say, the more these two components are aligned the more likely it is to create learning opportunities. For the first and the second teacher, their attempt to create learning opportunities had a counter effect on learners' contributions. Their overuse of feedback and repair obstructed the interactional "space "of the learners. According to these teachers, the overuse of these strategies is ascribed to learner's low level of motivation, autonomy in addition to their anxiety to speak publicly (participation was considered as a face-threatening act). Here, the researchers argue that it is due to teachers' overly use of form focused feedback was one of the primary reasons of learners' reluctance to participate. That said, it is evident that teachers lack awareness of Classroom Interactional Competence as a construct in the interactional architecture of the classroom (Seedhouse 2004). The sessions of Classroom Observation are illustrated in the following table:

Table (2): Table of classroom observation sessions

Teacher	Teacher01	Teacher02	Teacher03	Teacher01	Teacher02	Teachers03
Modes / Sessions		Session 01			Session 02	
Managerial	✓	✓		✓		✓
Materials	✓	✓				✓
Skills and Systems	✓			✓		
Classroom Context						✓

4- Conclusion

In conclusion, teachers' attitudes and practices regarding their Classroom Interactional Competence revealed a pedagogical dichotomy. Teachers had a positive attitude towards Classroom Interaction. However, most of their practices showed that they tended to dominate the classroom talk and they monopolize interaction. In addition, they had no theoretical background on how to evaluate and measure their Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC). This is apparent in teachers' plea to have a training regarding monitoring and evaluating their CIC systematically in order to have a solid and clear outlook on their interactive decision-makingpractices.

References and Referrals :

Allwright, R. and K. Bailey (1991). *Focus on the Language Classrooms: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. D & Lee, H.(2015). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* 4ed. Pearson Education ESL .

Ellis, R.(1991). *Second language acquisition and langage pedagogy.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ghafarpour,H. (2016). Classroom Conversation Analysis and Critical Reflective Practice: Self-evaluation of Teacher Talk Framework in Focus. *RELC Journal .*1-16.

Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2007). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. Vanpatten, & J. Williams (Eds.), Theories in second language acquisition. London: LEA. 175-200.

Hougham. G.C (2015).*Action Research: Supportive Teacher Talk And Interactional Strategies In An Elementary School Efl Teaching Context In Japan.*University of Birmingham, Edgbaston: United Kingdom.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation..* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 13-31

Johnson, K (1992). *The instructional decisions of pre-service ESL teachers; new directions for teacher preparation programmes'*in J.Flowerdew, M.Brock , Perspectives on Second Language Teacher Education, Hong kong:City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.

Kramsch, S. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *Modern Language Journal.* 70(4). 366-72.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly* 33. 84-453.

Malamah-Thomas, A. (1987). *Classroom Interaction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J (1990). *Second Language Teacher Education.* Cambridge: Cambdrige University Press.

Richards, J. C.(2001). Curriuclum Development in Language Teahing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sert, O (2015). *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Tsui, A. (1995), 'Introducing Classroom Interaction', London: Penguin English

Van Lier, L. (1988). *The Classroom and the Language Learner.* London: Longman.

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

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse; Language in Action.* London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising Classroom Interactional Competence. Novitas-ROYAL *.Reasearch on Youth and Language.* 6(1). 1-14.

<http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_6_1/Walsh.pdf> (last accessed April, 30[th]2018).

Walsh, S. (2013). C*lassroom Discourse and Teacher Development.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Appendix of Tables and Figures:

APPENDIX A

Table (3) : JEFFERSONIAN TRANSCRIPTION NOTATION

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

Jeffersonian Transcription Notation is described in G. Jefferson, "Transcription Notation," in J. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Interaction*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

APPENDIX B

Teachers' Interview

> ➢ **Section one: Teachers' schemata about CIC**

1. How would you define Classroom Interaction?

2. Are you familiar with the term Classroom Interactional Competence?

3. When planning your lessons do you take into consideration the interactive instances that may occur during the lesson and how?

4. According to you, what are the features that determine the dynamics of classroom interaction?

5. To what extent does a teacher's awareness of his conversational style would contribute in optimizing learning opportunities?

> ➢ **Section two: Teachers' application of CIC in their interactive practices**

1. In your opinion, what are the strategies that you take to shape learners' contributions?

2. How do you allow space for learners to interact?

3. Do you evaluate your Classroom Interactional Competence?

4. If yes how?

Appendix C:

Table (4): Walsh's revised SETT framework (2006, 94)

Mode	Pedagogic goals	Interactionalfeatures
Managerial	To transmit information To organize the physical learning environment To refer learners to materials To introduce or conclude an activity To change from one mode of learning to another	Single, extended teacher turn which uses explanations and/or instructions Use of transitional markers Use of confirmation checks Absence of learner contributions
Materials	To provide input or language practice around a piece of material To elicit responses in relation to the material To check and display answers To clarify when necessary	Predominance of IRF pattern Extensive use of display questions Form-focused feedback Corrective repair Use of scaffolding
Skills and Systems	To enable learners to produce correct forms To enable learners to manipulate the target language To provide corrective feedback To display correct answers To provide learners with practice in sub-skills	Use of direct repair Use of scaffolding Extended teacher turns Display questions Teacher echo Clarification requests Form-focused feedback
Classroom context	To enable learners to express themselves clearly To establish a context To promote dialogue and discussion	Extended learner turns Short teacher turns Minimal repair Content feedback Referential questions Scaffolding Clarification requests