



The logo for King's College London, featuring the text "KING'S" in a large, white, serif font, "College" in a smaller, white, italicized serif font, and "LONDON" in a large, white, serif font, all set against a red rectangular background. Two horizontal white lines are positioned below the word "LONDON".

**Developing Classroom Interactional Competence through a Teacher
Development Workshop**

Author: Lauren Perkins

King's College London

British Council ELT Master's Dissertation Awards 2018: Commendation

**Developing
Classroom Interactional Competence
through a Teacher Development
Workshop**

Abstract

This dissertation describes the process of developing and evaluating an in-service teacher development workshop, designed to raise teachers' awareness of the importance of classroom interaction. Research suggests that classroom interaction is central to the development of second language acquisition, yet there is a clear absence of the topic in teacher education. While there are numerous teacher development workshops focusing on classroom management and classroom language, there are very few on the topic of classroom *interaction*. This dissertation aims to address such a gap. By developing a workshop for in-service English language teachers, I endeavored to mediate between research and practice. I transformed the research on classroom interaction into a practical two-hour workshop for teachers, focusing particularly on Walsh's (2006) theory of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC). I piloted the workshop with a group of seven teachers and subsequently evaluated its effectiveness through a focus group, self-evaluation and video observation. The findings reveal that the workshop succeeded in making teachers more aware of classroom interactional processes and the effect they have on language learning. However, improvements to the workshop were suggested: metalanguage introduced to teachers should be less ambiguous and the discussion questions needed refining. Taking on board the proposed improvements, I conclude by recommending that the improved version of the workshop should be piloted a second time, before it is included as part of a teacher development programme.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	5
2	Literature Review	7
2.1	Classroom interaction	7
2.1.1	<i>Features of classroom interaction</i>	<i>7</i>
2.1.2	<i>Developing teachers' interactive strategies</i>	<i>10</i>
2.1.3	<i>Classroom interaction and context</i>	<i>11</i>
2.2	Classroom interaction and teacher development.....	13
2.2.1	<i>A gap between research and practice</i>	<i>13</i>
2.2.2	<i>Teacher guides and teacher training materials</i>	<i>13</i>
2.2.3	<i>Teacher education programmes.....</i>	<i>14</i>
2.3	Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC)	15
2.3.1	<i>Features of CIC.....</i>	<i>15</i>
2.3.2	<i>CIC and teacher development.....</i>	<i>17</i>
3	Methodology.....	18
3.1	Research approach and design	18
3.1.1	<i>Research approach.....</i>	<i>18</i>
3.1.2	<i>Research design</i>	<i>19</i>
3.2	Developing the workshop	20
3.2.1	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>20</i>
3.2.2	<i>Selection of workshop content.....</i>	<i>21</i>
3.2.3	<i>Selection of instructional practices</i>	<i>24</i>
3.3	Piloting the workshop	27
3.3.1	<i>The participants</i>	<i>27</i>
3.3.2	<i>The setting</i>	<i>29</i>
3.4	Evaluating the workshop	30
3.4.1	<i>Data collection</i>	<i>30</i>
3.4.2	<i>Data analysis.....</i>	<i>34</i>
3.4.3	<i>Limitations and considerations</i>	<i>35</i>
4	Findings and Discussion	36
4.1	How effective is the workshop?.....	36
4.1.1	<i>Outcomes.....</i>	<i>36</i>
4.1.2	<i>Metalanguage</i>	<i>38</i>
4.1.3	<i>Classroom modes</i>	<i>39</i>
4.1.4	<i>Organisation and cohesion</i>	<i>41</i>
4.1.5	<i>Discussion.....</i>	<i>42</i>
4.2	How can the workshop be improved?.....	44
4.2.1	<i>Improvements to metalanguage</i>	<i>44</i>
4.2.2	<i>Improvements to discussion</i>	<i>45</i>
5	Conclusion	48
6	References.....	50
7	Appendices.....	57

Appendix A: SETT framework (Walsh 2006).....	57
Appendix B: Workshop participant book.....	59
Appendix C: Workshop trainer’s notes	67
Appendix D: Workshop PowerPoint slides	81
Appendix E: Recruitment email to participants.....	82
Appendix F: Ethical approval	83
Appendix G: Participant information sheet	84
Appendix H: Participant consent form	85
Appendix I: Focus Group (FG) transcript and video recording.....	86
Appendix J: Self-Evaluation (SE).....	98
Appendix K: Observation Notes (ON) and video of workshop	101
Appendix L: Email Feedback (EF)	107
Appendix M: Improved list of interactional features.....	110
Appendix N: Improved discussion questions	111

List of abbreviations used

AL & ELT	Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching
CELTA	Certificate in English Language Teaching for Adults
CertTESOL	Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
CIC	Classroom Interactional Competence
DELTA	Diploma in English Language Teaching for Adults
DipTESOL	Diploma in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
EAP	English for Academic Purposes
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
ESL	English as a Second Language
L1	First language
L2	Second language
MA	Master of Arts
SETT	Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk

1 Introduction

It is widely acknowledged that *interaction*, which occurs “when learners communicate with one another, or with their teacher” (Thornbury 2017:135), is particularly important in second language (L2) classrooms. This is largely due to the fact that in L2 classrooms, language is both the object of study and the medium for learning (Long 1983, Tsui 1995, Willis 1992). The relationship between interaction, language and learning has often been highlighted by classroom interaction researchers (e.g. Allwright 1984, van Lier 1988, Walsh 2006). Nunan (2004:8) emphasises that learners “learn to communicate by communicating”, supporting the idea behind sociocultural theory that “learning arises not *through* interaction but *in* interaction” (Ellis 2000:209). As a result of this relationship, processes of interaction have the potential to create or impede learning opportunities in the classroom. It could be argued that “interaction is the most important element in the curriculum” (van Lier 1996:5) and consequently, for a teacher, an understanding of classroom interaction is essential.

Teachers play a central role in classroom interaction. As Ellis and Shintani (2014:223) point out, “teachers need to realise that ultimately *all* teaching is interaction”. Although interaction is a co-operative effort between the teacher and learners (Tsui 1995), it is usually managed by the teacher. The teacher normally asks the questions, gives feedback, determines the topic of interaction, and decides who speaks to whom (Johnson 1995). As managers of classroom interaction, teachers are arguably managers of learning; through their language use, teachers are responsible for fostering learning in the classroom. Walsh (2006, 2011, 2013) suggests that teachers need an understanding of classroom interaction and proposes that teachers should develop “Classroom Interactional Competence” (CIC) (Walsh 2006:130) to maximise learning opportunities in the classroom.

However, language teachers are usually unaware of the importance of classroom interaction (Walsh and Li 2016:495). While there are numerous classroom-based research studies focusing on how classroom interaction affects language learning (e.g. Cullen 1998, Tsui 1996), there appears to be an absence of the topic in teacher education. Pre-service and in-service teacher education programmes (e.g. Cambridge CELTA and DELTA - UCLES 2017) train teachers in classroom

methodology and language awareness, yet pay little attention to the processes of classroom interaction (Walsh 2013). Teacher educators (e.g. Thornbury 1996) have conducted studies on training teachers how to use transcripts of classroom interaction to improve their teaching, yet it has been suggested that research is seldom read by practising teachers (Borg 2009, Macaro 2003, Thornbury 2017b). In other words, there is a significant gap between research and practice. This dissertation attempts to address this gap.

As a teacher educator, I was surprised that a focus on classroom interaction was largely absent from teacher education programmes. Having analysed my own classroom discourse for a previous assignment, I recognise the value of studying classroom interaction. I learned a considerable amount about my own teaching from transcribing and analysing a short extract of classroom discourse, and I believe teachers should be made aware that they can do the same and potentially improve their practice. This was the motivation for the topic of this dissertation.

With the aim of closing the gap between research and practice, I developed, piloted and evaluated a teacher development workshop on CIC. I assumed a mediating role and translated Walsh's (2006) theory of CIC into a practical 2-hour workshop for in-service English language teachers. I designed a workshop that aimed to raise awareness of classroom interactional processes, equip teachers with the tools to evaluate their classroom interaction and subsequently help them to develop their own CIC. I developed two research questions: "How effective is the workshop?" and "How can the workshop be improved?". To answer these questions, I piloted the workshop with a small group of teachers, collected data and subsequently evaluated the effectiveness of the workshop.

The following section discusses the existing literature on classroom interaction, teacher development and CIC. The third section describes the methodology used, detailing how the workshop was developed, piloted and evaluated. In the fourth section, I present the findings and discuss the effectiveness of the workshop and how the workshop can be improved. Finally, in the fifth section, I draw conclusions, recommending that an improved version of the workshop should be piloted for a second time.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Classroom interaction

2.1.1 *Features of classroom interaction*

Classroom interaction has been recorded, transcribed and analysed by many researchers over the past forty years (e.g. Cazden 1986, Mehan 1979, Tsui 1995, Walsh 2006). Some of this research has analysed the interaction of mainstream primary and secondary classrooms (e.g. Cazden 2001) and other research has focused more specifically on L2 classrooms (e.g. Tsui 1995). Although the motives behind the analysis of both types of classroom discourse differ (i.e. how interaction affects the learning of science, maths, language etc.), studies have revealed that most classroom interaction has “fairly predictable characteristics” (Ellis 1994:574). Research has mainly focused on the ways in which teachers maintain control over the interaction, ask questions, correct errors, and modify their speech in the classroom. Most studies have stemmed from the important work of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), who identified a three-part exchange structure which is typical of classroom interaction: Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF). In an IRF exchange, the teacher initiates the interaction with a question (I), a learner responds (R), and then the teacher gives feedback, or a follow-up (F), to that response. This structure “represents the most basic interactional sequence of classroom lessons” (Johnson 1995:27) and has been very influential in subsequent research on classroom interaction (Walsh and Li 2016).

It is evident from the IRF exchange that for every turn a learner takes, the teacher takes two turns. This led Chaudron (1988) to reason that teacher talk represents two-thirds of classroom discourse. Similarly, as the teacher is the one who initiates the exchanges, it is the teacher who controls the interaction (Cazden 1986).

Classroom interaction researchers frequently draw attention to the fact that teachers and learners have unequal roles; teachers control both the content and the structure of classroom communication (Johnson 1995). Although more recent research suggests that teachers and learners are increasingly moving away from IRF exchanges (e.g. Waring 2009), the structure still manifests itself in most classrooms. The teacher usually chooses the topic of discussion (Cazden 1986) and decides who

speaks to whom and when (Mehan 1979). Early research on classroom interaction focused on these patterns of control in the classroom.

Such control over the interaction, however, is thought to impede learning opportunities in the classroom. Teacher educators advocating a communicative approach to language teaching (e.g. Nunan 1987, Thornbury 1996) are often critical of IRF sequences in the classroom, claiming they restrict learners' contributions by positioning the teacher as the source of expertise (Hedge 2000). Slimani's (1989) research supports this criticism, reporting that when learners have control of a topic in the classroom, they are more likely to claim to have learned something. Additionally, Kumaravadivelu (1993:14) stresses the importance of learners being actively involved in the interaction and giving them the "freedom to initiate interaction, not just react and respond to what the teacher says" if they are to learn a second language. The IRF structure, however, usually puts the learner in the responding role during classroom interaction, and the teacher retains control by asking all the questions (Johnson 1995).

Question and answer routines dominate the interaction between teachers and learners. Early research showed that questions comprise 20-40% of classroom talk (Chaudron 1988), a figure that has since been supported by more recent research (Tsui 1995, Cook 2008). As questions are common in classroom interaction, several studies have focused on teachers' questioning techniques (e.g. Richards 1990, Thompson 1997). As well as looking at the form of the questions that teachers use (i.e. open/closed questions), most studies have categorised questions according to purpose: whether they are "display questions" that require learners to display their knowledge, or "referential questions", which are genuine questions to which the teacher does not have the answer (Long and Sato 1983). Referential questions are thought to promote extended learner responses and are more "meaningful" and "communicative" than display questions (Long and Sato 1983, Nunan 1987, Thornbury 1996). As Tsui (1995) notes, display questions "discourage students from trying to communicate their own ideas in the target language". Yet even though display questions are not real questions (as the teacher knows the answer to them already), they can be deemed appropriate for some stages of a lesson, depending on the teacher's purpose and pedagogic goal (Seedhouse 1996, Walsh 2006). Furthermore, as Thompson (1997:101) pointed out, it is "more useful to look at

whether the teacher *behaves* as if he or she knew the answer or not”, which highlights the importance of the “F” move in the IRF exchange.

The teacher’s feedback to a learner’s response in the “F” move usually indicates whether a question is genuine or not (Johnson 1995). The teacher could ask a referential question, but then might give feedback that is focused on form rather than meaning. Tsui (1995:30) comments on how teachers often ask display questions but “disguise them as referential questions”. To demonstrate the differences, literature on classroom interaction often presents two contrasting examples of IRF exchanges. For example, if the teacher asks “what’s the time?” and a learner responds “it’s ten o’clock”, the teacher might use the feedback move to say “oh ok, thanks”, or alternatively, “very good” (Johnson 1995:4). Tsui (1995:28) pointed out that the second response would be the feedback given to a disguised referential question and would not be normal in “social communication” outside of the classroom. Thompson (1997:103) also comments on this type of feedback: “If the teacher says simply ‘Good’, this is a clear sign that he or she is only listening to whether the learner’s answer is grammatically correct”. In other words, the teacher gives “form-focused feedback” instead of the more natural “content feedback” (Walsh 2006:67). Thompson (1997:105) argues that teachers should say “oh” rather than “good” to show interest in the learner’s response and focus on content rather than form.

As well as promoting learner participation in the classroom, Willis (1992) argues that a teacher’s feedback in the “F” move of the IRF structure has the greatest potential to influence learning. Long and Sato (1983) researched how teachers modify discourse by expanding on and questioning learner responses. Other studies have similarly identified modification strategies that teachers use to scaffold learner responses in feedback (e.g. Lynch 1996). More recently, Cullen (2002:117) argues “the importance of the F-move” after examining transcripts from secondary school language classrooms. He examined follow-ups in the transcripts and noticed how teachers clarified and built on ideas that learners expressed in their responses. Cullen identifies features of effective follow-up including: “Reformulation”, to repair a learner’s contribution without disrupting the flow of discourse, and “Elaboration”, to add to or extend a learner’s original response (Cullen 2002:124-5). Such features can be used to build on learners’ contributions and create a language-rich learning environment. Walsh (2006:44) describes these features as examples of “scaffolding”;

teachers use strategies of “reformulation, extension and modelling” to shape learner talk during feedback.

Error correction typically occurs in the F-move, and as van Lier observes, “apart from questioning, the activity which most characterizes language classrooms is correction of errors” (1988:276). Similar to questioning techniques, there have been many studies on corrective feedback (e.g. Lyster 1998, Markee 2000, Ohta 2001). Studies have found that recasts, utterances that rephrase a learner’s utterance “by changing one or more sentence components” (Long 1996), are not always noticed by learners and instead, it is suggested that a “prompt” (i.e. a request for clarification) might be a more effective way of repairing a learner’s contribution (Lyster and Ranta 1997, Pica 1988). Walsh (2006:10) distinguishes between direct and indirect repair, and supports Kasper’s (1986:39) comment that the choice of repair strategy should be dependent on the teacher’s pedagogic goal. This could mean that an error is corrected directly and overtly if the teacher is focusing on language and form, or less directly through reformulation if the teacher is focusing on the content of what the learner is saying.

2.1.2 Developing teachers’ interactive strategies

In addition to descriptive studies that analysed typical features of classroom interaction, studies in the 1990s (e.g. Kumaravadivelu 1993, Thornbury 1996, Tsui 1996) focused on helping teachers to develop effective interactive strategies, often promoting communicative teaching methodology (Walsh and Li 2016). Research involved teachers making audio or video recordings of their lessons, transcribing extracts, analysing features (usually using “criteria of communicativeness” - Cullen 1998:180), and then trying out new strategies to improve their practice. For example, Thornbury’s (1996) study made use of transcripts to raise trainee teachers’ awareness of communicativeness in their classroom interactions. This was done by identifying the presence or absence of “features of communicative classroom talk” such as referential questions, content feedback, wait-time and student-initiated interaction (ibid:279). Thornbury reports that the study resulted in increased communicativeness of the trainees’ teaching. In a similar study, Tsui (1996) asked teachers to record a lesson, identify one problem, devise strategies to overcome it (e.g. lengthening wait time, improving questioning strategies, content feedback etc.), try out the new strategies and then evaluate the process. Tsui concludes that to

improve practice, a greater awareness of such strategies is needed through the discussion of classroom recordings (1996:165).

Most classroom-based research that has focused on teacher development used transcripts of classroom interaction and a set criteria of features, which are considered “effective” or “communicative” (Nunan 1987). However, other studies (e.g. Cullen 1998, Walsh 2006) have used a “framework” to help teachers evaluate their own classroom interaction, from a more neutral perspective. Walsh (2006:110) argues that we should look beyond an IRF-type analysis and examine “longer stretches of discourse” to get a better understanding of classroom interaction, while taking into account the pedagogic goals of the lesson. Walsh’s (2006) work, upon which this dissertation is based, has made a significant contribution to research on classroom interaction. Walsh designed a framework called “SETT: self-evaluation of teacher talk” (2006:62) (Appendix A). The first step of the evaluation process involves teachers identifying different stages of the lesson, which he labeled “modes” (ibid:66). Each mode has a set of “interactional features” (e.g. display questions) aligned with certain pedagogic goals (e.g. to check and display answers) (ibid). Walsh (2006) suggests that teachers could use a modes analysis along with the SETT framework to analyse the appropriateness of the interactional features in relation to the modes of the lesson. Walsh’s study differs from previous ones (e.g. Thornbury 1996) as it acknowledges the importance of context in classroom interaction.

2.1.3 Classroom interaction and context

When analysing features of classroom interaction, educators and researchers (e.g. Kumaravadivelu 1993, Nunan 1987, Thornbury 1996) have tended to evaluate classroom interaction by comparing it to “genuine communication” outside the classroom (Kumaravadivelu 1993:12). In other words, they view the classroom context as a replication of the real-world context. However, other researchers (Johnson 1995, Seedhouse 1996) have argued that such a comparison is pointless; it is impossible to replicate genuine conversation in the classroom (Seedhouse 1996:21) and the classroom should be viewed as a context in its own right (Walsh 2002). Instead of looking at the “unnaturalness” of the IRF exchange (see, for example, Thornbury 1996), educators should look at the discourse and its relationship with the teachers’ pedagogic purpose (Walsh 2002). As Seedhouse

(1996:16) points out, classroom discourse is an “institutional variety of discourse, in which interactional elements correspond neatly to institutional goals”. Rather than viewing the classroom as one singular context, it should be viewed as a series of smaller contexts.

Walsh (2006) built on Seedhouse’s (1996, 2004) idea that there are different classroom micro-contexts with different pedagogical purposes. Walsh (2014:5) argues that an evaluation of classroom interaction is “highly context specific, not only to a particular class, but to a specific moment in the discourse”, and he identified four classroom modes (Walsh 2006:63). These modes were characterized by particular turn-taking patterns in classroom data analysed in a corpus (ibid). The four modes were labeled:

(1) Managerial mode

Main focus: the management of learning and setting up activities.

(2) Materials mode

Main focus: the use of a text, audio-recording, video or other materials.

(3) Skills and systems mode

Main focus: particular language items, vocabulary or specific skills.

(4) Classroom context mode

Main focus: eliciting opinions or ideas from learners.

(Walsh 2006:166)

Therefore, rather than stating that an IRF structure is unnatural, it could be argued that it is appropriate within a certain mode. Similarly, instead of asserting that teachers should ask more referential questions, this may only be relevant if the teacher is in classroom context mode. Through analysing longer extracts of classroom discourse, it is clear that as the focus of the lesson changes, patterns of interaction change too. Thus, depending on the teacher’s pedagogic goal, interactional features can either “construct or obstruct learning opportunity” (ibid:64).

2.2 Classroom interaction and teacher development

2.2.1 A gap between research and practice

Even though research has focused on how teachers can use strategies to manage classroom interaction more effectively (see 2.1.2), there appears to be a significant gap between this research and classroom practice. As Thornbury (2017b:1) points out, “teachers don’t read research”, usually due to a lack of time and accessibility (Borg 2009). Consequently, information regarding the importance of interaction and language learning is not likely to be communicated to practising teachers. Walsh (2013:19) points out that one of the biggest challenges is “how to make teachers more aware of the importance of an understanding of classroom interaction”. A possible solution to this problem is some kind of “mediation” between researchers and teachers (Thornbury 2017b:1). “Mediators”, such as teacher educators and materials writers, are needed to “translate research into its practical applications” (ibid). Yet a brief examination of teacher guides (e.g. Scrivener 2005), teacher training materials (e.g. Thaine 2010) and teacher education programme syllabi (e.g. Cambridge English 2015) reveals a paucity of content related to classroom interaction and how it affects language learning.

2.2.2 Teacher guides and teacher training materials

While teacher guides (e.g. Harmer 2007b, Scrivener 2005) include advice on how to organise and manage classroom interaction with whole chapters dedicated to “classroom management” (Scrivener 2005), there is a clear lack of reference to processes of classroom interaction. As Ellis and Shintani (2014:194) point out, “teacher guides pay little attention to how interaction facilitates (or sometimes impedes) language learning”. Although Harmer (2007b:38) does acknowledge that teachers should look at “TTQ (Teacher Talking Quality)” as well as TTT (Teacher Talking Time), he fails to consider exactly how teachers can develop their TTQ and what effect it would have on learning. Similarly, there is an evident gap in teacher training materials. Published materials for professional development workshops, such as Thaine (2010), focus on the topics of “Classroom management and teacher language” and “Providing feedback and correction techniques”, but once again there is no mention of the effect of classroom interaction on language learning. Thaine (2010:14) illustrates a conflict between the use of content-focused feedback and

language-focused feedback in a classroom transcript, yet there is no discussion of how the teacher could improve his/her language use. In the same way, trainers' manuals for pre-service courses (e.g. Anderson 2017, Thornbury and Watkins 2007) typically include input sessions on "Classroom management", which include the topics of "Classroom organisation" and "Grading language" (Thornbury and Watkins 2007:19), but contain nothing on interaction and language learning.

2.2.3 Teacher education programmes

The topic of classroom interaction is also absent from teacher education programmes. Walsh (2013:19) noted how "most teacher education programmes, either pre-service or in-service, pay very little attention to classroom interaction". Such programmes focus on classroom management and language use, but often suggest that "good teacher talk" means "little teacher talk" (Cullen 1998:179), and thus the focus is on quantity rather than quality of language use. Pre-service teacher education programmes, such as CELTA and Trinity CertTESOL, contain syllabus content including "Teacher and learner language". However, the descriptions of this content usually refer to helping teachers to "adjust their own use of language to the level of the class" and "give clear instructions" (Cambridge English 2015:11), rather than referring to the teacher's language use and opportunities for learning. Nevertheless, this could be due to the fact that teachers are usually inexperienced on pre-service courses and are thus provided with a basic "introduction" to topics such as classroom management (Thornbury and Watkins 2007:19).

However, in-service teacher education programmes such as DELTA and Trinity DipTESOL, which are designed for more experienced teachers, have a similar absence of classroom interaction in the syllabi. In Module 2 of the DELTA, for example, the syllabus states that the programme helps teachers to "manage and support learning with individuals and groups to maximise learning" (Cambridge English 2015b:7). However, this is referring to "appropriate graded language to ask relevant and effective questions, and to give clear instructions, explanations, demonstrations, feedback and guidance as needed" (ibid). Thus, once again, the main focus is on classroom management rather than how interaction can facilitate language learning. Similarly, the Trinity DipTESOL syllabus (Trinity College London 2005) mentions how "student interaction patterns" and "teacher talking time" should be "appropriate", yet there is no acknowledgement of the importance of interaction,

language and learning. Nevertheless, it could be argued that teacher educators have the option of including the topic of classroom interaction on programmes, regardless of whether the topic is listed in the syllabus. This highlights the teacher educator's role as a mediator; teacher educators have the power to inform teachers about the importance of classroom interaction themselves.

Ultimately, there needs to be more effective mediation between the research on classroom interaction and teaching practice. In addition to a language awareness strand and a classroom methodology strand, Walsh (2013:19) proposes that there should be a "third strand" on teacher education programmes that focuses on studying classroom interaction, with the aim of raising teachers' awareness of the centrality of interaction to teaching and learning. Walsh argues that teachers need to be provided with tools to analyse their own interaction and be encouraged to "engage in research which will ultimately benefit themselves and their learners" (2013:139). An explicit focus on interaction in teacher education programmes, he argues, would eventually help teachers gain "Classroom Interactional Competence" (Walsh 2006).

2.3 Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC)

2.3.1 Features of CIC

Walsh (2006, 2013) identifies classroom interaction as the missing strand in teacher education, and presents the notion of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC), defined as "teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning" (2013:46). The concept of CIC builds on ideas related to the centrality of interaction in language learning (see, for example, Allwright 1984, van Lier 1988) and focuses on the ways in which teachers' and learners' interactional decisions create learning opportunities in the classroom (Walsh 2013). In terms of teacher development, Walsh (2014:5-6) suggests that teachers need to acquire an understanding of CIC that is appropriate for their own context and he describes three features of CIC that he believes are common to all contexts: (1) Alignment of pedagogic goals and language use; (2) Creating space for learning; and (3) Shaping learner contributions in feedback. These features are now considered in turn.

Teachers demonstrate CIC through their ability to use language which is appropriate to both the classroom mode and the learners (Walsh 2006). For example, a teacher in “managerial mode” (ibid:66) might have the goal of introducing an activity and transmitting information to learners. The teacher’s language use might include an extended teacher turn and transitional markers. This would be an example of CIC, as language use and pedagogic goals are working together. If, however, at the same stage of the lesson, the teacher used a series of referential questions and extended learner turns, the pedagogic goals and language use would not be appropriately aligned, and therefore the teacher would not demonstrate CIC.

Another feature of CIC is the extent to which classroom discourse “facilitates interactional space” in the classroom (Walsh 2006:131). In other words, learners need space to participate in (and learn from) the interaction. This can be achieved by increasing wait-time, reducing teacher echo (i.e. the repetition a previous utterance or a learner’s contribution) and promoting extended learner turns (Walsh 2014:5). This space will maximise the potential for learning opportunities in the classroom. For example, in classroom context mode, when the teacher aims to elicit opinions from the learners, CIC would be demonstrated if there are lengthy pauses in the interaction (i.e. more than one second) after a teacher’s question, giving learners the chance to form opinions and express them in their own time. In contrast, if the teacher repeatedly fills silence in the classroom with unnecessary teacher echo, he/she would not demonstrate CIC (Walsh 2006:131).

A third feature of CIC, according to Walsh (2006:133), is the teacher’s ability to shape learner contributions by “seeking clarification, scaffolding, modelling or repairing learner input” and consequently “helping learners to say what they mean” (ibid:131). Walsh (2014:5) gives a useful description of this feature: “Shaping involves taking a learner response and doing something with it rather than simply accepting it”. For example, a learner’s response might be recast (Lyster 1998), or perhaps scaffolded to help the learner express what they want to say. As mentioned in 2.1.1, the feedback move has the potential to influence learning (Willis 1992). Walsh (2014:6) goes further and claims that “feedback is one of the most important interactional practices a teacher can master”. Rather than giving an evaluative comment during feedback (e.g. “good” or “right”), which might close down an interaction, Walsh (2014:6) argues that teachers should use more “subtle types of shaping” to help learners communicate and subsequently learn from the interaction.

2.3.2 *CIC and teacher development*

Walsh (2013:136) convincingly argues there is a “pressing need” for teacher education programmes to introduce the concept of CIC and provide teachers with the “tools, data and dialogue” to reflect on their own classroom practice. Walsh suggests that a workshop could be used to help teachers “gain an understanding of the relationship between language use, interaction and learning opportunity” (2006:169). Rather than using whole lesson transcripts, Walsh recommends that teachers are given a framework (e.g. Walsh’s 2006 SETT framework) to analyse short 10-minute lesson “snapshots” (Walsh 2013:138). Indeed, a workshop that raises awareness of the effects of classroom interaction on language learning is arguably essential on any teacher development programme. In the next section, I explain how I used Walsh’s (2006) SETT framework and concept of CIC in a teacher development workshop in an attempt to close the gap between research and practice, as described above.

3 Methodology

3.1 Research approach and design

3.1.1 Research approach

As a teacher educator, I set out to mediate between research and practice by developing, piloting and evaluating a 2-hour teacher development workshop based on Walsh's (2006) SETT framework and concept of CIC. After designing the materials, I trialled the workshop with a group of teachers and collected data about its effectiveness. The research could thus be considered a type of "program evaluation" (Kiely and Rea-Dickens 2005, Nunan 1992, Weir and Roberts 1994); I systematically collected and interpreted data about one aspect of a programme with the aim of improving practice. As I wanted to establish whether the workshop was suitable for in-service teachers, I conducted an "in-use evaluation" (McGrath 2002:190). This involved collecting data from the participants, the teacher educator and an observer during the workshop pilot.

Considering my role as both researcher and teacher educator, my research approach corresponds with a "teacher-led evaluation" (Kiely and Rea-Dickens 2005:246). Although the evaluation was not carried out with my own teacher-learners, it was carried out in a context similar to my own teaching/training context. My approach, therefore, has much in common with action research. As action research is "a form of self-reflective enquiry carried out by practitioners, aimed at solving problems, improving practice, or enhancing understanding" (Nunan 1992:229), I can be considered a "practitioner" (ibid) carrying out research to potentially improve teacher development programmes. Following Burns' (2009) interpretation, I identified a gap in my own context of work (i.e. the absence of the topic of classroom interaction in teacher education) and put into action "deliberate practical changes" (i.e. the workshop) to improve the situation, while systematically collecting and analysing data "to see if the intervention worked" (ibid:115). To investigate the success of the intervention, I developed the following two research questions:

1. How effective is the workshop?
2. How can the workshop be improved?

The research project was divided into three stages:

- (1) Developing the materials for the workshop
- (2) Piloting the workshop with a group of in-service teachers
- (3) Evaluating the effectiveness of the workshop.

In the next section, I briefly outline what happened in each of the above stages, before describing how the workshop was developed, piloted and evaluated in more detail.

3.1.2 Research design

A set of workshop materials was designed for in-service English teachers, who had either little or no knowledge of Walsh's (2006) concept of CIC. I based the materials on Walsh's (2006:66-7) SETT framework, as well as a video extract of classroom teaching (Harmer 2007). Referring to the literature on teacher education (e.g. Wallace 1991), I created the following materials: a "Participant book" (Appendix B), which was used as a handout by participants during the workshop; "Trainer's notes" (Appendix C), which includes a training plan and information about workshop activities; and a "PowerPoint presentation" (Appendix D).

I piloted the workshop with a group of in-service teachers. Although most action research is done in "the teacher's own classroom" (Richards and Schmidt 2013:8), for practical reasons, I was not able to pilot the workshop on my own group of teacher-learners. This was not a problem, however, as I did not develop the workshop materials for one particular group of teacher-learners. Instead, I designed the workshop for "institution-wide use" (McGrath 2002:190), for use with in-service teachers on a teacher development programme. The participants were students on the MA in Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching (MA in AL & ELT) programme at a UK university. They were suitable participants for the pilot as they were all studying on an in-service teacher development programme at the time and were all practising teachers.

To answer the research questions about the effectiveness of the workshop and how it could be improved, I needed to conduct a "formative" or "development-oriented" evaluation of the workshop (Weir and Roberts 1994:8). I wanted to evaluate the

workshop's effectiveness and improve its "educational quality" (ibid:7) by finding out how the workshop materials could influence the classroom practice of the participants (Tomlinson 2011). Rather than evaluating the workshop materials "pre-use", I decided to conduct a "retrospective evaluation" (Ellis 1997:37) to get information about the actual outcomes of the workshop. As I needed a flexible research approach that would allow me to explore emergent themes that arose from the workshop pilot, I selected methods associated with qualitative research (Dornyei 2007:37). I chose two "non-observational methods" (Burns 2009:117): a focus group and a self-evaluation. These methods allowed me to assess the workshop from the perspectives of both the participants and the teacher educator (myself) respectively. I also opted to use one "observational method" (ibid) of a video observation. By collecting data in three different ways, I triangulated the methods to strengthen the credibility of the research (Burns 2009, van Lier 1988). This triangulation arguably provides a more reliable evaluation of the workshop, especially, as McGrath (2002) points out, when the teacher/teacher educator is also the workshop designer. In the next section, I explain how the workshop was developed in more detail and describe the principles followed in the design of the materials.

3.2 Developing the workshop

3.2.1 Purpose

The workshop had both "awareness-raising" and "skills-development" purposes (Clarke 2017); it aimed to raise participants' awareness of classroom interactional processes as well as equip them with the tools to analyse their own CIC. The following learning outcomes were outlined in the Trainer's notes (Appendix C:1):

By the end of the workshop, participants will be:

- more aware of classroom interactional processes and the effect they have on language learning.
- able to analyse classroom data using metalanguage in Walsh's (2006) SETT framework.
- able to describe features of Walsh's (2006) concept of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC).
- motivated to analyse and evaluate their own classroom interaction.

With these purposes and learning outcomes in mind, I selected the *content* and *instructional practices* of the workshop (Graves 2009). (For reference, see Appendix B for the Participant book and Appendix C for the Trainer's notes).

3.2.2 Selection of workshop content

In his proposal for the inclusion of a "third strand" on teacher education programmes, Walsh (2013:136) suggests that in an initial workshop on classroom interaction, teachers should be given guidance on collecting and using class-based data. Walsh proposes that teacher education programmes should give teachers "tools" to collect, analyse and reflect on data themselves, and raise teachers' awareness of the importance of classroom interaction through analysis of "classroom data" (ibid). Taking these ideas into consideration, I selected the *tools* and *classroom data* for the workshop.

3.2.2.1 Tools

I chose Walsh's (2006:67) SETT framework (Appendix A) as the main tool to be introduced to workshop participants. I decided on using SETT over other frameworks (see 2.1) primarily because it was specifically designed to be used by L2 teachers (Walsh 2013), rather than by researchers. Walsh suggests that the framework should be included as "part of a teacher development process" (ibid:86) and used as a tool to enable teachers to become researchers of their own practice (ibid:136). As I was designing the workshop for in-service (rather than pre-service) teachers, with the aim of encouraging participants to analyse their own classroom interaction, the SETT framework seemed an appropriate instrument. Furthermore, as prospective workshop participants teach in different L2 classroom contexts (i.e. language school, state school, university etc.), the SETT framework could be adapted accordingly. Walsh (2013:86) explains that the framework is an "ad-hoc instrument", designed with the intention that it should be "modified to suit a particular context". I considered it an appropriate tool for workshop participants, who could adapt it for their specific needs.

Another reason for using SETT is related to the metalanguage (i.e. managerial mode, display question etc.) that is introduced to teachers via the framework.

Wallace (1991:78) acknowledges the importance of giving teachers “the provision of metalanguage” to discuss aspects of their classroom teaching in appropriate detail. The SETT framework has advantages over other frameworks in this respect as it includes descriptions of “classroom modes” (Appendix A). I evaluated my own classroom discourse using the SETT framework for a previous MA assignment and found the descriptions of the modes particularly helpful. As classroom interaction is context-dependent (see 2.1.3), the identification of modes is essential in an evaluation of CIC. I also found the metalanguage useful for describing various interactional processes. Unlike other frameworks (e.g. Cullen 1998), the SETT framework includes interactional features such as “scaffolding” and “seeking clarification”, which are also features of CIC and are thus crucial for analysing classroom interaction.

I also chose to introduce workshop participants to the use of transcripts (Appendix C:12). Despite Walsh’s (2006b:137) claim that the SETT framework “eliminates the need” for transcription (as SETT can be used as an ad-hoc coding system while listening to a lesson recording), I still consider transcripts a valuable tool for data collection and analysis. Even though transcription is a “time-consuming process” (Wallace 1991:64), it is an incredibly useful tool for data analysis (Ellis 1990). From my own experience of analysing classroom discourse, some interactional processes are only observable in a transcript. Some features (e.g. teacher echo / reformulation) are more noticeable in a transcript than they would be in a recording. Also, as noted in 2.1.2, many educators and researchers have used transcripts to analyse classroom interaction (e.g. Johnson 1995, Thornbury 1996, Cullen 2000). As Thornbury (1996:281) demonstrated in his research project, transcripts are an effective and practical “training tool”, which can be integrated into teacher development programmes. Furthermore, Wallace (1991) highlights the accessibility of transcripts as “it is usually easier to make a detailed analysis of a transcript than from an electronic (audio or video) recording” (ibid:64). It is for these reasons that I included transcripts in the workshop and encouraged participants to use transcription in their own analysis of classroom interaction.

To accompany the SETT framework and transcripts, I decided to include Walsh’s (2014:5-6) description of features of CIC (see 2.1.3) to aid teachers in their evaluation of classroom interaction. Walsh’s (2014) article changed the way I viewed classroom interaction and language learning. At the time, I was not accustomed to

reading research or theories about language teaching, but the article was clear and comprehensible, and it motivated me to study my own classroom interaction and evaluate my own CIC. I wanted the content of the workshop to be equally accessible to teachers who might not be familiar with research articles on language teaching theory. I therefore included excerpts that describe the three features of CIC (ibid) in the workshop (see Appendix C:14).

3.2.2.2 *Classroom data*

I needed to include actual classroom data in the workshop to raise teachers' awareness of interactional processes. While Walsh's (2006:113) study involved participants "using their own data" to sensitise them to the effects of classroom interactional processes, I considered it inappropriate to use teachers' own classroom data in an initial awareness-raising workshop. Analysing participants' data in front of other participants would be too intimidating, and perhaps too subjective. Instead, I decided that participants should analyse their own data *after* the workshop, as part of the action plan and follow-up task (Appendix B:7). During the workshop itself, classroom data was obtained from video-recorded material, an idea suggested by many teacher educators (e.g. Ellis 1990, Wallace 1991). Walsh (2013:129) recommended using videos from the International House series (Carr 2006), but after watching several lessons from the series, I decided they were outdated, having been recorded in the 1990s. Instead, I selected a lesson extract from Harmer's (2007) DVD.

Ellis (1990:28) advised that video-recordings should be made in the classroom contexts in which the student-teachers teach. With this in mind, I chose the extract of "Laura's lesson" (Harmer 2007: DVD) as it was a General English class with multi-lingual learners, filmed in a language school, a context familiar to most prospective workshop participants. Additionally, it includes clear lesson extracts involving both the teacher and the students, which means that teacher-student interaction can be analysed. "Laura" is an example of a teacher who demonstrates CIC, so participants would have a model of good practice. Also, by using a recorded lesson extract in the workshop, I could simulate the reflective processes that teachers would have to go through with their own recordings after the workshop (i.e. listen/watch and identify the modes etc.). Consequently, participants could practice analysing the class-based data in the video before studying their own recorded data.

As well as using the video for examples of classroom data, I also created two artificial transcripts of classroom interaction (Appendix B:1): one transcript that illustrates CIC and one that does not. Rather than choosing authentic extracts of classroom data to exemplify how teachers interact competently (or incompetently) with their learners (see, for example, Thornbury 1996), I decided to create the examples myself to make the differences between the extracts more apparent. I aimed to show participants how two classroom exchanges that begin in the same way can go in different directions depending on how the teacher responds to learners. If I included two authentic examples, the contrast would not be so obvious as the context would be different. Together with the video, the transcripts would provide participants with enough classroom data to analyse and would subsequently raise their awareness of various classroom interactional processes.

3.2.3 Selection of instructional practices

I consulted the literature on second language teacher development (e.g. Burns and Richards 2009, Wallace 1991) when selecting various *instructional practices* (Richards 1998), through which teachers are thought to learn the content of the workshop. I followed three design principles to guide the selection of workshop tasks and activities:

Instructional practices should:

1. *draw on participants' prior knowledge* and experience before they engage with new ideas (Borg 2016, Graves 2009, Lamb 1995)
2. *provide opportunities for collaboration and dialogue* so that teachers can learn through their interactions with other teachers (Hayes 1995, Richards 2008).
3. *promote reflective teaching* so that teachers think critically about their own teaching and take steps to improve it (Bartlett 1990, Lynch 2003, Wallace 1991)

3.2.3.1 Drawing on participants' prior knowledge

As this was an in-service teacher development workshop, all participants would come to the session with prior knowledge and experience of classroom interactional

processes. I therefore followed Hayes' (1995) suggestion and included two activities that aimed to make prior knowledge and experience explicit at the beginning of the workshop; as a result, participants would be ready to engage with new ideas. As Graves (2009:118) points out, "teacher-learners must first recognize their existing knowledge and beliefs about teaching in order to transform them". I thus included a "discussion" and an analysis of "two extracts" in Activity 1.1 and 1.2 (Appendix B:1), which required participants to discuss their prior experience and prior knowledge, respectively. These discussion activities would allow the teacher educator to find out participants' prior experience of analysing their own classroom interaction ("Have you ever watched or listened to yourself teaching? If so, what did you find out?"), and their existing knowledge about features of classroom interaction ("Which teacher uses language to create more opportunities for language learning? How?"). Such activities were put at the beginning of the workshop to stimulate interest in the topic, get participants engaged, and also prepare them to accommodate new concepts and ideas.

3.2.3.2 *Providing opportunities for collaboration and dialogue*

I incorporated pair, group or whole-class discussions into almost every workshop activity. The rationale behind this decision is linked with sociocultural theory of learning (Vygotsky 1978) and the importance of what Swain (2000) labels *collaborative dialogue*: "dialogue in which speakers are engaged in problem solving and knowledge building" (102). Research (e.g. Richards 2008, Walsh 2011, Wells 1999) suggests that collaboration and dialogue is a crucial part of learning; through collaborative activity with peers, learning is mediated and jointly constructed. This is because it allows for clarification, questioning, expression of new ideas and "ultimately enhanced understanding" (Walsh 2013:6). Teacher educators claim that teachers learn more about teaching through the dialogues they have with other professionals than they do on their own (van Lier 1996). With this in mind, I provided opportunities for collaboration throughout the workshop. For example, in Activity 4.1 (Appendix B:6), a "jigsaw reading" involves participants reading about Walsh's (2014) description of CIC and then sharing the main points with other participants, before evaluating the teacher's CIC together in the "discussion" in Activity 4.2. As prospective workshop participants would all be experienced teachers, they would all have their own knowledge and ideas about classroom interaction to share. Thus, through collaboration, they would have more opportunities to learn from each other.

Another reason for including plenty of dialogue in the workshop was related to the fact that the workshop is actually *about* using dialogue to improve learning opportunities. As Legutke and Dittfurth (2009:211) point out, workshops “should allow student-teachers to experience the very processes that they are supposed to initiate with students”, and teacher educators should “practice what they preach” (Johnston 2000:160). I thus considered it appropriate to involve myself in some of the discussions as a teacher educator, as I was promoting the benefits of teacher-student interaction in the workshop. I included whole-class feedback discussions in the workshop, which would give me the opportunity to mediate teacher learning.

3.2.3.3 Promoting reflective teaching

Teacher development workshops should include instructional practices that develop a reflective approach to teaching (Bartlett 1990, Graves 2009). It is thought that teachers need to develop reflective skills to analyse and evaluate their teaching in order to improve their practice (Walsh 2013). According to Richards and Schmidt (2013:491), activities that help develop teachers’ reflective skills include the use of “audio and video taping of a teacher’s lesson by the teacher, for purposes of later review and reflection” and “group discussion with peers or a supervisor in order to explore issues that come out of classroom experience”. Since one of the workshop’s aims was to equip participants with the tools to analyse and reflect on their own classroom interaction, both the above activities were included in the workshop. In Activity 3.2, participants watch a video of a teacher’s lesson, analyse features of interaction in Activity 3.3 and then reflect on the teacher’s CIC in Activity 4.2 (Appendix B:5-6). These interactional processes enable participants to develop the same skills they will be using when they reflect on their own teaching. As reflective teaching “works best when it is done through dialogue, preferably with a colleague” (Walsh 2013:112), all the reflection activities are completed in pairs or groups.

Lynch (2003) highlights how teacher education programmes should also promote future reflective practice. In light of this, a discussion activity was included at the end of the workshop to help teachers move towards reflecting on their own practice. In the pairwork discussion in Activity 5.1 (Appendix B:7), participants are encouraged to reflect on how they interact with their learners in their classrooms, comparing their own classroom interaction with the classroom interaction in the video. After

predicting features of interaction they might find in a recording of one of their own lessons, participants are presented with an action plan in Activity 5.2. In the action plan, they are given information of how they can reflect on their teaching, as part of their continued professional development. The action plan is a necessary follow-up to the workshop, in which participants engage in reflective teaching themselves using the skills acquired in the workshop. Clarke (2017:1) states that “ensuring a workshop has a follow-up activity is a useful way of making it effective”. Similarly, Graves (2009:119) points out that one aim of teacher development programmes is to “help teacher-learners develop tools to continue their learning once the program ends”. Thus, the action plan is included to encourage participants to reflect on their practice after the workshop has finished.

3.3 Piloting the workshop

Although I could have limited the subjectivity of the research by asking an external teacher educator to pilot the workshop materials, I decided to conduct the pilot myself. The decision was based on three factors: (1) This was the first pilot and I wanted to find out if the workshop was effective myself before seeing if someone else could use the workshop materials; (2) I wanted to view the workshop’s effectiveness from an “emic” (insider) perspective (Heigham and Croker 2009:312); and (3) I aimed to improve the workshop materials myself before they were used by other teacher educators in a second pilot (see section 5). As Weir and Roberts (1994:23) note, “insiders...have far greater experience of the situation, and are aware of the history behind developments”, while another teacher educator might not understand the “full complexity” (ibid) of the workshop. Furthermore, insider-evaluation is part of the action research approach; the research should be “self-reflective” and “carried out by practitioners” (Nunan 1992:229).

3.3.1 The participants

To pilot the workshop, I recruited participants from the MA AL & ELT programme at a UK university. I sent out an email (Appendix E) inviting teachers to contact me if they were willing and available to participate in the workshop. As I selected participants from a particular subgroup (i.e. they were all attending the same teacher education programme), I conducted “homogenous sampling” (Dornyei 2007:128). The aim was to pilot the workshop with a group of participants similar to teachers on a teacher

development programme. I also specified that participants needed to meet two “predetermined criteria” (ibid): (1) they should be experienced English language teachers and (2) they should be currently working. This was to ensure that workshop participants were in-service practising teachers, for whom the workshop was designed.

Seven teachers were recruited for the pilot. Although this number is small compared with typical numbers of participants on teacher development programmes (i.e. 10-15), it could be argued that it is an ideal number of participants for an initial pilot, as they were all “willing participants”, a “pre-requisite to having a rich data-set” (Dornyei 2007:129). Also, six-eight is the recommended number of participants in a focus group (Dornyei 2007, Krueger and Casey 2000). Ethical approval was obtained in advance (Appendix F) and the participants were given an information sheet (Appendix G), clearly stating the purpose of the research and expectations of the participants. Participants signed consent forms (Appendix H), declaring that they were willing for data from the workshop to be recorded and used confidentially in the evaluation.

All teachers participating in the workshop were studying for an MA in AL & ELT at a UK university at the time. There was a balance of males and females in the group, with five L1-users of English and two L2-users. Participants had a mean average of 10 years’ teaching experience and were teaching in various types of institution. Six teachers were CELTA-qualified, with three also holding a DELTA qualification. All participants were teachers of English, teaching classes with 10-26 students. Most participants claimed to know little or nothing about CIC prior to the workshop, and only half had experience of recording their classroom interaction. Participants’ profiles are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Participant Profiles

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7
Gender	M	M	M	F	F	F	M
L1	English	English	English / Hindi	Italian	Turkish	English	English
Teaching context	Adults, Higher education	Adults, Secondary	Higher education	Higher education	Higher education	Adults	Higher education
Type of school	University	Private language school	Private college / University	Private college	University	Further education college	Private college / University
Subject	EAP, CELTA	General English	EAP	EAP	General English	ESOL	EAP
Teaching experience (years)	24	5	9	9	3	9	10
Class size (no. of students)	10	12-15	14	12-26	18-23	15-20	14-25
ELT qualifications	CELTA, DELTA	CELTA	CELTA, DELTA	CELTA, PGCE, MA	Undergraduate degree in ELT	CELTA, PGCE	CELTA, DELTA
Prior knowledge of CIC	Nothing	A little	Nothing	A little	Some	Nothing	A little
Prior experience recording	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

3.3.2 The setting

The 2-hour workshop took place in a classroom at a UK university on a Saturday morning in June. The room was fully equipped with a computer, sound system and projector. The seating was arranged in a horseshoe, allowing participants to easily interact in pairs, groups and as a whole class. As the teacher educator running the

workshop, I sat in the middle of the horseshoe. For data collection purposes (see 3.4.1), two video cameras were placed behind the participants. As Dornyei (2007:184) recommended, a colleague helped to operate the cameras, moving them to focus on whoever was speaking during the workshop. Dornyei (ibid) noted that when making recordings, researchers need to make sure the equipment produces good quality recordings. To prevent poor quality recorded data, a dictaphone was placed in the middle of the class as a back-up in case the sound quality of the video was not good enough.

3.4 Evaluating the workshop

3.4.1 Data collection

3.4.1.1 Focus group and email feedback

To collect data about the workshop from the participants' perspectives, I held a focus group with the seven workshop participants, followed by individual email feedback. Focus groups, or "small structured groups with selected participants" (Litosseliti 2003), who engage in an informal group discussion focused on a particular topic, are renowned for their flexibility (Wilkinson 2004). As I needed to explore emergent feelings and experiences of the participants within a group context, a focus group seemed a suitable data collection tool. Rather than conducting one-to-one interviews with participants, I wanted a more "dynamic" and "naturalistic" type of interaction (ibid:180) that promoted a more generative discussion. A focus group would allow participants to react to and build upon the contributions of other group members (Stewart and Shamdasani 1990), which would not be possible in individual interviews.

The moderator of a focus group, however, or the "facilitator of the discussion" (Dornyei 2007:144), usually has less control over the discussion and the interaction can seem quite chaotic (Litosseliti 2003). There is the potential problem of a "false consensus" (ibid:21); participants with strong personalities may dominate the discussion. Nevertheless, if the moderator is experienced in running group discussions with "people management" skills (Wilkinson 2004:179), then this should not be a significant problem. I decided to take on the role as moderator myself as I knew about the workshop in detail and was familiar with managing group

discussions. I believed I met Litosseliti's (2003:42) criteria of being "flexible and adaptable" with "good personal, interpersonal, communication and managing skills". Although Litosseliti (ibid:40) advises against a teacher moderating a group consisting of his/her students, this particular situation was different as I was piloting the workshop myself and adopting an action research approach.

A more important potential limitation of using focus groups is the danger of bias and manipulation; participants might say what they think the researcher wants to hear (Litosseliti 2003). This is likely in this research situation, in which the focus group moderator and teacher educator is the same person. To prevent this from happening, I followed Dornyei's (2007) advice: during the introductory phase of the focus group, I outlined the purpose of the discussion (to evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop and discuss possible improvements), emphasising that the discussion should include critical perspectives about the workshop, and there are "no right or wrong answers" (145). Another possible limitation is that there may be difficulty in distinguishing between a group view and an individual view (Litosseliti 2003). However, to counteract this, I asked participants to give delayed individual feedback via email after the focus group. This gave participants the opportunity to express their own personal views about the workshop which they may have felt unable to verbalise in front of other group members. In the email, I asked participants what they liked most about the workshop and one thing they would change. I also asked if they had recorded themselves since attending the workshop and if not, whether they had plans to do so. This data was used in the analysis in addition to the focus group transcript (see 3.4.2).

The focus group took place immediately after the workshop and the discussion was 45-minutes long. The session was video and audio-recorded so it could be transcribed afterwards (see Appendix I for the link to the video/audio recordings). It was a "semi-structured" focus group (Dornyei 2007:144), with broader, open-ended questions at the beginning to give participants the freedom to discuss anything related to the workshop (e.g. "What did you learn?"). Such open questions enabled a variety of topics to emerge (e.g. "Metalanguage"), which were followed by closed "probe questions" (Dornyei 2007:146) that explored the emergent topics (e.g. "Was it useful, that metalanguage?"). As recommended by Litosseliti (2003:55), I used a "topic guide" to structure the rest of the discussion; "a list of topics or issues to be explored during the session". These topics were the activities in the workshop (e.g.

“Video observation task”). Using the Participant book (Appendix B) as “stimulus material” (ibid:56), the discussion was structured around the workshop activities, focusing on what was effective and what could be improved.

3.4.1.2 *Self-evaluation*

To complement the focus group and email feedback data, I wrote a self-evaluation of the workshop in a “reflective journal” (Burns 2009:119). While the focus group collected information about the effectiveness of the workshop from the participants’ perspective, I wanted to evaluate the workshop’s effectiveness from my own perspective as a teacher educator. As Burns (2009:118) points out, reflective journals can be used to explore “observations, reflections, decisions and insights” in relation to an event (i.e. the workshop). This can be classified as an “introspective technique” (McKay 2009:220), which is a valuable tool for providing insight into my own thought processes as a teacher educator. Although a reflective journal can be judged as a subjective data-collection method (Bailey 1991), when used with other sources of data, it can “provide a vehicle for data triangulation” (McKay 2009:230). Thus, using a reflective journal in addition to a focus group and a video observation provides “a broader and richer perspective” of the workshop (ibid:229).

As Burns (2009) advised, I wrote the self-evaluation soon after the workshop, “following thinking about and processing what occurred” (119). I divided the self-evaluation into four sections, answering the following questions adapted from Weir and Roberts (1994:324-5):

1. Which aims were achieved in the workshop?
2. Which part/s of the workshop went well? Why?
3. Which part/s of the workshop didn’t go well? Why?
4. How would you improve the workshop?

These questions helped to guide my evaluation of the workshop from the perspective of a teacher educator.

3.4.1.3 *Video observation*

Video observation was selected as a third data-collection method. As Weir and Roberts (1994:136) point out, it is difficult to justify an evaluation of a training programme (or in this case, a workshop) “without observational data”. Similarly, Tomlinson (2011:298) argue that evaluation should focus on “what actually happens as outcomes of materials use rather on the reactions of the teachers and the learners”. I could have made field notes during the workshop as a “full participant” (Cowie 2009:167), but as Samway (1994) highlights, making notes can be difficult during class time when you are focused on the actual event. Instead, as I was both the teacher educator and the researcher, I needed to use a recording device that allowed me to revisit the workshop and review what happened (Burns 2009). I chose a video-recording over audio-recording, as the data would be “richer” (Dornyei 2007:139) and I would get a clearer picture of the workshop, including non-verbal information such as facial expressions and gestures.

This “self-directed observation” has an important role in development-oriented evaluation (Weir and Roberts 1994:136). By observing the workshop myself, I could consider what worked well and what could be improved from an “etic” (outsider’s) perspective (Heigham and Croker 2009:313). I could also look at the workshop materials and compare them with “the behaviors” (Richards 2003) of the workshop, including timing, activities and events. As Dornyei (2007:185) points out, observational data “can provide a more objective account of events and behaviours than second-hand self-report data”. This more objective account is especially important in an action research project, as data from the focus group and self-evaluation can be compared with actual evidence in the video of the workshop (see section 4).

After the workshop, I watched the video-recording of the 2-hour session (see Appendix K for the link to the video/audio recording of the workshop). During the first watching of the video, I noted down general descriptive comments about the timing and activities. I then re-watched the video and made “high-inference” observation notes (Weir and Roberts 1994); I noted down more evaluative-type comments about how the workshop materials were used and how participants engaged with both the content of the workshop and the instructional practices. Overall, I conducted an

“unstructured observation” (ibid), which enabled me to note down anything about the workshop that seemed relevant.

3.4.2 Data analysis

One week after the workshop, I watched the recording of the focus group again and transcribed it. The focus group data was used as a resource, for “content analysis” (Wilkinson 2004:183) rather than for ethnographic, linguistic or discourse analysis. I transcribed the whole group discussion to provide a record of exactly what was discussed (Stewart and Shamdasani 1990). As the transcription was for content-analysis only, I did not make a detailed transcription; I included non-verbal actions such as laughter and pauses, but I did not include information about overlapping talk or intonation patterns as I deemed such features unnecessary for understanding the content (see Appendix I for transcript conventions). After transcribing, I organised the data so it was ready for analysis (Patton 2002). I made sure that the transcription was complete by re-listening to the recording of the focus group and checking the transcript at the same time. Line numbers were added to the transcript (as well as to the email feedback, observation notes and self-evaluation) to enable clear referencing.

Once I had the focus group transcript, email feedback, self-evaluation and observation notes, I needed to use qualitative analysis to “transform the data into findings” (Patton 2002:432). As I was analysing open-ended written data, I used the data analysis strategy of “identifying themes and patterns” (Burns 2009:122). Following Litosseliti’s (2003) advice, I looked at the focus group transcript first, reading it for general impressions before looking for specific opinions and topics (ibid:87). I re-read the transcript several times, annotated it and identified common themes. I then analysed the email feedback, self-evaluation and observation notes in the same way, identifying major themes and patterns. By colour-coding each theme with the same colour across the whole body of data, it was easier to identify common themes and patterns. I therefore reduced the volume of data (Patton 2002:432) and focused on only the colour-coded sections. This made the data more manageable (Burns 2009), so the themes could be clearly presented in the findings. These findings are presented in section 4. (See Appendix I, J, K and L for the annotated focus group transcript, self-evaluation, observation notes and email feedback data, respectively).

3.4.3 Limitations and considerations

Taking on multiple roles in an evaluation (i.e. researcher, focus group moderator and teacher educator) inevitably involves a degree of subjectivity. I attempted to make the research more rigorous by collecting data from different sources and by using more than one data-collection tool, but as I analysed and interpreted the data myself, subjectivity was unavoidable. Nonetheless, as I took an approach that corresponds with action research, this evaluation could be considered part of an initial research cycle, which “leads to another research cycle” (Thornbury 2017:4). The next research cycle would be informed by the first, involving a second pilot of the workshop. I would pilot the workshop (with suggested improvements) again with other teachers, perhaps those on a different in-service teacher development course, and with another teacher educator. In the next pilot, I would only take on the researcher role, so I could find out how effective the workshop is from the perspective of another teacher educator.

4 Findings and Discussion

In the following sections, I draw upon all sources of data, including the focus group transcript (FG: Appendix I), self-evaluation (SE: Appendix J), observation notes (ON: Appendix K) and email feedback (EF: Appendix L) to present the findings of the evaluation. After each quotation or excerpt taken from the data, the corresponding data source and line number(s) is cited (e.g. Self-evaluation line 12 = SE:12). I answer the two research questions, with the findings of the second question developing from the findings of the first.

4.1 How effective is the workshop?

After analysing the whole body of data, several themes emerged regarding the effectiveness of the workshop. Some of the emergent themes were related to *participant engagement* and use of *theory, transcripts* and *data extracts*. However, due to the limited scope of this evaluation, I have only focused on themes that influenced the overall effectiveness of the workshop: (1) **Outcomes**, (2) **Metalanguage**, (3) **Classroom modes**, (4) **Organisation and cohesion**, and (5) **Discussion**. The findings related to these five prominent themes are discussed in turn.

4.1.1 Outcomes

As one of the workshop's learning outcomes (see 3.2.1) involved participants being motivated to analyse and evaluate their own classroom interaction, it is apparent from the data that this outcome was achieved. In the focus group, when asked about recording their own teaching, all participants agreed that they were inspired to record themselves. Participant 7 explicitly stated that he was "keen to try recording [himself] to see if the modes apply and what's going on" (FG:79-80), and Participant 3 made a similar statement:

yeah I'm kind of annoyed because I'm coming to the end of term now and I won't actually be teaching again for another four weeks or something so I kind of want to do this next lesson.

(FG:512-3)

While these statements illustrate participants' enthusiasm for analysing their own classroom interaction, they also highlight a limitation of this pilot. Although the participants were working in London at the time, most of them had finished teaching when the workshop was piloted. As a result, they could not implement the action plan immediately. Two participants referred to this problem in the email feedback, with Participant 6 stating: "I wish we'd done [the workshop] earlier and had a chance to record ourselves and discuss it with you" (EF:55). Nevertheless, a motivation to analyse their classroom interaction in the near future was emphasised. In the email feedback, all participants confirmed an intention to record themselves, and three participants mentioned specific plans (EF:6/20/68). At the time of writing, I have found out (through personal communication) that Participants 1, 3 and 7 have since recorded and analysed their classroom interaction. Due to time constraints, I was not able to follow this up with an additional workshop. However, a second workshop ought to be part of any subsequent pilot (see section 5).

Related to the other learning outcomes, participants were seemingly more aware of classroom interactional processes and better able to describe features of CIC at the end of the workshop than they were at the beginning. In the self-evaluation, I pointed out that a class discussion at the end of the workshop revealed an increased awareness of classroom interactional processes (SE:4-5). This is further supported in the observation notes, as I stated how participants only mentioned "display questions" and "direct correction" (ON:32) when evaluating the extracts in Activity 1.2. In contrast, nearer the end of the workshop in Activity 4.2, participants "mention how the teacher effectively shapes the interaction but doesn't give learners much space for learning" (ON:181-2), which demonstrates an increased awareness of CIC and interactional processes. Furthermore, in the Conclusion (Activity 6), participants accurately describe features of CIC, including "extending wait time", "opening the space" and "shaping" (ON:216-7).

The outcome related to participants' ability "to analyse classroom data using metalanguage", however, was not completely achieved. During the focus group, it became apparent that participants had not learned all the metalanguage introduced in the workshop. For example, Participant 1 mentioned learning about "referential questions and the other one" (FG:61), failing to recall the term "display questions". In the self-evaluation, I commented how participants "might not be fully equipped with the tools, or the discourse, to identify some of the features" (SE:16-17) of their

interaction. The fact that participants had difficulties with the metalanguage meant that this outcome was not fully achieved. These difficulties are discussed in more detail in 4.1.2 below.

4.1.2 Metalanguage

There was a significant degree of confusion over some metalanguage introduced in Activity 3.1 of the workshop. Although Participant 1 stated that he learned a lot about “that metalanguage stuff” (FG:61), participants were not very clear about the meaning of different terms. In the self-evaluation, I noted that participants seemed confused about the differences between some of the interactional features (SE:11-12). This confusion was also observed in the video:

P1 asks what extension is and says that he didn't quite understand what it meant...[Participant 7] says they extend what the participants are saying. T then says it can be quite similar to modelling...Ps seem a little confused by the differences between extension and modelling.

(ON:133-7)

It seems that the terms “extension” and “modelling” were not clearly explained to participants. Similarly, Participant 4 brought up the differences between “modelling, form-focused feedback and direct repair” in the workshop, mentioning “how they are overlapping and could be considered the same thing” (ON:138-9). This came up again later with the term “reformulation” (ON:151), and I observed that there was “clearly quite a lot of confusion when distinguishing between reformulation, direct repair, and form-focused feedback” (ON:153-4). Furthermore, in the focus group, Participant 3 pointed out:

...the only thing is that I'm not too clear on the difference [between] direct repair, scaffolding, [form-focused] feedback...what is actually kind of the delineation between them or is there any delineation are they essentially the same?

(FG 283-5)

As this confusion was frequently highlighted both during the workshop and in the focus group, it appeared to be a significant issue for participants.

The large number of interactional features and the comprehensibility of the matching descriptions in Activity 3.1 appeared to be the source of the problem. In the email feedback, Participant 7 noted how “the interactional features list seemed a bit long and messy with a lot of overlap.” (EF:62). When designing the workshop, the list of fourteen interactional features and descriptions were taken directly from Walsh’s (2006:67) SETT framework (Appendix A), with no adaptation. It seems that this was an oversight, as too many features were introduced and the metalanguage needed clearer explanation. The descriptions of “modelling” and “direct repair” were too similar; the former was defined as “correcting a learner’s contribution” and the latter was “correcting an error quickly and directly” (Appendix A and Appendix B:4). It is therefore understandable that the participants were confused. In fact, “modelling” should be defined as giving learners “an example” of language rather than correcting them (Walsh 2013:84). As a teacher educator, I admitted that I should have clarified the meaning of each feature, or elicited some examples to check understanding (SE:75-6). In the self-evaluation, I also noted how participants could have been overwhelmed with the amount of new metalanguage, and as a result, participants did not understand the meaning of all features by the end of the workshop (SE:81-2). In all, as one of the learning outcomes of the workshop was to be able to analyse classroom data using metalanguage, the mix-up over the different terms impinged on the effectiveness of the workshop. (Suggested improvements will follow in 4.2.1)

4.1.3 Classroom modes

One of the most striking themes that emerged from the data was the participants’ positive reaction to Walsh’s (2006) classification of classroom modes that was introduced in Activity 2.3. In the focus group, after being asked about how they feel about the workshop in general, Participant 3 commented: “...the part about the modes...I don’t know why this is the first time I’m hearing about this to be honest - it’s really useful.” (FG:11-12). Other participants agreed, and a general positive reaction to the modes was evident across the data. In the self-evaluation, for example, I noted how participants were enthusiastic about learning about the modes, reporting that they had never thought about different stages of the lesson in that way before (SE:32). Similarly, in the observation notes I mention that “whenever they get a chance, participants comment on how useful the modes analysis will be when they listen to their own teaching” (ON:96-7). When asked about what they liked most about the workshop in an email, Participant 7 noted:

The framework of modes...seem[s] very important in teaching...The categories you introduced seem helpful in terms of clarifying your own thinking about what is happening in the class.

(EF:58-61)

Such a positive response from participants could have been influenced by my own enthusiasm for the modes classification. In the observation notes, it is clear that in my role as teacher educator, I frequently emphasise “the importance of modes” (ON:67/87) and “the importance of context” (ON:46/115) during the workshop, which could have affected participants’ reaction to the modes. Nevertheless, interest in the modes seems to be linked to both the perceived usefulness of a modes analysis and the fact that participants were learning something new.

Another reason participants had a positive reaction to the modes was perhaps related to prior experience of training programmes that only focused on teacher talking time (TTT). In the focus group, most participants agreed with Participant 3’s suggestion that a classification of modes should be included “on a pre-service course”, as “it puts the TTT in context” (FG:14-18). Throughout the focus group, participants frequently mentioned their negative experiences on pre-service training programmes involving being told about their high TTT (e.g. FG:20/24/44), and they claimed that the modes analysis would be helpful for focusing on the quality rather than the quantity of teacher talk. For example, Participant 6 explained:

ok for me this was very very important because [pre-service trainers] always criticise teacher talking time and we analyse and this is a good way to think...are we talking all the time without any purpose is there any aim to why I said this or that...

(FG:275-8)

However, Participant 1, who is a CELTA trainer as well as a teacher, argued that introducing modes on pre-service programmes might not be appropriate, as informing trainees that “there’s this mode and there’s that mode...might sort of freak them out a bit” (FG:35-6). He was referring to the large amount of new metalanguage pre-service teachers had to learn on the CELTA, and reasoned that learning about different modes as well might be too much. In fact, it was for this reason that this workshop was designed for in-service rather than pre-service teachers. Other participants agreed with Participant 1’s argument (FG:50) and

Participant 5 concluded that learning about modes would be “very helpful for *in-service* teachers” (my italics - FG:42).

4.1.4 Organisation and cohesion

When participants remarked on what they liked most about the workshop in the email feedback, Participant 1 mentioned that the workshop was “well prepared”, “questions and activities were well devised, well composed, and well executed” (EF:1-2), Participant 3 “liked the professionalism and the smoothness” of the workshop (EF:15) and Participant 5 noted that the order of activities was “well thought-out” (EF:46). In the self-evaluation, I noted that Activities 2.4, 3.2, and 3.3 were particularly effective, with each activity effectively building on the previous one (SE:27-8). This flow and cohesion is also evident in the observation notes, as there are many references to “links” with previous activities (ON:18/41/46/111) and “signposts” that inform participants what they are doing next and the rationale for different activities (ON:21/39/47). My own frequent signposting could have contributed to the overall cohesion of the workshop.

In the focus group, participants commented on how some activities made the workshop cohesive and the concepts clear. For example, when discussing the effectiveness of the two extracts in Activity 1.2, participants commented on how this activity was “very clear” and “made things transparent” (FG:139-40). Similarly, when discussing the micro-contexts in Activity 2.2, participants stated that it was “a good lead in”, moving from “general to particular” and consequently the activity “contextualized the modes” (FG:226-232). Participant 3 made an interesting point regarding the micro-contexts and classroom modes:

...they're such familiar contexts [in Activity 2.2] and then you see the theory [the modes in Activity 2.3] and it's not so scary...you can see oh yeah that's just the technical word, Walsh's word, for this.

(FG:233-4)

The actual design of the workshop and the order of activities, therefore, seems to have helped participants make sense of the theory.

In both the focus group and the email feedback, Participant 4 emphasised that there was “a good balance of theory and practical applications” in the workshop (FG:84 and EF:21). She went further in the focus group and explained:

...we've got clear examples...you also provided us with your personal examples which makes it look like it is easy and feasible to do, and it's probably helpful to have some theory as well to know why we are looking at this...

(FG:84-6)

This is also highlighted in the observation notes, which state that “participants respond well” to the anecdote about my own personal experience of analysing classroom interaction (ON:186), which links theory with practice. In the email feedback, Participant 4 made an interesting observation:

The workshop created links to the participants' teaching contexts during group discussions. The focus on our context was explicit especially at the beginning and at the end of the workshop, creating a 'learning circle', which helped me link the workshop content to my teaching reality.

(EF:29-31)

Ultimately, the structure of the workshop, with a focus on context in both Activity 1.1 and Activity 5.2, seems to have helped make the workshop cohesive for participants and allowed them to link it with their own classroom practice.

4.1.5 Discussion

In all sources of data, there were many comments regarding both the quality and the quantity of discussion. In the video of the workshop, I observed that there was “lots of productive discussion” (ON:79), with participants frequently “engaged” in dialogue (ON:7/28/52/75/105) and “talking to each other with enthusiasm” (ON:5-6). This is also supported in the self-evaluation, as I highlighted that the pair and group discussions were productive, as participants had prior experience and ideas to share (SE:47). I also pointed out, however, that I thought there were too many discussion-type activities in the workshop (SE:56-7). I mentioned this in the focus group, but Participant 1 reasoned: “It's just valuable...co-construction of knowledge and all that sort of [thing]” (FG:413). He then enquired: “Why would there be way too much discussion? I think we need discussion it's a workshop” (FG:489-92). He made a

relevant point here, reflecting the importance of collaboration as an instructional practice in a workshop. In fact, in the self-evaluation, I commented on the same idea:

As we shared our ideas with each other, I felt like I was learning from them too. The process of discussing the features of interaction with the participants helped to consolidate the concepts in my own head, and I found that I noticed more about the classroom interaction than I did when I analysed it on my own.
(SE:52-5)

This supports the idea of collaborative learning and sociocultural learning theory (see 3.2.3.2). Other participants also acknowledged the value of collaborating with their peers in the workshop: Participant 3 claimed the discussions were “good” because “people noticed things [he] hadn’t seen” (FG:411), and Participant 4 commented on how she had not noticed something about the teacher’s CIC in the video but then “the group discussion helped [her] focus on this” (FG:451). Thus, it appears that both the participants and I (as a teacher educator) learned through collaboration.

Nonetheless, some discussion questions in the workshop were evidently not as effective as others; some were skipped and some were repetitive (SE:58-9). The repetition of some questions could have contributed to my impression that there was too much discussion in the workshop. In the focus group, Participant 4 pointed out that the questions in Activity 3.1 and 3.2 were “a bit repetitive” (FG:396). Similarly, Participant 3 highlighted that we had talked about the second question in Activity 4.2 before, and therefore he “skipped” it (FG:453-4). Additionally, in the self-evaluation, I noted how I missed out the final discussion question in Activity 5.1 that asked participants to think about their own contexts, due to concerns involving timing. However, I acknowledged that this was not the best question to skip as it would have been useful for participants to discuss their own teaching contexts (SE:60-63). Participant 3 noticed that this question was missed out and commented on how he “would have liked to talk about the last one...because we’ve got lots of different contexts” (FG:493-4). Correspondingly, Participant 2 mentioned the same thing in the email feedback: “...it might have been interesting to discuss how we do these different things in our own teaching contexts” (EF:11-12). Nevertheless, some participants avoided discussing a question themselves in Activity 1.1. In the observation notes, I spotted that “only one pair attempts to answer question 3 and they seem unsure about what to say” (ON:8-9). Participant 1 stated that it was a “difficult one”, while Participant 2 alluded to its incomprehensibility:

...I wasn't really sure yeah exactly what you meant...learning through the choice of language...and also the wording...are you talking about me or in general...I was a little unsure.

(FG:120-7)

It therefore appears that the discussion questions need refining, so that they are not repeated or skipped. In the next section, I take the above findings into account and answer the second research question regarding how the workshop can be improved.

4.2 How can the workshop be improved?

When analysing the data and looking for suggestions for how the workshop can be improved, I noticed isolated recommendations about incorporating more “authentic examples” of data in Activity 1.2 (EF:64), “watching a video of a less effective lesson” (EF:40) and allowing “more time for feedback” (EF:3). However, these were one-off suggestions that were not related to the effectiveness of the workshop (or previously discussed themes), and therefore I have limited the following discussion to the most important suggestions for improvement. Considering the less effective parts of the workshop highlighted in 4.1 (i.e. under the themes of **Metalanguage** and **Discussion**), I outline suggested improvements for the workshop below. I refer to suggestions provided by participants in the focus group and email feedback as well as my own ideas written in the self-evaluation.

4.2.1 Improvements to metalanguage

Participants suggested some improvements regarding the list of interactional features introduced in Activity 3.1 of the workshop (see Appendix B:4). In the focus group, Participant 3 suggested that the differences between the features such as “scaffolding” and “direct repair” would be clearer if you “mention that...some of [the features] include specific [terms], some of them are broader...” (FG:297-8). Participant 2 then proposed that “reformulation, extension, modelling...could be separate [features]” (FG:301), rather than under the broad term of “scaffolding”. This would then ensure that the features each have clear separate definitions. However, Participant 3 pointed out that there could be “too many things...in an exercise like this” (FG:309-10) and Participant 7 highlighted that the list of features already “seemed a bit long” (EF:62). Supporting this, in the self-evaluation I noted that the

number of interactional features should be reduced and there should just be a clearer definition of each interactional feature (SE:86). Taking these points into consideration, I suggest that Activity 3.1 is revised.

An improved list of interactional features is presented in Appendix M. Rather than having a long list of fourteen different terms, the number has been decreased to ten. I removed “teacher interruption”, as this feature is rarely found in classroom interaction in participants’ typical teaching contexts. Additionally, “confirmation checks” has also been taken out, as I have since discovered that it is not part of Walsh’s (2013:84) version of the framework and it could fall under the category of “seeking clarification” instead. I also removed “extended learner turn” and “extended teacher turn”, as both these features are relatively easy to describe without metalanguage. The terms “reformulation”, “extension” and “modeling” are still included under the umbrella term “scaffolding”, but with clearer descriptions. For example, with the term “modelling”, instead of using (Walsh’s (2006:67) description “correcting a learner’s contribution”, I have used Walsh’s (2013:84) more accurate description: “providing an example for learners”. This will hopefully prevent confusion with direct repair. Descriptions of “scaffolding”, “reformulation”, “extension”, “direct repair” and “form-focused feedback” have been similarly revised and made more comprehensible (see Appendix M).

4.2.2 Improvements to discussion

In the focus group, participants proposed changing the wording of some questions to make them clearer. With regards to the problematic question in Activity 1.1 that asked “In what ways do teachers create opportunities for language learning through their choice of language?” (Appendix B:1), Participant 4 suggested that the question should be “personalised...to create a link with the previous two” (FG:145-6). Connected with this idea of personalisation, Participant 5 suggested the following question: “How do you think your choice of language affects your classroom interaction?”. Such personalised questions at the beginning of the workshop fits in with the aim of finding out participants’ prior knowledge, so this seems to be an appropriate third question. Similarly, participants also suggested improvements to the questions in Activity 3.1; instead of asking “Which features would you expect to help or hinder learner contributions?” (Appendix B:5), Participant 3 stated that “the question could be WHEN do these help or hinder?” because “they’re all capable of

doing both at different times” (FG:370-2). This is a valid point, and such a question takes into account the classroom modes that were previously introduced.

In addition to refining some of the discussion questions in the workshop, there were also suggestions about the number of discussions. When suggesting how I would improve the workshop as a teacher educator, I noted that I would reduce the number of discussions and make sure there is no repetition of particular questions (SE:83-4). Similar suggestions were proposed in the focus group transcript. For example, when there was a noticeable repetition of a question-type in Activity 3.1 (“Which features would you expect to see in each of the classroom modes?”) and 3.2 (“Which interactional features do you think you will see in this extract?”) (Appendix B:4-5), Participant 3 stated that the question in “3.2 was a bit more useful than the other one” (FG:401) and Participant 4 agreed that the question in 3.1 was unnecessary (FG:403). Additionally, participants recommended that the discussion in 4.2 was also adapted, with fewer questions: “...maybe instead of four questions just one or two – like how could the teacher improve her CIC or what does she already do well?” (FG:463-4). Other participants then suggested one question that asked about the teachers’ “strengths and weaknesses” (FG:465), which I considered to be an effective (and simpler) alternative to the original four questions.

As a way of reducing the number of discussions in the workshop, Participant 4 proposed that the questions in Activity 5.1 should be answered individually rather than in pairs:

...we were discussing [the questions] in a group of three and not all of us really had time to express our feelings, ideas and predictions, while if I had time to just think on my own...maybe it’s just a good moment to reflect on the whole workshop before you go home and you put into practice what you have learned.

(FG:501-5)

Making Activity 5.1 an individual reflection task would help to solve the problem of having too many discussion-type activities in the workshop. Also, as Participant 4 mentioned, it would be more suitable as a reflection task rather than a discussion in the final activity, as participants could reflect on their own personal teaching contexts. As Participants 2 and 3 requested “more of a discussion of contexts”

(FG:17) in the final question of the activity, participants could be given the option to share their reflections with a partner at the end.

Ultimately, considering all the ideas suggested above, I have made improvements to the discussions in Activity 1.1, 3.1, 5.1 and 5.2 (see Appendix N).

5 Conclusion

In this dissertation, I have described the process of developing and evaluating a workshop on CIC for in-service English language teachers. Overall, the evaluation has revealed that the workshop effectively mediates between research and practice as it enables participants to link Walsh's (2006) theory with their own "teaching reality" (EF:30). Despite participant suggestions surrounding the workshop's timing, the use of metalanguage, and the number and phrasing of discussion questions (see 4.1), the workshop ultimately did what it set out to achieve: it motivated participants to analyse their own classroom interaction. With the suggested improvements (see 4.2), the workshop certainly has the potential to help in-service teachers develop their own CIC. Interestingly, the evaluation revealed participants' enthusiasm for including a workshop such as this one on teacher education programmes. Participants clearly recognised the value of studying the quality (rather than the quantity) of teacher talk and they were surprised that a focus on classroom interaction was absent on pre-service and in-service programmes (e.g. FG:14-15). This finding supports Walsh's (2013) observation that a focus on classroom interaction is largely missing in teacher education (see 2.2.3), and this workshop arguably has the potential to help close this gap.

Perhaps the most interesting finding, however, was the perceived effect that particular workshop activities had on learning. The evaluation itself gave an unusual insight into the learning process of the participants, with perceptive comments arising from the focus group discussion and the email feedback about the usefulness of workshop activities. It was revealed, for example, that participants were keen on activities that contextualised the theory, as they made the concepts easier to relate to and understand (FG:233-4). Similarly, the reflexive approach of the self-evaluation allowed an insight into my own views of the workshop activities as a teacher educator, as I could comment on the impact that collaborative activities had on my own understanding of classroom interaction (SE:53-55). These observations regarding certain instructional practices helped me to evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop and make subsequent improvements. The perspectives of the participants, combined with my own views as an insider (teacher educator) and an outsider (observer), contributed towards an overall assessment of the workshop.

However, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of this evaluation. The workshop has only been piloted once, with one small group of teachers. As such, the participating teachers' views of the workshop are clearly not representative of all in-service teachers. Furthermore, as I was simultaneously the researcher and the teacher educator running the workshop, this could be considered a rather subjective evaluation of a workshop that I designed myself. Accordingly, the workshop needs to be piloted for a second time, with a different group of participants and another teacher educator. In fact, it would be valuable to pilot the workshop multiple times, with different groups of participants from various teaching backgrounds. Teachers who are not studying for an MA in AL and ELT or those who have less experience of teaching, for example, might have different views of the workshop. Likewise, different teacher educators would give alternative views on the effectiveness of the workshop from an outsider's perspective, as well as an insight into the clarity and comprehensibility of the trainer's notes.

The next pilot should involve a succession of two workshops: Workshop 1 would be the improved version of this workshop that raises participants' awareness of classroom interactional processes, gives participants the tools to analyse classroom interaction and sets them the task of recording and transcribing their own teaching. Workshop 2 would be a follow-up to the first workshop, held one-two weeks later, giving participants the opportunity to discuss their recordings and transcripts with the teacher educator and other participants, and subsequently helping them to evaluate their own CIC. The workshops should be evaluated in the same way as this one, using a focus group, perhaps with some individual interviews as well, along with a self-evaluation written by the teacher educator and an observation done by an external researcher. It would be worthwhile to compare the findings of the next evaluation with the findings of this one, with the aim of making further improvements. Finally, after this additional trial, the workshop should then be ready to be used in the context of an actual in-service teacher development programme. Practising teachers would then be more aware of the importance of interaction, and therefore capable of creating more learning opportunities in the classroom.

Word count: 15,003

6 References

- Allwright, R.L. 1984. 'The importance of interaction in classroom language learning', *Applied Linguistics*, 5: 156–71.
- Anderson, J. 2017. *Trinity CertTESOL Companion: A guide for English Language Teachers*. London: DELTA publishing.
- Bailey, K.M 1991. 'Diary studies of classroom language learning; The doubting game and the believing game'. In E. Sadtono (ed.) *Language acquisition and the second/ foreign language classroom*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Center. 60-102.
- Bailey, K.M. 2001. 'Observation'. In *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Carter, R. and Nunan, D (eds.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 114-120.
- Barnes, D. 1969. 'Language in the secondary classroom'. In D. Barnes, J. Britton and H. Rosen. *Language, the Learner and the School*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Bartlett, L. 1990. 'Teacher development through reflective teaching'. In Richards, J.C. and Nunan, D. *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 202-214
- Borg, S. 2009. 'English language teachers' conceptions of research'. *Applied Linguistics* 30/3
- Borg, S. 2016. 'Workshops and Teacher Change'. *Simon Borg's blog*. <http://simon-borg.co.uk/workshops-and-teacher-change/> Accessed on 02/08/17.
- Burns, A. 2009. 'Action Research'. In Heigham, J. and Croker, R.A. (eds.) *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 112-134.
- Burns, A. and Richards, J. 2009. (eds.) *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge English. 2015 *CELTA Syllabus and Assessment Guidelines (Fourth edition)*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge English Language Assessment.
- Cambridge English. 2015b *DELTA Syllabus Specifications*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge English Language Assessment.
- Carr, A. 2006. *Teacher Training DVD Series*. London: International House London.
- Cazden, C.B. 1986. 'Classroom discourse', in M.C. Wittrock (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, New York: Macmillan.

- Cazden, C.B. 2001. *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Cook, V. 2008. *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. (4th edition) London: Hodder Education.
- Chaudron, C. 1988. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, M. 2017. 'Five things to consider when running a workshop'. *OUP ELT Blog* <https://oupeltglobalblog.com/2017/03/16/5-things-to-consider-when-running-a-workshop/> Accessed on 09/08/17.
- Cowie, N. 2009. 'Observation'. In Heigham, J. and Croker, R.A. (eds.) *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 165-181.
- Cullen, R. 1998. 'Teacher talk and the classroom context', *English Language Teaching Journal*, 52: 179–87.
- Cullen, R. 2000. 'The use of lesson transcripts for developing teachers' classroom language'. *System* 29: 27-43.
- Cullen, R. 2002. 'Supportive teacher talk: the importance of the F-move'. *ELT Journal* 56/2: 117-127.
- Dornyei, Z. 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 1990. 'Activities and procedures for teacher preparation'. In Richards, J.C. and Nunan, D. *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 26-36.
- Ellis, R. 1994. 'Classroom interaction and second language acquisition'. In *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 565-610.
- Ellis, R. 1997. 'The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials'. In *ELT Journal* 51/1: 36-42.
- Ellis, R. 2000. 'Task-based research and language pedagogy', *Language Teaching Research*, 49: 193–220.
- Ellis, R. & Shintani, N. 2014. *Exploring Language Pedagogy through Second Language Acquisition Research*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Graves, K. 2009. 'The Curriculum of Second Language Teacher Education' in Burns, A. and Richards, J. (eds.) *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th edition – with DVD) Harlow: Pearson Longman.
- Harmer, J. 2007b. *How to teach English* (2nd edition). Harlow: Pearson Longman.
- Hayes, D. 1995. 'In-service teacher development: some basic principles'. *ELT Journal* 49/3: 252-261.
- Hedge, T. 2000. *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heigham, J. and Croker, R.A. 2009. (eds.) *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Johnson, K. 1995. *Understanding Communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnston, B. 2000 'Investigating Dialogue in Language Teacher Education: The Teacher Educator as Learner', in K. Johnson (ed.), *Teacher Education*. Virginia: TESOL 157-74.
- Kasper, G. 1986. 'Repair in foreign language teaching'. In G. Kasper (ed.) *Learning, Teaching and Communication in the Language Classroom*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Kiely, R. and Rea Dickens, P. 2005. *Program Evaluation in Language Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Krueger, R.A. and Casey, M.A. 2000. *Focus Groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage publications.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. 1993. 'Maximizing learning potential in the communicative classroom'. *ELT Journal* 47/1: 12-21.
- Lamb, M. 1995. 'The consequences of INSET'. *ELT Journal* 49/1: 72-80.
- Legutke, M.K. and Dittfurth, M.S. 2009. 'School-based experience' in Burns, A. and Richards, J. (eds.) *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Litosseliti, L. 2003. *Using Focus Groups in Research*. London: Continuum.
- Long, M. 1983. 'Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of meaning', *Applied Linguistics* 4: 126-41.
- Long, M. 1996. 'The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition', in W.C. Ritchie and T.K. Bhatia (eds.) *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Long, M.H. and Sato, C.J. 1983 'Classroom foreigner talk discourse: forms and functions of teachers' questions'. In H.W. Seliger and M.H. Long (eds.)

- Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lynch, B.K. 2003. *Language assessment and programme evaluation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lynch, T. 1996. *Communication in the Language Classroom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lyster, R. 1998. 'Recasts, repetition and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 20: 51–81.
- Lyster, R. and Ranta, L. 1997. 'Corrective feedback and learner uptake'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19: 37–66.
- Macaro, E. 2003. *Teaching and Learning a second language: a guide to recent research and its applications*. London: Continuum
- Markee, N. 2000. *Conversation Analysis*, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McGrath, I. 2002. *Materials Evaluation and Design for Language Teaching* (2nd edition). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McKay, S.L. 2009. 'Introspective techniques'. In Heigham, J. and Croker, R.A. (eds.) *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 220-241.
- Mehan, H. 1979. *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nunan, D. 1987. 'Communicative Language Teaching: making it work'. *English Language Teaching Journal* 41: 136-45.
- Nunan, D. 1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. 2004. *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ohta, A. 2001. *Second Language Acquisition Processes in the Classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Patton, M.Q. 2002. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. (3rd edition) London: Sage Publications.
- Pica, T. 1988. 'Interlanguage adjustments as an outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction. *Language Learning* 38 (1): 45-73.
- Richards, J.C. 1990. 'The dilemma of teacher education in second language teaching'. In J.C. Richards and D. Nunan (eds.) *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. 1998. *Beyond training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Richards, K. 2003. *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Richards, J. 2008. 'English Language Teacher Education Today'. *RELC Journal* 39/2: 158-177
- Richards, J.C. and Schmidt, R. 2013. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th edition). London: Pearson Longman.
- Samway, K. D. 1994. 'But it's hard to keep fieldnotes while also teaching'. *TESOL Journal*. 4/1: 47-48.
- Scrivener, J. 2005. *Learning Teaching: The Essential Guide to English Language Teaching* (2nd edition). London: Macmillan.
- Seedhouse, P. 1996. 'Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities'. *ELT Journal* 50/1: 16-24.
- Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The interactional Architecture of the Second Language Classroom: A Conversational Analysis Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Slimani, A. 1989. 'The role of topicalization in classroom language learning'. *System* 17: 223-34
- Stewart, D.W. and Shamdasani, P.N. 1990. *Focus Groups: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Swain, M. 2000. 'The output hypothesis and beyond: mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue'. In J. Lantolf (ed.) *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thaine, C. 2010. *Teacher Training Essentials: Workshops for professional development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, G. 1997. 'Training teachers to ask questions'. *English Language Teaching Journal* 51/2: 99-105.
- Thornbury, S. 1996. 'Teachers research teacher talk' *ELT Journal* 50/4: 279-89.
- Thornbury, S. 2013 'T is for Teacher Knowledge'. *An A-Z of ELT: Scott Thornbury's blog*. <https://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/tag/tkt/> Accessed on 29/06/17.
- Thornbury, S. 2017. *The New A-Z of ELT: A Dictionary of Terms and Concepts*. London: Macmillan.
- Thornbury, S. 2017b. 'M is for Mediation'. *An A-Z of ELT: Scott Thornbury's blog*. <https://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/2017/04/23/m-is-for-mediation/> Accessed on 18/07/17.
- Thornbury, S. and Watkins, P. 2007. *The CELTA Course Trainer's Manual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Tomlinson, B. 2011. *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trinity College London 2005. *Licentiate Diploma in TESOL: Validation Requirements, Syllabus and Bibliography* (updated 2007). London: Trinity College.
- Tsui, A.B.M. 1995. *Introducing Classroom Interaction*. London: Penguin.
- Tsui, A.B.M. 1996. 'Reticence and anxiety in second language learning'. In K.M. Bailey and D. Nunan (eds.) *Voices from the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- UCLES 2017. 'Teaching qualifications and courses'
<http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/teaching-english/teaching-qualifications/>
 Accessed on 19/07/17.
- Ur, P. 2014. 'Practice and Research-based Theory in English Teacher Development'. *TESOL Teacher Education and Development: Special number of EJALELT* 3 (2).
- van Lier, L. 1988. *The Classroom and the Language Learner*. London: Longman.
- van Lier, L. 1996. *Interaction in the Language Curriculum: Awareness, Autonomy and Authenticity*. New York: Longman.
- Vygotsky, L.S. 1978. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wallace, M. 1991. *Training Foreign Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walsh, S. 2002. 'Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom'. *Language Teaching Research* 6: 3-23.
- Walsh, S. 2006. *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. 2006b. 'Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom' *English Language Teaching Journal* 60/2: 133-141.
- Walsh, S. 2011. *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. 2013. *Classroom Discourse and Teacher Development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Walsh, S. 2014. 'Developing classroom interactional competence'. *Language Issues: The ESOL journal*. 25/1: 4-8
- Walsh, S. and Li, L. 2016. 'Classroom talk, interaction and collaboration'. In G. Hall (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Oxon: Routledge. 486-498.

- Waring, H.Z. 2009. 'Moving out of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback): A Single Case Analysis'. *Language Learning* 59/4: 796-824.
- Weir, C. and Roberts, J. 1994. *Evaluation in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wells, G. 1999. *Dialogic Inquiry: Towards a Sociocultural Practice and Theory of Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilkinson, S. 2004. 'Focus group research'. In Silverman, D. (ed.) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Willis, J. 1992. 'Inner and outer: spoken discourse in the language classroom'. In M. Coulthard (ed.) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.

7 Appendices

Appendix A: SETT framework (Walsh 2006)

<i>Mode</i>	<i>Pedagogic goals</i>	<i>Interactional features</i>
Managerial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single, extended teacher turn which uses explanations and/or instructions The use of transitional markers The use of confirmation checks An absence of learner contributions
Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide language practice around a piece of material To elicit responses in relation to the material To check and display answers To clarify when necessary To evaluate contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predominance of IRF pattern Extensive use of display questions Form-focused feedback Corrective repair The use of scaffolding
Skills and systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enable learners to produce correct forms To enable learners to manipulate the target language To provide corrective feedback To provide learners with practice in sub-skills To display correct answers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of direct repair The use of scaffolding Extended teacher turns Display questions Teacher echo Clarification requests Form-focused feedback
Classroom context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enable learners to express themselves clearly To establish a context To promote oral fluency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extended learner turns. Short teacher turns Minimal repair Content feedback Referential questions Scaffolding Clarification requests

<i>Interactional feature</i>	<i>Description</i>
(A) Scaffolding	(1) Reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution). (2) Extension (extending a learner's contribution). (3) Modelling (correcting a learner's contribution).
(B) Direct repair	Correcting an error quickly and directly.
(C) Content feedback	Giving feedback to the message rather than the words used.
(D) Extended wait-time	Allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for students to respond or formulate a response.
(E) Referential questions	Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer.
(F) Seeking clarification	(1) Teacher asks a student to clarify something the student has said. (2) Student asks teacher to clarify something the teacher has said.
(G) Confirmation checks	Making sure that the teacher has correctly understood the learner's contribution.
(H) Extended learner turn	Learner turn of more than one clause.
(I) Teacher echo	(1) Teacher repeats a previous utterance. (2) Teacher repeats a learner's contribution.
(J) Teacher interruptions	Interrupting a learner's contribution.
(K) Extended teacher turn	Teacher turn of more than one clause.
(L) Turn completion	Completing a learner's contribution for the learner.
(M) Display questions	Asking questions to which the teacher knows the answer.
(N) Form-focused feedback	Giving feedback on the words used, not the message.

(From Walsh 2006: 66-7)

Classroom Interactional Competence Teacher Development Workshop

1. Introduction

1.1 Discussion

- What is your teaching context? Who / where / what do you teach?
- Have you ever watched or listened to yourself teaching? If so, what did you find out?
- In what ways do teachers create opportunities for learning through their choice of language?

1.2 Two extracts

Read the two extracts of classroom interaction below. Discuss:

- What are the differences between the two extracts?
- Which teacher uses language to create more opportunities for learning? How?

Extract A

1 T: ok so let's talk about weekend activities (.) what did you do last weekend Nina?
2 L1: I went shopping
3 T: ok good (.) how about you Marcus?
4 L2: I go to the cinema to see er:=
5 T: =go? what's the past tense?
6 L2: er went
7 T: good (.) can say that sentence again Marcus
8 L2: I went to the cinema
9 T: good (.) you went to the cinema (.) and what did you do Dana?
10 L3: same Marcus I went to the cinema
11 T: you went to the cinema too (.) ok great (.) so open your books...

Extract B

1 T: ok so let's talk about weekend activities (.) what did you do last weekend Nina?
2 L1: I went shopping
3 T: oh really (.) did you buy anything?
4 L1: yes I buy something er for my friend
5 T: ah:
6 L1 for her birthday
7 T: you bought a birthday present?
8 L1: yes a present and we celebrate er celebrated her birthday
9 T: you went to a party?
10 L1: a party yes
11 T: great sounds like fun (.) how about you Marcus, did you go to a party?
12 L2: I go to the cinema to see er film er Pirates=
13 T: you saw Pirates of the Caribbean?
14 L2: yes but er it was er not good
15 L3: I saw it too!
16 L2: (laughs) I think it was not good
17 T: oh you didn't like it. what did you think Dana, did you like the film?
18 L3: yes!
19 L2: (laughs) why do you like it?
20 L3: it's funny
21 L2: I think it's boring (laughs)
22 T: (laughs) ok interesting so Dana thought the film it was funny but Marcus thought it was boring (.) has anyone else seen it?

1

2. Context

2.1 Teaching context

Look at the picture of a classroom in the UK. What is the teaching context?



Video screenshot from Harmer (2007)

2.2 Teaching micro-contexts

Look at the pictures of the same classroom at different stages of the lesson.

Which stage of the lesson is it? What do you think the teacher is doing and saying?



Video screenshots from Harmer (2007)

2.3 Classroom modes

Walsh (2006) describes 4 teaching micro-contexts, which he calls 'classroom modes', that are typical in language classrooms:

- **Managerial mode**
The main focus is on the management of learning and the setting up of activities.
- **Materials mode**
The main focus is on the use of a text, audio recording, video, or other materials.
- **Skills and Systems mode**
The main focus is on particular language items, vocabulary or a specific skill.
- **Classroom context mode**
The main focus is on eliciting opinions or ideas from the learners

'L2 Classroom Modes' adapted from Walsh (2006: 166)

Discuss in groups:

- Which of the four pictures (a, b, c or d) above might represent each classroom mode?
- What kind of language do you expect the teacher to use in each mode?

2.4 Video observation task

Watch an extract from an upper-intermediate lesson in a UK language school.

List the classroom modes in the order they appear below:

Classroom modes in the video

- 1) *Managerial mode*
- 2)
- 3)
- 4)
- 5)
- 6)
- 7)
- 8)

Compare your list with a partner's list.

Tell your partner what happened in each classroom mode.

3. Features of interaction

3.1 Interactional features

Complete the table with 'interactional features' (Walsh 2006: 67) from the box below:

Referential questions	Display questions	Seeking clarification
Extended teacher turn	Content feedback	Scaffolding
Extended wait-time	Teacher echo	Direct repair
Extended learner turn	Form-focused feedback	Teacher interruptions

Feature	Description
	(1) Reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution). (2) Extension (extending a learner's contribution). (3) Modelling (correcting a learner's contribution).
	Correcting an error quickly and directly.
	Giving feedback to the message rather than the words used.
	Allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for learners to respond or formulate a response.
	Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer.
	(1) Teacher asks a learner to clarify something the learner has said. (2) Learner asks the teacher to clarify something the teacher has said.
	Making sure that the teacher has correctly understood the learner's contribution.
	Learner turn of more than one clause.
	(1) Teacher repeats a previous utterance. (2) Teacher repeats a learner's contribution.
	Interrupting a learner's contribution.
	Teacher turn of more than one clause.
	Completing a learner's contribution for the learner.
<i>Display questions</i>	Asking questions to which the teacher knows the answer.
	Giving feedback on the words used, not the message.

Adapted from Walsh (2006: 67)

Work in pairs. Comment on what you understand by each of the features. Discuss:

- Which features would you expect to help or hinder learner contributions?
- Which of these features did you see in the video?
- Which features would you expect to see in each of the classroom modes?

3.2 Video observation task

You are going to watch a 2-minute clip of the video again. In this clip, the teacher is eliciting opinions and ideas from the learners. The pedagogic goals of this stage of the lesson are:

- to elicit predictions from learners
- to promote oral fluency and enable learners to express themselves clearly.

Which interactional features do you think you will see in this extract?

Watch the video clip. Tick (✓) the interactional features that you see:

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Direct repair | <input type="checkbox"/> Content feedback | <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher echo |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Display question | <input type="checkbox"/> Turn-completion | <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher interruptions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Scaffolding | <input type="checkbox"/> Extended wait-time | <input type="checkbox"/> Extended learner turn |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Form-focused feedback | <input type="checkbox"/> Extended teacher turn | <input type="checkbox"/> Seeking clarification |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmation checks | <input type="checkbox"/> Referential questions | |

Share with a partner. Did you spot the same features?

3.3 Transcript analysis

Work in pairs. Your trainer will give you transcript of the video extract. Highlight interactional features in the transcript. For example:

T	ok (.) can I stop you (.) let's have a look (.) and let's listen to some of your ideas um so let's have a think first of all what kind of man is he anyone	
L7	(ugly)	
T	ugly (laughs)	→ (REFERENTIAL QUESTION)
LL	{laughs}	
T	ok ugly perhaps yes	→ (TEACHER ECHO)
L5	maybe (.) in his 40 (laughs)	
T	in his 40s	
L5	yes (laughs)	

Watch part of the video extract again and read the transcript at the same time. Highlight more features that you notice in the video. Compare transcripts in pairs.

4. Features of Classroom Interactional Competence

4.1 Jigsaw reading

Walsh (2014) presented a conceptualisation of Classroom Interactional Competence. He outlined three features of CIC:

1. Alignment of pedagogic goals and language use
2. Shaping learner contributions in feedback
3. Creating space for learning

Your trainer will give you a text describing one of these features. Highlight the main points in the text and be ready to share them with your group.

Share the main points of the text with your group. Make notes in the boxes below:

Alignment of pedagogic goals and language use

Shaping learner contributions in feedback

Creating space for learning

4.2 Discussion

Work in groups. Considering the features of CIC outlined above, look at the video transcript again. Discuss:

- Are the teacher's pedagogic goals and language use aligned? How appropriate is the teacher's language use in this extract?
- Does the teacher shape learner contributions in feedback? If so, how?
- Does the teacher create space for learning? If so, how?
- How could the teacher improve her CIC?

5. Developing our CIC

5.1 Discussion

Work in pairs. Discuss the following questions:

- How do you interact with your learners? How similar / different is your classroom interaction to the classroom interaction in the video?
- What features of interaction do you think you would find in a video recording of your one of your lessons?
- How would you describe classroom interactional competence in your teaching context?

5.2 Action plan

Evaluate your own classroom interaction by following the steps below (Walsh 2006: 166):

- 1 Make a 10-15 minute recording (audio/video) of one of your lessons. Try and choose a part of the lesson involving both you and your learners.
- 2 Listen to the recording as soon as possible after the lesson. The purpose of the first listening is to analyse the extract according to classroom mode. Decide which modes are in operation.
- 3 Listen to the recording a second time and use the list of interactional features to keep a tally of different features of your teacher talk. Transcribe an extract if this helps you.
- 4 Evaluate your teacher talk in the light of your overall aim and modes used. How appropriate was your use of language in this segment?
- 5 Bring your recording / transcription to the next workshop for discussion

6. Conclusion

Work in pairs. Discuss the answers to the following questions:

- What is Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC)?
- How is CIC linked to context?
- What are features of CIC?
- How can we develop our CIC?

References and further reading

- Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th edition with DVD) Harlow: Pearson Longman.
- Long, M. 1983. 'Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of meaning', *Applied Linguistics* 4: 126-41.
- Nunan, D. 2004. *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Thompson, G. 1997. 'Training teachers to ask questions'. *English Language Teaching Journal* 51/2: 99-105.
- Thornbury, S. 1996. 'Teachers research teacher talk' *English Language Teaching Journal* 50: 279-89.
- van Lier, L. 1988. *The Classroom and the Language Learner*. London: Longman.
- Walsh, S. 2006. *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. 2006b. 'Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom.' *English Language Teaching Journal* 60/2: 133-141.
- Walsh, S. 2011. *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. 2013. *Classroom Discourse and Teacher Development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Walsh, S. 2014. 'Developing classroom interactional competence'. *Language Issues: The ESOL journal*. 25/1: 4-8

Classroom Interactional Competence Trainer's notes

Summary

Focus Classroom interaction

Aims

- To raise participants' awareness of classroom interactional processes
- To equip participants with the tools to evaluate their own Classroom Interactional Competence

Contexts Experienced in-service teachers

Duration 120 minutes

Preparation

- You need a copy of *The Practice of English Language Teaching DVD* (Harmer 2007) – Laura's lesson (See Appendix 1 for transcript).
- You need the 'Classroom Interactional Competence' PowerPoint
- You need the 'Classroom Interactional Competence' Participant book
- Make sure you have a projector, a DVD player and speakers to show the PowerPoint and play the video.
- Copy and cut up the 'Interactional features' cards in Appendix 2 – you need one set of cards for each pair of participants.
- Copy the 'Video extract transcript' in Appendix 3 – you need one copy for each participant.
- Copy the "Annotated video extract transcript" in Appendix 4 – you need one copy for an answer key.
- Make sure you have highlighter pens for Activity 3.3.
- Copy and cut up the 'Jigsaw reading texts' in Appendix 5 – you need one text for each participant.

Learning outcomes

By the end of the workshop, participants will be:

- more aware of classroom interactional processes and the effect they have on language learning
- able to analyse classroom data using metalanguage in Walsh's (2006) SETT framework.
- able to describe features of Walsh's (2006) concept of Classroom Interactional Competence.
- motivated to analyse and evaluate their own classroom interaction.

1. Introduction - 20 minutes

1.1 Discussion (10 minutes)

- Ask participants to work in pairs and discuss the three questions (PPT Slide 2).
- Monitor and listen to find out participants' teaching contexts, their previous experience of recording classroom interaction and what they already know about the relationship between language use and learning.
- Feedback as a whole group.
- Show the four 'Overview' questions (PPT Slide 3)
- Tell participants they will hopefully be able to answer the questions by the end of the workshop.

1.2 Two extracts (10 minutes)

- Tell participants that they will find out what classroom interactional competence is by examining two extracts of classroom interaction.
- Draw participants' attention to the two extracts and ask them to work in pairs to notice the differences between them (PPT Slide 4).
- Monitor and listen to pairs to find out what they already know about classroom interactional competence and features of interaction.

1.2 Suggested answers

- **What are the differences between the two extracts?**

The teacher responds to the content of what learners are saying in Extract B.

The teacher focuses on language/form of what learners are saying in Extract A.

The teacher helps the learners express their ideas in Extract B, but closes down the interaction in Extract A.

Extract B is much longer than Extract A with more language and ideas.

Extract A is typical of a classroom context, whereas Extract B is typical of a conversation.

- **Which teacher uses language to create more opportunities for learning? How?**

The teacher in Extract B uses language to create more opportunities for learning.

The teacher does this by modelling language students can use to express their ideas, reformulating and responding to the content of what they are saying. The teacher opens up the interaction to involve other learners and gives learners space to express themselves.

- Show the quotation (PPT Slide 5) that explains the meaning of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC).
- Tell participants that Extract B is a good example of a teacher who has CIC.
- Show participants the triangular relationship of language, learning and interaction (PPT Slide 6). Talk through how they are all interconnected and use quotations to support the ideas. Emphasise the importance of interaction in language teaching – interaction IS language and learning.

2. Context – 30 minutes

2.1 Teaching context (5 minutes)

- Draw participants' attention to the picture of the classroom (PPT Slide 7). Elicit ideas about the teaching context and how similar to / different it is from their own contexts.

2.2 Teaching micro-contexts

- Ask participants to work in pairs and discuss the four pictures (PPT Slide 8).
- Participants guess the stage of the lesson that the teacher is in and imagine what she is doing and saying.
- Feedback as a whole group.

2.3 Classroom modes (5 minutes)

- Introduce the four classroom modes (PPT Slide 9).
- Ask participants to discuss the two questions (PPT Slide 10).
- Monitor and listen to find out what participants already know about modes and language use.

2.4 Video observation task (20 minutes)

- Prepare the video so that it shows the whole of 'Laura's lesson'.
- Tell participants that they are going to watch an extract from an upper-intermediate class in a UK language school. Explain that the previous pictures were all taken from this video (PPT Slide 11).
- Ask participants to watch the whole extract and write down the different modes that they observe. Tell them there are about 8 modes in total and the first one is managerial mode.
- Participants watch the video and write down the modes.
- Feedback – participants check with each other.
- Feedback as a whole group – ask participants to compare their list of modes with my list (PPT Slide 12). Elicit any differences and discuss.

2.4 Suggested answers

1. Managerial mode
2. Classroom context mode
3. Skills and systems mode
4. Managerial mode
5. Classroom context mode
6. Managerial mode
7. Materials mode / skills and systems mode
8. Managerial mode

3. Features of interaction - 35 minutes

3.1 Interactional features (15 minutes)

- Tell participants they you will now look at some specific features of interaction that can be found in different classroom modes.

- Ask participants if they would prefer to match the features with the definitions with the cut-ups (Appendix 2) or write the features in the gaps in their Participant books.
- Hand out cut-ups to pairs of participants.
- Participants work in pairs and match the features and the descriptions.
- Participants make write the features in their Participant books.
- Ask participants to discuss the three questions in pairs (PPT Slide 14).
- Feedback as a whole group.

3.1 Suggested answers (see Appendix 2)

- **Which features would you expect to help or hinder learner contributions?**

Help – scaffolding, extended learner turn, Extended wait-time

Hinder – teacher echo, teacher interruptions, extended teacher turn

- **Which of these features did you see in the video?**

Teacher echo, scaffolding, referential questions, seeking clarification, turn-completion

- **Which features would you expect to see in each of the classroom modes?**

Managerial mode – extended teacher turn

Materials mode – Display questions, form-focused feedback, direct repair

Skills and systems mode – Display questions, teacher echo, form-focused feedback, extended teacher turn, scaffolding

Classroom context mode – Extended learner turns, content feedback, referential questions, scaffolding, seeking clarification.

3.2 Video observation task (10 minutes)

- Prepare the video so it shows the 'Classroom context mode' extract (41.58-44.12) from lines 51-114 in the transcript (Appendix 1).
- Tell participants that they are going to watch a 2-minute clip of the video again (PPT Slide 15).
- Explain the pedagogic goals of this stage of the lesson.
- Ask participants to predict the interactional features they will see in the extract.
- Participants watch and tick the interactional features that they see.
- Play the video clip.
- Feedback – check with a partner.
- Feedback as a whole group

3.2 Suggested answers

Teacher echo

Referential question

Content feedback

Scaffolding

Seeking clarification

Extended learner turn

Turn completion

3.3 Transcript analysis (10 minutes)

- Give participants the transcript of the extract (Appendix 3)

- Ask participants to work in pairs and highlight the interactional features in the transcript. Show example (PPT Slide 16).
- If necessary, participants can watch the video again while they read.
- Participants compare transcripts in pairs.
- Feedback as a whole group. Use annotated transcript (Appendix 4) as answer key

3.3 Suggested answers

See Annotated video extract transcript in Appendix 4.

4. Features of CIC - 20 minutes

4.1 Jigsaw reading (15 minutes)

- Introduce the three features of Classroom interactional Competence (PPT Slide 17).
- Tell participants that they will each read a text describing one of these features.
- Hand out one text to each participant (Appendix 5). Make sure at least one participant reads each text. Ask participants to highlight the main points in the text and be ready to share them with a new group.
- After participants have read their texts, re-group them so that at least one person who read one text is in a new group.
- Participants share the main points with their groups and make notes in the boxes in their Participant books.

4.1 Suggested answers

See texts in Appendix 5

4.2 Discussion (5 minutes)

- Tell participants that they can now go back to the transcript and use their knowledge of the theory to decide how much interactional competence the teacher has in the video.
- Ask participants to work in groups, look at the transcript again and discuss the four questions (PPT Slide 18).
- Feedback as a whole group.

4.2 Suggested answers

- **Are the teacher's pedagogic goals and language use aligned? How appropriate is the teacher's language use in this extract?**

Yes the goals and language use are aligned. The aim of this stage is to promote oral fluency, enable learners to express themselves, and elicit questions, so referential questions, scaffolding and content feedback are used appropriately.

- **Does the teacher shape learner contributions in feedback? If so, how?**

Yes she uses lots of scaffolding – particularly modelling and reformulation.

- **Does the teacher create space for learning? If so, how?**

She uses a bit too much teacher echo and fills the space. The pace is very fast-moving so some learners might not be able to keep up.

- **How could the teacher improve her CIC?**

Reduce teacher echo, increase wait-time.

5. Developing our CIC - 10 minutes

5.1 Discussion (5 minutes)

- Tell participants that we will now focus on how we can develop OUR Classroom Interactional Competence. Tell anecdote about how you have recorded yourself teaching and learned from the whole process.
- Ask participants to work in pairs and discuss the questions (PPT Slide 19)
- Monitor and listen to find out how they predict their own CIC to be.
- Feedback – focus on the differences between teaching contexts.

5.2 Action plan (5 minutes)

- Talk through the stages of the action plan (PPT Slide 20). Ask participants to record themselves and bring the transcriptions to the next workshop.

6. Conclusion - 5 minutes

- Ask participants what they think the conclusion to the workshop would be. Participants write a conclusion in pairs.
- Return to the four questions from the beginning of the session (PPT Slide 21). See if participants can answer the questions.

6. Suggested answers

1. What is Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC)?

Effectively managing interaction in the classroom in order to create opportunities for learning.

2. How is CIC linked to context?

Classroom interaction will change according to both the teaching context and also the micro-context of the lesson.

3. What are features of CIC?

Shaping learner contributions, giving space for learning and aligning pedagogic goals and language use.

4. How can we develop our CIC?

Record ourselves, transcribe, analyse and evaluate strengths and weaknesses in a particular micro-context of a lesson. Create our own action plans for our teaching contexts.

Appendix 1: Video transcript

1) Managerial mode

- 1 T right good morning everyone um I'm gonna show you (1) a sign (draws a sign on board and
 2 writes WIFE WANTED) ok this is a sign (.) that I saw (.) somewhere (.) in London ok can you
 3 just read it for me what does it say Pamela
 4 L1 [wife wanted]=
 5 L3 [wife-]
 6 T =wife wanted yes exactly ok so this is a sign saying wife wanted (1) I'd like you to try to
 7 imagine with your partner try to think about where (.) I saw this sign ok so where did I see it
 8 and why did somebody put this sign (.) where they put it (.) ok so with the person next to you
 9 just try to imagine where did I see this sign and what does it mean why did they put this sign
 10 there ok just try to guess with your partner in pairs
 11 LL (Discuss in pairs)

2) Classroom context mode

- 12 T ok can I hear (.) some of your ideas
 13 L2 we think er the er you you saw on the internet
 14 T on the internet
 15 L2 yes
 16 T [ok and the meaning]
 17 L2 [and er] and er the wife er look for a husband
 18 T the wife look for a HUSBAND=
 19 L2 =yes
 20 T hmm do you agree? do you think it's a wife looking for a husband?
 21 LL no
 22 T you think it's the opposite
 23 LL yes
 24 L3 the opposite
 25 T the husband looking for a wife
 26 L3 the [husband looking for a wife]
 27 L2 [the husband looking for a wife yes] (laughs)
 28 T ok ok alright that's ok (laughs) so yes a man looking for his wife yeah so on the internet ok
 29 did you have any other ideas
 30 L4 newspaper=
 31 T =newspaper yeah could have been a newspaper
 32 L5 and some sections help people who is um finding for a date or for a couple
 33 T yes yes trying to look for [(1)] a date
 34 L5 [yes] and they put here um her or his picture and I'm
 35 twenty-five years old and I um I er I don't know her or his profession or something like that=

3) Skills and systems mode

- 36 T =yeah yeah yeah what do you call that kind of advert when you put it in the newspaper to try
 37 to find a partner do you know?
 38 L6 partner finder
 39 T partner finder er yeah something similar
 40 LL (laughs)
 41 T (write on board) a lonely hearts ad ad is short what's the long word (2) ad (1) (makes
 42 lengthening gesture with hands)
 43 LL advertisement=
 44 T =advertisement yeah so a lonely hearts ad um YES (nods head) it could have been (.) yes.

4) Managerial mode

- 45 T so it's a shop (1) and in the window of the shop they had this sign (.) wife wanted (1) in
 46 London (nods head) ehm ok so a man put this advertisement in his shop window ok (.)
 47 now I want you to try to imagine about this man ok and I'm gonna give you some questions
 48 to think about try to imagine what this man is like (.) here are your questions I'll give you one
 49 between two so you can work together (.) with your (.) group
 50 LL (Discuss questions in pairs)

5) Classroom context mode

- 51 T ok (.) can I stop you (.) let's have a look (.) and let's listen to some of your ideas um so let's
 52 have a think first of all what kind of man is he anyone
 53 L7 (ugly)
 54 T ugly (laughs)
 55 LL {laughs)
 56 T ok ugly perhaps yes
 57 L5 maybe (.) in his 40 (laughs)
 58 T in his 40s
 59 L5 yes (laughs)
 60 T ok late 40s mid 40s early-
 61 L5 um mid or late
 62 T mid to late
 63 L5 between mid or late
 64 T mid to late 40s right
 65 L5 yes
 66 T mid to late 40s ok (write on board) right let's think about the woman so what kind of woman
 67 does he want
 68 L5 er younger
 69 T younger
 70 L5 than him
 71 T younger than him right
 72 L5 [yeah]
 73 L8 [obviously]
 74 T obviously right (laughs) er how much younger?=
 75 L5 =beautiful
 76 T beautiful?
 77 L5 beautiful
 78 T ok
 79 L5 um maybe for just for make a construct construct a funny character? funny? character?
 80 T funny? ha ha?
 81 L5 yes if he is um boring a boring person maybe he wants something-
 82 T lively energetic lots of fun
 83 L5 yes
 84 T ok alright yes do you agree?
 85 L1 no
 86 T no ooh Pamela tell me why not (.) that was a definite no
 87 LL (laughs)
 88 L1 because I don't know maybe (.) he knows that if he puts an advertisement in a shop it's
 89 difficult to attract er er beautiful woman
 90 T ok
 91 L1 maybe maybe the women that that er responds the advertisement also needs a husband
 92 T right (laughs) ok (laughs) errrm and finally do you think that many women answered his ad
 93 LL no no
 94 T no?
 95 L8 maybe yes
 96 T maybe? how many do you think?
 97 L8 between ten to twenty
 98 T TEN to twenty (nods head and smiles)

- 99 LL (laughs)
 100 T he was quite successful
 101 LL (laughs)
 102 L9 very crazy
 103 L8 no (there's desperate woman in London)
 104 T there's lots of desperate women in London (LAUGHS)
 105 LL (laughs)
 106 T I see (laughs) how many have you met? (laughs) we'll stop (.)
 107 LL (laughs)
 108 T um (.) Pablo how about you? you said he's crazy-
 109 L3 erm (2) (laughs) he have lucky if he find one (laughs)
 110 T he's lucky if he finds one (.) ok so we've got one (gestures to one learner) ten to twenty
 111 (gestures to another learner) any more?
 112 LL no
 113 T zero none (2)
 114 L8 zero

6) Managerial mode

- 115 T right (.) ok well we're gonna find out the real answers to these questions now ok (.) we're
 116 gonna read a text (.) um it comes from the newspaper (.) the headline (.) special offer (.) I
 117 need a wife (1) so can you read this text and try to find out what the real answers to these
 118 questions are ok (hands out materials)

7) Materials mode / Skills and systems mode

- 119 T ok um so the woman that he wants is (1)
 120 L5 pretty?
 121 T pretty pretty-ish what does this mean pretty-ish? ish is kind of like not exactly Angelina Jolie
 122 BUT not a monster
 123 LL (laughs)
 124 T pretty-ish ok so I you can think of somewhere in between Angelina Jolie and a monster you'll
 125 pretty-ish (waves hand with palm faced down) and erm how old?
 126 LL younger
 127 T younger?
 128 LL younger seventeen
 129 T seventeen-ish to thirty-ish
 130 T ok this ish we can use to kind of say not exactly
 131 L5 you can add ish-
 132 T you can to any adjective or example what colour is my skirt for example
 133 LL green-ish
 134 T green-ish exactly exactly yeah and er it's very common with time what time do you want to
 135 meet hmm twelve-ish?
 136 LL oh
 137 T one-ish? two-ish? ok very common ish
 138 LL ish
 139 T do you love him? hmm ish
 140 LL (laughs)
 141 T for example for example (laughs)

8) Managerial mode

- 142 T ok so from this text um I'm now going to divide you into two groups ok into men and women
 143 um so you guys are the men (gestures with hands) ok and you guys are the women
 144 (gestures with hands) now (claps hands) men um I'd like you to imagine that you are the
 145 shopkeeper ok and you want to um create some questions that you can ask your potential
 146 wives when they come for your meeting ok I'd like you to write about um five or six questions
 147 (.) questions that you think would be good for finding out if this woman is the perfect wife for
 148 you (.) girls (.) Pablo

- 149 LL (laughs)
- 150 T um ok I want you to imagine you've seen this advert ok and you're interested in this man and
- 151 I'd like you to imagine (.) a new personality (.) for yourself (.) so just try to think of perhaps
- 152 some life experience um some characteristics some hobbies some skills maybe you're very
- 153 good at cooking for example maybe a new name a new age that will attract the man ok so
- 154 just three or four minutes just try to think about who you are
- 155 LL (Plan)
- 156 T ok so we've got our characters women you know who you are (.) men you've got your
- 157 questions what's gonna happen now is I'm gonna get the men to come up and stand her and
- 158 I want you to make a circle (gestures circle) but facing out (gestures with hands) ok women
- 159 (.) I want you to also come up but you're gonna make a circle going around (gestures with
- 160 hands) the men sop you're facing um the men ok so that you'll be face-to-face (.) with each
- 161 other (.) so when you're ready you can stand up
- 162 LL (stands up)
- 163 T let's have the men first the men just come here (1) women choose a man and stand in front
- 164 of them
- 165 LL (moves)
- 166 T right ok (1) ok I'm just gonna stand (1) on this chair (1) ok just wait one second (.) ok so um
- 167 I'll clap my hands (claps hands) and when I clap you can start asking your questions (.)
- 168 women at this stage if you want to ask any questions to the man for example how much do
- 169 you earn very important you can ask these questions and um when I clap my hands twice
- 170 (claps hands twice) you can stop and I'll rotate you so that you can talk to another person
- 171 ok? ok READY? and (claps hands) go (whispers)
- 172 LL (asks and answers questions)
- 173 T um alright let's move the men so if the men I you could just move round to the right left your
- 174 let yeah (laughs) ok so just move round so that you have a new partner ok and when you're
- 175 ready (claps hands) go
- 176 LL (asks and answers questions)
- 177 T ok men can I ask you to move around and go onto the next future wife
- 178 LL (asks and answers questions)
- 179 T (claps hands) ok thanks guys er that's wonderful um I hope you enjoyed talking to each
- 180 other you can sit back down now and just relax

Transcription system (adapted from Walsh 2013: 145-146)

T:	teacher
L1: L2:	identified learner
LL:	several learners at once or the whole class
[can you see it?] [yeah yeah]	overlapping between teacher and learner
=	turn continues, or one turn follows another without any pause (latching)
(.)	pause of one second or less
(2)	silence; length given in seconds
::	a colon after a vowel or a word is used to show that the sound is extended. The number of colons shows the length of the extension.
?	a question mark indicates that there is slightly rising intonation
-	a dash indicates an abrupt cut-off, where the speaker stopped speaking suddenly
CAPS	capital letters indicate that the speaker spoke the capitalised portion of the utterance at higher volume than the speaker's normal volume
(T shows picture)	non-verbal actions or editor's comments are in parenthesis
((word))	when a word appears in double parenthesis, it indicates that the transcriber has guessed what was said, because it was indecipherable on the recording.

Appendix 2: Interactional features

Scaffolding	(1) Reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution). (2) Extension (extending a learner's contribution). (3) Modelling (correcting a learner's contribution).
Direct repair	Correcting an error quickly and directly.
Content feedback	Giving feedback to the message rather than the words used.
Extended wait-time	Allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for learners to respond or formulate a response.
Referential questions	Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer.
Seeking clarification	(1) Teacher asks a learner to clarify something the learner has said. (2) Learner asks the teacher to clarify something the teacher has said.
Confirmation checks	Making sure that the teacher has correctly understood the learner's contribution.
Extended learner turn	Learner turn of more than one clause.
Teacher echo	(1) Teacher repeats a previous utterance. (2) Teacher repeats a learner's contribution.
Teacher interruption	Interrupting a learner's contribution.
Extended teacher turn	Teacher turn of more than one clause.
Turn completion	Completing a learner's contribution for the learner.
Display questions	Asking questions to which the teacher knows the answer.
Form-focused feedback	Giving feedback on the words used, not the message.

Appendix 3: Video extract transcript

- 51 T ok (.) can I stop you (.) let's have a look (.) and let's listen to some of your ideas um so let's have a
 52 think first of all what kind of man is he anyone
 53 L7 (ugly)
 54 T ugly (laughs)
 55 LL {laughs}
 56 T ok ugly perhaps yes
 57 L5 maybe (.) in his 40 (laughs)
 58 T in his 40s
 59 L5 yes (laughs)
 60 T ok late 40s mid 40s early-
 61 L5 um mid or late
 62 T mid to late
 63 L5 between mid or late
 64 T mid to late 40s right
 65 L5 yes
 66 T mid to late 40s ok (write on board) right let's think about the woman so what kind of woman does he
 67 want
 68 L5 er younger
 69 T younger
 70 L5 than him
 71 T younger than him right
 72 L5 [yeah]
 73 L8 [obviously]
 74 T obviously right (laughs) er how much younger?=
 75 L5 =beautiful
 76 T beautiful?
 77 L5 beautiful
 78 T ok
 79 L5 um maybe for just for make a construct construct a funny character? funny? character?
 80 T funny? ha ha?
 81 L5 yes if he is um boring a boring person maybe he wants something-
 82 T lively energetic lots of fun
 83 L5 yes
 84 T ok alright yes do you agree?
 85 L1 no
 86 T no ooh Pamela tell me why not (.) that was a definite no
 87 LL (laughs)
 88 L1 because I don't know maybe (.) he knows that if he puts an advertisement in a shop it's difficult to
 89 attract er er beautiful woman
 90 T ok
 91 L1 maybe maybe the women that that er responds the advertisement also needs a husband
 92 T right (laughs) ok (laughs) errrm and finally do you think that many women answered his ad
 93 LL no no
 94 T no?
 95 L8 maybe yes
 96 T maybe? how many do you think?
 97 L8 between ten to twenty
 98 T TEN to twenty (nods head and smiles)
 99 LL (laughs)
 100 T he was quite successful
 101 LL (laughs)
 102 L9 very crazy
 103 L8 no (there's desperate woman in London)
 104 T there's lots of desperate women in London (LAUGHS)
 105 LL (laughs)
 106 T I see (laughs) how many have you met? (laughs) we'll stop (.)
 107 LL (laughs)
 108 T um (.) Pablo how about you? you said he's crazy-
 109 L3 erm (2) (laughs) he have lucky if he find one (laughs)
 110 T he's lucky if he finds one (.) ok so we've got one (gestures to one learner) ten to twenty (gestures to
 111 another learner) any more?
 112 LL no
 113 T zero none (2)
 114 L8 zero

Appendix 4: Annotated video extract

			(TRANSITIONAL MARKER)
51	T	ok (.) can I stop you (.) let's have a look (.) and let's listen to some of your ideas um so let's have a	
52		think first of all what kind of man is he anyone	
53	L7	(ugly)	(REFERENTIAL QUESTION)
54	T	ugly (laughs)	(TEACHER ECHO)
55	LL	(laughs)	
56	T	ok ugly perhaps yes	(CONTENT FEEDBACK)
57	L5	maybe (.) in his 40 (laughs)	
58	T	in his 40s	(SCAFFOLDING - Reformulation)
59	L5	yes (laughs)	
60	T	ok late 40s mid 40s early-	(SCAFFOLDING - Modelling)
61	L5	um mid or late	
62	T	mid to late	(SCAFFOLDING - Reformulation)
63	L5	between mid or late	
64	T	mid to late 40s right	(SCAFFOLDING - Extension)
65	L5	yes	(TEACHER ECHO)
66	T	mid to late 40s ok (write on board) right let's think about the woman so what kind of woman does he	
67		want?	(REFERENTIAL QUESTION)
68	L5	er younger	(REFERENTIAL QUESTION)
69	T	younger	(TEACHER ECHO)
70	L5	than him	
71	T	younger than him right	(SCAFFOLDING - Extension)
72	L5	[yeah]	(TEACHER ECHO)
73	L8	[obviously]	
74	T	obviously right (laughs) er how much younger? =	(REFERENTIAL QUESTION)
75	L5	=beautiful	
76	T	beautiful?	(SEEKING CLARIFICATION)
77	L5	beautiful	(SEEKING CLARIFICATION)
78	T	ok	(EXTENDED LEARNER TURN)
79	L5	um maybe for just for make a construct construct a funny character? funny? character?	
80	T	funny? ha ha?	
81	L5	yes if he is um boring a boring person maybe he wants something-	
82	T	lively energetic lots of fun	(TURN COMPLETION / SCAFFOLDING)
83	L5	yes	
84	T	ok alright yes do you agree?	(REFERENTIAL QUESTION)
85	L1	no	
86	T	no ooh Pamela tell me why not (.) that was a definite no	(REFERENTIAL QUESTION)
87	LL	(laughs)	
88	L1	because I don't know maybe (.) he knows that if he puts an advertisement in a shop it's difficult to	
89		attract er er beautiful woman	(EXTENDED LEARNER TURN)
90	T	ok	(CONTENT FEEDBACK)
91	L1	maybe maybe the women that that er responds the advertisement also needs a husband	
92	T	right (laughs) ok (laughs) errrm and finally do you think that many women answered his ad	
93	LL	no no	
94	T	no?	(SEEKING CLARIFICATION)
95	L8	maybe yes	(SEEKING CLARIFICATION)
96	T	maybe? how many do you think?	(REFERENTIAL QUESTION)
97	L8	between ten to twenty	
98	T	TEN to twenty (nods head and smiles)	(TEACHER ECHO)
99	LL	(laughs)	
100	T	he was quite successful	(SCAFFOLDING - MODELLING)
101	LL	(laughs)	(LEARNER-INITIATED TURN)
102	L9	very crazy	(SCAFFOLDING - Reformulation)
103	L8	no (there's desperate woman in London)	
104	T	there's lots of desperate women in London (LAUGHS)	
105	LL	(laughs)	(CONTENT FEEDBACK)
106	T	I see (laughs) how many have you met? (laughs) we'll stop (.)	(REFERENTIAL QUESTION)
107	LL	(laughs)	
108	T	um (.) Pablo how about you? you said he's crazy-	(REFERENTIAL QUESTION)
109	L3	erm (2) (laughs) he have lucky if he find one (laughs)	
110	T	he's lucky if he finds one (.) ok so we've got one (gestures to one learner) ten to twenty (gestures to	
111		another learner) any more?	(REFERENTIAL QUESTION)
112	LL	no	(SCAFFOLDING - Reformulation)
113	T	zero none (2)	(SCAFFOLDING - Modelling)
114	L8	zero	

Appendix 5: Jigsaw reading texts

Alignment of pedagogic goals and language use

While it is true to say that CIC is highly context specific, not only to a particular class, but to a specific moment in the discourse, there are a number of features of CIC which are common to all contexts. First, teachers may demonstrate CIC through their ability to use language which is both convergent to the pedagogic goal of the moment and which is appropriate to the learners. Language use and pedagogic goals must work together. This position assumes that pedagogic goals and the language used to achieve them are inextricably intertwined and constantly being re-adjusted (see, Walsh 2003; Seedhouse 2004). Any evidence of CIC must therefore demonstrate that interlocutors are using discourse which is both appropriate to specific pedagogic goals and to the agenda of the moment.

(Walsh 2014: 5)

Creating space for learning

Turning now to a second feature of CIC, and one which, I believe, is common to all language teaching contexts, is the extent to which it facilitates interactional space; learners need space for learning to participate in the discourse, to contribute to class conversations and to receive feedback on their contributions. In short, CIC creates 'space for learning' (Walsh and Li 2012). There are a number of ways in which space for learning can be maximised. These include increased wait-time, by resisting the temptation to 'fill silence' (by reducing teacher echo), by promoting extended learner turns and by allowing planning time. By affording learners space, they are better able to contribute to the process of co-constructing meanings – something which lies at the very heart of learning through interaction.

(Walsh 2014: 5)

Shaping learner contributions in feedback

Shaping involves taking a learner response and doing something with it rather than simply accepting it. For example, a response may be paraphrased, using slightly different vocabulary or grammatical structures; it may be summarised or extended in some way; a response may require scaffolding so that learners are assisted in saying what they really mean; it may be recast (cf Lyster 1999): 'handed back' to the learner but with some small changes included. By shaping learner contributions and by helping learners to really articulate what they mean, teachers are performing a more central role in the interaction, while, at the same time, maintaining a student-centred, decentralised approach to teaching.

What is evident from the discussion here is that feedback is one of the most important interactional practices a teacher can master since it has the greatest potential to influence learning. The ways in which teachers acknowledge a contribution, evaluate it and make modifications is a skill which requires detailed understanding and practice. All too often, when we look at recordings of teachers, the feedback offered tends to be evaluative, normally comprising a brief comment such as 'thanks', 'right', 'excellent', and so on. While this kind of feedback does have its place, more subtle types of shaping are necessary, I suggest, if we are to really help learners communicate their intended meaning. Excessive use of acknowledgement tokens (typically discourse markers such as *right*, *ok*, *great*, *excellent*, etc.) may actually close down an interaction and signal the end of an exchange.

(Walsh 2014: 5-6)

Appendix D: Workshop PowerPoint slides

Classroom Interactional Competence

Teacher Development Workshop

King's College London
24 June 2017
Lauren Perkins

Introduction

- What is your teaching context? Who / where / what do you teach?
- Have you ever watched or listened to yourself teaching? If so, what did you find out?
- In what ways do teachers create opportunities for learning through their choice of language?

Overview

1. What is Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC)?
2. How is it linked to context?
3. What are the features of CIC?
4. How can we develop it?

Two extracts

- What are the differences between the two extracts?
- Which teacher uses language to create more opportunities for learning?

Classroom Interactional Competence is...

'Teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning.'

Walsh 2006: 132

Classroom Interactional Competence

Learners 'learn to communicate by communicating' (Nunan 2004: 8)

Language 'lies at the heart of everything' (Walsh 2011: 2)

Teachers need to understand 'the effects of interactional features on learning opportunity' (Walsh 2006: 135)

Language is 'the vehicle and object of study' (Long 1983: 37)

The interaction which takes place in the classroom IS the learning - they are one and the same thing (van Lier 1988)

Context

Micro-contexts

Classroom modes

Managerial mode
The main focus is on the management of learning and the setting up of activities.

Materials mode
The main focus is on the use of a text, audio recording, video, or other materials.

Skills and Systems mode
The main focus is on particular language items, vocabulary or a specific skill.

Classroom context mode
The main focus is on eliciting opinions or ideas from the learners.

Classroom modes in the video

1. Managerial mode
2. Classroom context mode
3. Skills and systems mode
4. Managerial mode
5. Classroom context mode
6. Managerial mode
7. Materials mode / skills and systems mode
8. Managerial mode

Features of interaction

Direct repair	Display questions	Scaffolding
Form-focused feedback	Content feedback	Teacher echo
Turn-completion	Extended wait-time	Extended teacher turn
Extended learner turn	Seeking clarification	Referential questions
	Teacher interruptions	Confirmation checks

Features of interaction

- Which features would you expect to help or hinder learner contributions?
- Which of these features did you see in the video?
- Which features would you expect to see in each of the classroom modes?

Transcript analysis

Features of CIC

1. Alignment of pedagogic goals and language use
2. Creating space for learning
3. Shaping learner contributions in feedback

Features of CIC

- Are the teacher's pedagogic goals and language use aligned? How appropriate is the teacher's language use in this extract?
- Does the teacher shape learner contributions in feedback? If so, how?
- Does the teacher create space for learning? If so, how?
- How could the teacher improve her CIC?

Developing our CIC

- How do you interact with your learners? How similar / different is your classroom interaction to the classroom interaction in the video?
- What features of interaction do you think you would find in a video recording of your one of your lessons?
- How would you describe classroom interactional competence in your teaching context?

Developing our CIC

1. Make a 10-15 minute recording of one of your lessons.
2. Listen and decide which modes are in operation.
3. Listen and use the list of interactional features to keep a tally of different features of your teacher talk. Transcribe an extract if this helps you.
4. Evaluate your teacher talk in the light of your overall aim and modes used.
5. Bring your recording / transcription to the next workshop for discussion

Conclusion

1. What is Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC)?
2. How is it linked to context?
3. What are the features of CIC?
4. How can we develop it?

Appendix E: Recruitment email to participants

From: (Name)

Date: 15 May 2017 15:00

Dear MA AL & ELT students,

Invitation to participate in a teacher training workshop on 'Classroom Interactional Competence'.

As most of you already know, I am currently studying for an MA in Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching. For my dissertation, I will be delivering and evaluating a teacher training workshop on 'Classroom Interactional Competence'.

I am looking for experienced English teachers who are currently teaching in London to participate in the 2-hour workshop, and take part in a focus group (1 hour) immediately afterwards to evaluate the workshop's effectiveness.

Workshop details

Date: TBC. Either: Saturday 17th June 2017 or Saturday 24th June 2017

Time: 10:30 - 13:30

Place: TBC

Abstract: For a teacher, understanding classroom discourse and interaction is essential for maximising learning opportunities in the classroom. Walsh (2013) put forward the notion of *Classroom Interactional Competence* (CIC), claiming that teachers should develop their CIC, defined as the 'ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning' (2013: 46) if they wish to improve their teaching. In this workshop, participants will look at features of classroom interaction and learn how to use a framework to evaluate their own classroom discourse, with the aim of developing their interactional competence.

If you are interested in participating in the workshop, please let me know which of the above dates (17/24 June) would suit you best. Please reply to this email by the end of this week (Friday 19 May) if possible.

Many thanks in advance, I look forward to hearing from you.

(Name)

Appendix F: Ethical approval

Appendix G: Participant information sheet

Appendix H: Participant consent form

Appendix I: Focus group (FG) transcript and video recording

24th June 2017 – 12.45 – 13.30 (45 minutes)

Link to recording of focus group: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B-IVGiEnYVywM1VrUGFJbFkwWUU>

(The video is also on the accompanying DVD – see the inside of the back cover)

Transcription system (adapted from Walsh 2013: 145-146)

T	Teacher educator (moderator)
P1	Identified participant
PP	Several participants at once or the whole group
=	turn continues, or one turn follows another without any pause (latching)
(.)	pause of one second or less
(2)	silence; length given in seconds
?	a question mark indicates that there is slightly rising intonation
-	a dash indicates an abrupt cut-off, where the speaker stopped speaking suddenly
CAPS	capital letters indicate that the speaker spoke the capitalised portion of the utterance at higher volume than the speaker's normal volume
(laughs)	non-verbal actions or editor's comments are in parenthesis
((word))	when a word appears in double parenthesis, it indicates that the transcriber has guessed what was said, because it was indecipherable on the recording.

Colour-coded key of themes

Outcomes

Classroom modes

Discussion

Metalanguage

Organisation and cohesion

- 1 T **how do you feel?**
- 2 PP (laughs)
- 3 T **we've just had a 2-hour workshop (.) how do you feel now? (1) do you feel=**
- 4 P1 =I don't feel strange by it or anything I thought it was um you know **a useful way to spend two hours**
- 5 (laughs)
- 6 PP (laughs)
- 7 P1 it was it was interesting you know
- 8 P2 yeah it it for me it felt **um it felt worthwhile but not overwhelming** (.) which some things can be if you
- 9 kind of have a workshop or a lecture or whatever which is kind of all- you leave just feeling I don't
- 10 know anything and that's not nice at all and this fortunately wasn't like that
- 11 P3 **I thought the part about the modes that you can be in (.) I don't know why this is the first time I'm**
- 12 **hearing about this to be honest it's really useful (.)**
- 13 PP uh-huh mmm yeah
- 14 P3 **well it would be it's not particularly hard to understand so I think that you know why don't you do this**
- 15 **on a pre-service course on a CELTA or something**
- 16 P4 uh huh
- 17 P1 that's a good point
- 18 P3 **you know cos then it puts the TTT in context**
- 19 PP mmm uh huh
- 20 P3 **you know you're always like my TTT is bad but as we can see it like depends what mode you're in**
- 21 **sometimes it's good so I don't think it'll be all that difficult to include it into a CELTA lesson plan just**
- 22 **what is the what is the mode you're gonna be in during this stage of the lesson**
- 23 P2 I think it's er a useful kind of rebuke in a way because one of the things **I remember from my CELTA**
- 24 **course a long time ago I left having the impression that they always talk about excess TTT you're**

Focus group (FG) transcript

- 25 talking too much don't talk so much that just seems we were never told why but that just seemed to
26 be hammered home stop talking they should be talking not you and like you said it wouldn't have
27 taken long to explain this to show them that sometimes it's better really for teachers to speak a bit
28 more=
- 29 P1 =well without being explicit about it I think it does come into a CELTA in a sense um you know I
30 always tell my trainees that you have to talk you know there's this TTT thing but TTT becomes an
31 issue when um you know people you know are rabbiting on nervously and going off things and just
32 rambling that's what when we talk about TTT that's the stuff that's the stuff that needs to be
33 addressed really but I'd say you know give your instructions give clear instructions ask a couple of
34 ICQs and if you do that then that should be enough you know (.) but I'm not sure you cos they
35 trainees you know are all buzzed up with things the technical thing about all there's this mode and
36 there's that mode and this that and the other might be a little bit sort of freak them out a bit (.)
- 37 T **yeah ok that's what I thought about the CELTA actually it might be a bit too much to take in
38 there but I thought maybe on in-service training courses like the DELTA I think it might be
39 quite useful but it's not on the DELTA at all is it?**
- 40 P3 I don't think so (1)
- 41 T **ok**
- 42 P5 I think it would be very helpful for in-service teachers as well (.) I was just telling you about my
43 experience so as part of the CPD programme as my institution so I videotaped myself and just went
44 over the recordings with my manager and all the time she was saying excessive teacher talk
45 excessive teacher talk time you're talking too much let them talk all these things but we're talking for a
46 reason of course now I would like to go back and just you know do all of these activities with my
47 recordings erm but yeah I think definitely the teachers and the managers need to be aware of these
48 things
- 49 T **ok great**
- 50 P2 I mean on that note I suppose this contradicts what I've just said actually but um it does make sense
51 actually what you said because in initial courses especially short teacher training courses like the
52 CELTA or whatever um trainees you know trainees get a lot of input they get a lot of sessions but
53 especially if they haven't taught before um most of the time I think their mind is just on what am I
54 gonna do in my class tomorrow so to really say oh we need even more input is probably not practical
55 but in-service with people who are working as a kind of input session it would be a lot more it would
56 be invaluable a lot more useful than many sessions that I've had in-service=
- 57 P1 =yeah it gives more opportunities to reflect
- 58 P2 yeah absolutely (.)
- 59 T **ok (.) so thinking about YOU coming to this workshop what did you learn (.) personally what
60 did you learn that you might not have known before? (1) anything?**
- 61 P1 some of that metalanguage stuff referential questions and the other one (display questions) (laughs)
- 62 PP (laughs)
- 63 T **yeah**
- 64 P2 the other one of the two
- 65 T **(laughs) yeah yeah**
- 66 P1 um but you know-
- 67 T **was it useful that metalanguage?**
- 68 P1 yeah
- 69 PP yeah yeah
- 70 P6 yep very much so (1)
- 71 T **ok (2)**

Focus group (FG) transcript

- 72 P1 as was this (.) you know (.) sculpting out of different modes
- 73 PP yep (1)
- 74 T ok
- 75 P2 helps to clarify um ideas that as P3 said are not I think totally new to us but are maybe a bit more
- 76 abstract in our minds or like you said teachers talking is ok it depends that's not a very clear-cut idea
- 77 but for the moment it's ok (.)
- 78 P7 I think the idea of shaping learner feedback I mean it's the stuff you talk about on a lot on the DELTA
- 79 but it's quite bitty the reformulation and direct correction delayed correction and I'd be I'd be keen to
- 80 try recording myself to see to see if the modes apply and what's going on
- 81 T **yep (2) um (1) so do you feel inspired to go and do this yourself? do you feel like this**
- 82 **workshop has inspired you to go and record yourself?**
- 83 PP yeah
- 84 P4 there's a good balance of theory and practical applications we've got clear examples you also
- 85 provided us with your personal examples which makes it look like it is easy and feasible to do (1)
- 86 and it's probably helpful to have some theory as well to know why we are looking at this so I (2) yeah
- 87 T **right yep (.) um (1) ok do you feel do you feel prepared to analyse your own classroom**
- 88 **interaction? like with metalanguage and things like that do you feel like you've got enough**
- 89 **tools to do it?**
- 90 P3 yeah I think so if you especially if you transcribed it (1) you can see it so much more clearly when it's
- 91 written there
- 92 PP yeah yeah
- 93 P3 I think if you're just watching it it's very much like your impressions and it's very quick when you're
- 94 listening so=
- 95 P2 =yeah I think the transcription thing (.) you said it helped you and I think it would be really helpful
- 96 P3 I think it would help you to be critical whereas if you're just watching it you might not be as critical of
- 97 yourself
- 98 P2 it it um really helps I imagine it would really help to depersonalise it it stops becoming oh my god
- 99 that's me that's how I sound that's what I look like but it's not now it's just teacher says this the fact
- 100 that it was me is kind of irrelevant
- 101 T **that's a really good point actually it depersonalises it so you yeah don't feel so invested in it**
- 102 **yep (1) also it's a nice visual representation of it like so you can actually SEE visually like**
- 103 **how much talk there is and-**
- 104 P4 well we used different colours and it was clear to see what the majority of techniques used by the
- 105 teachers by the teacher were and it's probably easier to just use the transcription because when
- 106 you're watching the video you have so many elements that could interfere with your analysis you
- 107 could be focusing on setting or body language a lot of elements that could be useful but again if you
- 108 just want to focus on these interactional features it could be just-
- 109 P5 distracting=
- 110 P4 =distracting yes
- 111 T **right yeah it could be (2) ok um now let's just quickly go through the hand out (1) so at the**
- 112 **beginning I did um a sort of discussion to my aim was to get you thinking about to activate**
- 113 **your schemata or whatever just thinking about your context and sharing it because context**
- 114 **has come in a lot in this so was it helpful the discussion (.) were there any questions that we a**
- 115 **bit off? or (1) what about the last one cos I just wanted to see what you already knew about it**
- 116 P1 yeah I just when I first looked at it when it was on the board I I sort of thought oh you know there's a
- 117 couple of nice questions oh crikey there's a difficult one (laughs)
- 118 T ah yeah yeah yeah

Focus group (FG) transcript

- 119 P2 yeah we well we didn't actually get round to discussing the third one but I was kind of relieved
120 (laughs) to be honest because I wasn't really um sure yeah exactly what you meant er learning
121 through the choice of language so are we talking about er grading language I wasn't really sure what-
- 122 T yeah I was only er sort of seeing what you already knew about how teachers use language but
123 it's a weirdly phrased question I guess the first two are really easy cos they're personal right
124 and they were fine to answer in your experience but number three was sort of
- 125 P3 like an essay question
- 126 P2 and also the wording do teachers create are you talking about me or in general um I was a little
127 unsure
- 128 P3 but I think when me and P7 were discussing it we did touch on most of the points we then covered in
129 the workshop but not in the same detail at all I think we sort of got the gist
- 130 T mmm (2) ok ok yeah so maybe the first two questions but think about the third one or just take
131 it out maybe maybe we don't need to see what you already know cos the NEXT activity the two
132 extracts we kind of seeing what you already knew and you knew loads (laughs) um so yeah I
133 gave an overview with four questions which we will hopefully answer in a minute we'll come
134 back to that but then I wanted to just put it into context straight away instead of starting with
135 theory and starting with Walsh I thought you might fall asleep with that but if I just gave you an
136 example of two extracts you might be able to see straight away what what do you think of
137 these?
- 138 P3 it's really clear
- 139 P1 very clear yeah
- 140 P6 transparent you made things transparent yes
- 141 T ok ok
- 142 P4 especially when you had two examples which have differences so it's easier to compare and contrast
143 instead of just having one and focusing on that one (.) and yeah sorry just er going back to the er third
144 question that we were talking about before I don't think it was actually so unnecessary well it could
145 have just be a bit personalised a little bit more like do you ever think about your choice of language
146 when you're teaching so to create a link with the previous two but I think it was we didn't discuss
147 about it we didn't have time but I think it was it's a relevant question to introduce the workshop just
148 make it personalised (.) personalise it because the first two are about your teaching context and you
149 and your experience so again do you ever think about that
- 150 P7 it's probably good to have a question people aren't too sure about as well because it actually it gets
151 people interested in what you're doing so yeah
- 152 P5 or maybe you could say how do you think your choice of language affects your classroom or
153 classroom interaction
- 154 T yeah (1) ok brilliant
- 155 P1 just getting onto the extracts again sorry (.) um are they authentic? or did you make them up?
- 156 T er yeah that was a question that P3 asked so it's based on authentic examples like that Walsh
157 gives a few in the book but they're not quite as clear as that-
- 158 P1 right
- 159 T so I've adapted it and I've changed it so I had two that are the same
- 160 P1 just slightly- suspicions aroused by the what did you do last weekend Nina you know (laughs) in both
161 of them thinking oh-
- 162 T oh no that's why yeah no I created- so it was all based on like the first one as an example of
163 what I used but then I decided to change it and make one that they're incompetent do you
164 think that affected it because it's not real therefore-
- 165 P1 I did wonder

Focus group (FG) transcript

- 166 T **yeah does that affect the way you looked at it?**
- 167 P1 um-
- 168 P3 [for me no]
- 169 P1 [not particularly no] no but it just it just gave it that slight edge of (1) inauthenticity but nevertheless as
170 an exercise in what you had us do with it it was you know it all worked perfectly well
- 171 P2 it didn't bother me really I mean I noticed the names but they're both I mean as experienced teachers
172 I'm sure these are both situations we can relate to we've seen it we've been in it both are very
173 believable and relatable
- 174 T **yeah I did I did try and find two examples that were like different but similar but I don't know
175 for my purpose at the beginning I was like oh I just want a simple thing just to show the
176 differences (1)**
- 177 P4 I think it was actually helpful to see how the same conversation could go in different ways so it's as a
178 first er example to analyse the first activity it's actually useful to help trainees like us to pick up
179 differences if the extracts are dealing with the same topic then the intro- the first question which
180 introduces the topic is the same one and then you can see how the different- a conversation can
181 develop differently depending on how the teacher erm interacts
- 182 T **yeah cos I didn't want you to say oh but this is a different situation she's got different goals so
183 like you know-**
- 184 P4 yeah exactly I found it helpful
- 185 T **ok brilliant thank you oh so then I went away from the hand out and I went back to the
186 PowerPoint and I gave you um a quote from Walsh just saying what it was but then the next
187 one I gave you some theory about interaction, learning-**
- 188 P3 the triangle
- 189 T **yeah the triangle now what do you think to this? I was (.) I was wondering whether to take this
190 out like last night I was like should I keep it in or take it out and I decided to leave it in**
- 191 P3 I personally like the quotes I quite like it I think it worked I don't know what you guys think?
- 192 T **too much?**
- 193 PP no not really
- 194 P2 I think all those quotes hammer home the point quite clearly
- 195 P3 **I thought it really brought out when it was just the triangle without any quotes but then you see all of
196 these and it makes it clearer I thought I liked it**
- 197 P4 yeah the fact that the two people at the moment- first just the triangle and then the-
- 198 T **yeah because um looking through it I was wondering how much theory to put in how much to
199 take out because I wanted it to be a practical workshop but um also I wanted to let you know
200 that it wasn't just Steve Walsh who talking about it it was lots of other people as well**
- 201 P6 it's a good point it helped a lot actually
- 202 P2 I think for us as I mean we are all teachers but we're all MA students as well the idea of a bit of theory
203 doesn't scare us and
- 204 PP (laughs)
- 205 P2 I don't know some teachers may not you know
- 206 T **well it's funny um I showed the materials to my friend who's taken a DELTA and not done an
207 MA and he was like what's all that theory are you just showing off he said like and I was just
208 like no you know it was quite weird so that's what made me second guess it but we're very
209 used to this-**
- 210 P6 yeah
- 211 P3 so if you had a different group of teachers

Focus group (FG) transcript

- 212 PP yeah
- 213 T **yeah maybe think about it**
- 214 P2 it may not but I can only speak for myself you have to be aware of the caveat or-
- 215 P3 just thinking about the transcript you might have to put the guidelines on
- 216 T **mmm**
- 217 P3 if you want to do it with different teachers so-
- 218 T **yep yep yep**
- 219 P3 you know cos we're all used to looking at this kind of thing
- 220 T **um yeah (2) (writes notes) ok so then we looked at the teaching context that was just sort of**
- 221 **just to get preliminary ideas how does it compare with yours and then the micro-contexts (.) so**
- 222 **this was a lead in to the modes how did this work (1) was it alright?**
- 223 PP yeah
- 224 P1 yeah
- 225 P3 very familiar
- 226 P1 contextualised the modes
- 227 P5 instead of just directly talking about the modes reflecting on the contexts and micro-contexts so in a
- 228 way it was graded towards just think about your own classroom and THEN the modes
- 229 P3 it's a good lead in
- 230 PP yeah
- 231 P5 exactly
- 232 P4 general to particular
- 233 P3 yeah cos they're such familiar contexts and then you see the theory and it's not so scary you can see
- 234 oh yeah that's just the technical word Walsh's word for this
- 235 T **yeah Walsh's metalanguage**
- 236 P2 yeah it could have been a bit more confusing without that you know I mean again might an MA thing I
- 237 think we have all read things that we think what is this that's a very fancy word for something every
- 238 teacher does
- 239 T **yeah ok and so then classroom modes I mean I did have an activity where you match the**
- 240 **classroom mode with the focus with goals and things like that but then I decided no just give it**
- 241 **to them there's no need for that matchy matchy stuff was that ok just to be given them?**
- 242 PP yeah
- 243 P6 absolutely
- 244 P1 in the light of what we'd just done beforehand
- 245 T **yeah so it adds a bit of variety**
- 246 P2 and the matching we did later as well so
- 247 T **yeah yep exactly so the first observation task was just to watch it and just write down the**
- 248 **modes how easy was that to do? did you feel like you just wanted to watch it without writing**
- 249 **anything down or was it an ok task?**
- 250 P6 it was it was it was quite useful just to make sure what we understood about what you read fit into the
- 251 context
- 252 P3 I guess it it wasn't I didn't find it CHALLENGING in a way but it was also clear because I guess that
- 253 you could have lessons with a lot more overlap and stuff but that might not be good for a workshop
- 254 but (1) because it was so clear you know what I mean
- 255 T **it was it was a bit too obvious? oh right yeah**
- 256 P3 no I'm not saying TOO obvious I just yeah=

Focus group (FG) transcript

- 257 P2 =I think in some lessons it could have been a lot more obvious I mean I'm thinking particularly of er
258 one of the modes the skills and systems the main focus is on on particular language items vocabulary
259 or a specific if there was a grammar or something on the video that would be much more obvious the
260 fact that this was a created a little bit er bit more of a question I think not ridiculously so and it could
261 have been more obvious
- 262 T **hmm well look it was kind of to imitate what you should be doing when you're recording yours**
263 **so Walsh wants you to listen for the first time and identify modes so that was imitating what**
264 **you were doing**
- 265 P4 I think it was useful also to familiarise with these four modes at FIRST you match them with the
266 pictures and they seem clear but you need some time you need some time to actually memorise the
267 differences and similarities and to identify them especially in a lesson like the one we watched which
268 had a lot of overlapping of different modes and (1) it was probably a good example to to use in erm
269 post-workshop practice so when we're supposed to record our own lesson we know how to identify
270 different modes
- 271 T **yes exactly (1)**
- 272 P4 yeah so it's kind of useful to=
- 273 P6 =can I add something?
- 274 T **yeah**
- 275 P6 ok for me this was very very important because they always criticise teacher talking time and we
276 analyse and this is a good way to think when you analyse or evaluating your own or reflecting on your
277 lessons it's a good way to think are we talking all the time without any purpose is there any aim to why
278 I said this this or that this is different from recast this is different from reformulation or extension
- 279 T **right yeah (2) yep ok great (.) so then after the first oh yeah so then we went from modes into**
280 **features and you matched them how do you feel about the matching?**
- 281 P3 I liked it
- 282 PP yeah
- 283 P3 I liked having the tactile thing but the only thing is that I'm not too too clear on the difference direct
284 repair scaffolding feedback you know these things what is actually kind of the delineation between
285 them or is there any delineation are they essentially the same
- 286 T **yeah so ok so maybe it wasn't quite clear enough hmmm**
- 287 P2 I could see personally a distinction between most of them but um to me anyway scaffolding seemed
288 like a broader term like scaffolding isn't scaffolding some of those sometimes?
- 289 P3 yeah
- 290 T **yeah**
- 291 P3 that was the-
- 292 T **yeah it caused quite a bit of confusion didn't it and and maybe like I remember you were**
293 **asking between the differences between extension and modelling and things like that so**
294 **maybe they should be separate features I don't know (1) so instead of just putting yeah like**
295 **you were saying it's a very broad term so then you provide maybe that so an explanation for**
296 **modelling is**
- 297 P3 you could just mention that these are- this is a list of terms that you can use some of them include
298 other specific um some of them are broader just just mention that
- 299 P2 or possibly um
- 300 P3 can be interpreted
- 301 P2 or possibly as you were saying reformulation extension modelling those could be separate ones and
302 then just at the end as we were checking we could have said um we talk a lot about scaffolding as a
303 general broader term which one of these can be part of scaffolding

Focus group (FG) transcript

- 304 T **yeah but like direct repair yeah there was a bit of an overlap between direct repair and**
305 **reformulation I'm not so clear about-**
- 306 P3 I think it is a form of direct repair
- 307 T **yeah**
- 308 P3 they're not so there isn't a clear category basically so if you were gonna kind of say them in different
309 ones like this one is reformulation and this one is extension that could be too many things you know to
310 have in an exercise like this
- 311 T **yeah that's true**
- 312 P3 because there's already like ten twelve things
- 313 P1 is this how it appears on page 186 of Walsh?
- 314 T **yeah**
- 315 P1 it is ok
- 316 T **yeah I haven't adapted it that was going to be my next question do you think I should have**
317 **taken some out? (1) because he thinks that these features are good for all contexts or you**
318 **know you could analyse them for all contexts but do you think that some aren't that helpful?**
- 319 P7 I mean direct repair does seem useful because it's I mean I guess the focus is look your language
320 isn't working here here's how you fix it whereas with scaffolding it's look here's something else and
321 the focus is on helping them it kind of builds to that but yeah there is overlap
- 322 T **yeah you don't want to have too many (1) yeah but like things like interrupting does that**
323 **happen? do you really interrupt?**
- 324 P3 well we were saying going onto sort of the next one and helping or hindering we kind of felt that all of
325 them were context-dependent and interruption sometimes you need to do it when one student is
326 going on and on and on and they're dominating you kind of need to cut it off and go ok=
- 327 T **=yeah P3 anyway**
- 328 PP (laughs)
- 329 T **yeah that's true but he does he does say that these should so in each context you should**
330 **change these features cos it is context-dependent so if you're teaching in a state school for**
331 **example a lot of these might be quite different so I think the idea is make your own little list of**
332 **things**
- 333 P4 well it's good to have an overview of the different possibilities because then you can select-
- 334 T **yeah do you there's anything missing? (3)**
- 335 P7 um those what what are they called acknowledgment tokens cos they are really useful I think um in
336 terms of opening up space and
- 337 P2 whether they're useful or not they appear so if you're then gonna then look at a transcript of teacher-
338 student interaction they're they're quite likely to be in there they're just as likely to be in there as
339 teacher interruptions or turn completion
- 340 P3 it's very difficult to to talk to anyone without doing that because when I'm doing IELTSs examining I'm
341 not supposed to do any backchanneling at all just nodding it's really hard to stop doing it
- 342 T **yeah (1) um what about transitional markers like ok right stuff like that I was surprised that**
343 **wasn't in there because she does that a lot that's to signal going into different modes like she**
344 **does that when she goes into I don't know I was thinking that and I was also thinking like**
345 **student-initiated turns cos that's a sign that if you have more student-initiation like if a student**
346 **says something unsolicited said something that's quite a good sign like she does it in the**
347 **transcript and someone does it later on and that's when it gets really quite communicative and**
348 **interactive and then that's just something I thought about-**
- 349 P2 sorry what did you call um the things like right ok so
- 350 T **transitional markers**

Focus group (FG) transcript

- 351 P2 **transitional markers**
- 352 T **yeah**
- 353 P2 those are very I mean I use them a lot when I'm teaching I don't have to record myself to know that
- 354 P6 because they're linguistic features they're not going to be included
- 355 T **yeah maybe that's why maybe it's just interaction yeah**
- 356 P6 maybe he's differentiating between discourse and interaction
- 357 T **I think so yeah no you're right**
- 358 P3 they don't have the non-linguistic like (moves arm) your turn now
- 359 P2 gestures
- 360 P3 that kind of thing gestures yeah
- 361 T **no yeah that's true (.) so what do you think about that question I was just going to ask you**
- 362 **about if they help or hinder just to get a general idea**
- 363 P3 **so sometimes it can help sometimes it can hinder**
- 364 T **so maybe that's not very useful**
- 365 P3 **maybe the wording of the question is not**
- 366 P2 I think being aware of how context-dependent they are is useful in a sense
- 367 P3 yeah it's definitely useful to think about it
- 368 T **yeah**
- 369 P2 but not necessarily to think about it in such detail
- 370 P3 **the question could be WHEN do these help or hinder?**
- 371 T **when yeah ok great**
- 372 P2 **cos they're all capable of doing both at different times**
- 373 T **yep and then which did they see in the video and I think we said something about echo I just**
- 374 **wanted to see what stood out and if you could relate it back ok that's great so THEN we had**
- 375 **another video observation so I was wondering whether to give you the transcript now while**
- 376 **you watched or to leave you to tick it but I decided to leave you to tick it because that's what**
- 377 **Walsh wants you to do he wants you to do it like that so I just wanted to see if it was easy to**
- 378 **do what do you think?**
- 379 P1 well it's like gist task isn't it really it
- 380 T **yeah**
- 381 P1 then we went into the detail
- 382 T **yeah that's true**
- 383 P4 **it makes you realise how much you really don't notice just watching the video then when you analyse**
- 384 **the transcription there are lots of elements (.) like the echo**
- 385 P2 oh yeah it seems a lot more one dimensional
- 386 P4 **you also have time to think and reflect on erm different features when you read the transcript during**
- 387 **the video it's more of an on-the-spot reaction**
- 388 T **right ok yeah any other comments about this section 3.2 and 3.3 (1) you didn't want to like**
- 389 **watch it again?**
- 390 P3 no
- 391 PP no
- 392 P2 I personally have seen that video an awful lot of times
- 393 T **not as much as me P2**
- 394 PP (laughs)

Focus group (FG) transcript

- 395 P4 well probably the question before the one where we ticked the features there's a question that asks
396 you which interactional features do you think you will see in these extracts seems a bit repetitive if you
397 think of the previous page the last one which features would you expect to see
- 398 T **yeah different modes yeah=**
- 399 P4 =yeah that one was about different modes but on page five it was a bit more specific on these er
400 extracts
- 401 P3 yeah I think this was more the one on 3.2 was a bit more useful than the other one
- 402 T **yeah ok**
- 403 P4 yeah I don't think the other one was necessary
- 404 T **I don't think we did it actually I think we might have skipped past it I think we did**
- 405 P3 hmmm
- 406 T **um (2) ok (1) and you like highlighting and analysing and seeing it ok**
- 407 P1 yeah it was more interactive and er kinaesthetic and that stuff
- 408 T **yeah and then there was quite a lot of discussion like do you feel like there was too much**
409 **discussion like you were like oh we're going to discuss this again how do you feel about the**
410 **discussion part?**
- 411 P3 it was good cos people er noticed things I hadn't seen and you know said something (2)
- 412 T **anything else?**
- 413 P1 it's just valuable to do that isn't it you know co-construction of knowledge and all that sort of-
- 414 T **well that is actually in there um in the theory about it it's sort of social learning like mediation**
415 **and stuff social learning theory**
- 416 PP (laughs)
- 417 T **ok and then the jigsaw (1) cos I thought I needed to give you a bit more theory about what**
418 **classroom interactional competence- was it ok at this stage?**
- 419 PP yeah
- 420 T **so we looked at the interactional features and then we were like right now let's see what**
421 **competence is**
- 422 P3 it was nice to talk to someone that wasn't P4
- 423 T **yes! (laughs)**
- 424 P3 sorry (laughs) but you know have different partners
- 425 T yeah yeah definitely yeah (2) um and the texts themselves are they accessible?
- 426 PP yeah
- 427 P2 I thought this one the second one shaping learner contributions in feedback er I thought it was really
428 good it says a lot in two paragraphs
- 429 T **yeah that one and the other one was pretty good but the pedagogic goals one didn't really say**
430 **much though it was I was struggling with that one whether to include it or not because it was**
431 **just the main idea was just gonna be a line and that's it**
- 432 P6 yep it is a bit vague but then when we were talking you had pointed out the fact that they had
433 pedagogic goals here and that's what helped me understand it
- 434 T **ah ok ok**
- 435 P1 when you were sort of monitoring us as we were doing it were we coming out with the stuff that you
436 expected us to come out with?
- 437 T **in which bit?**
- 438 P1 in you know any of the sections

Focus group (FG) transcript

- 439 T yeah definitely well you knew quite a lot before you knew more than I thought you did yeah it
440 was great (1) ok after so in light of the discussion I wanted you to discuss- so we kind of went
441 from the transcript to the theory and then back to the transcript again sort of oh now what do
442 you think so we can actually evaluate it whereas before we were just looking at features and
443 going echo echo echo you know but we didn't really KNOW whether that was a good thing or a
444 bad thing cos echoing can be a good thing
- 445 P4 yeah
- 446 T **so did that help? having that discussion?**
- 447 P3 hmmm (nods)
- 448 P4 yeah I hadn't considered for example the er the fact that the teacher should pay more attention to
449 creating space because of the co-construction of learning between students and she tends to create
450 these interactions between each student and herself but not among students and I hadn't noticed it so
451 the group discussion helped me focus on this (1)
- 452 P3 I think the second one though "does the teacher shape learner contributions in feedback if so how" I
453 think we had talked about that before kind of um you know a lot of echo a lot of reformulation
454 scaffolding and all that so that question I think we skipped over it a bit didn't we
- 455 P4 well the last question the key one how could the teacher improve her classroom interactional
456 competence according to these three=
- 457 T =maybe I should just do that one? I didn't want to just focus on the negative
- 458 P4 well
- 459 T you know I just wanted you to see oh she does that really well cos I do think she shapes pretty
460 well but maybe I didn't take into account that we had discussed all that already
- 461 P4 or maybe just like erm leave in that question at the end for some groups or pairs means that you don't
462 have time to reach it or answer it because you spend too much time on the first one or on the second
463 one and then there's no time for the last one so maybe instead of four questions just one or two- like
464 how could the teacher improve her CIC or what does she already do well?
- 465 PP her strengths or weaknesses
- 466 T **strengths and weaknesses**
- 467 P3 her strengths and weaknesses
- 468 T **yeah**
- 469 PP yeah
- 470 T **yeah that's a good idea because instead of focusing on each one-**
- 471 P2 yeah cos I think I think it's it's good to not only focus on negatives cos that was hardly a bad lesson
472 that we saw but at the same time like you know the purpose of teacher training workshops are to think
473 of ways to improve really
- 474 T **definitely it's what we're doing now**
- 475 P2 and the question about how to improve is probably one of the most important ones you can ask so-
- 476 T **yeah (2) ok so then in the last section we focus on YOU (1) and I just want to I think we skipped**
477 **the first bit but I just wanted you to predict and to personalise it a little bit and sort of think oh**
478 **what do you think you do? and I began that with an example about me so it wasn't just like oh**
479 **I'm perfect what do you guys cos we're all the same really and I wanted to make sure that it**
480 **was an equal relationship you know we're all teachers so-**
- 481 P3 we didn't really discuss these
- 482 T **we did the second one maybe we should have done it a bit more**
- 483 P3 yeah not that much
- 484 T **I think I was just worried about the time**
- 485 P3 yeah yeah cos it's towards the end isn't it and we've done loads of tasks

Focus group (FG) transcript

- 486 T **yeah and at the back of my mind I was like oh way too much discussion**
- 487 PP (laughs)
- 488 T **but maybe you didn't feel that I'm not sure**
- 489 P1 **why would there be way too much discussion what what what else were we going to do matching**
- 490 **exercises and things?**
- 491 T **yeah true yeah**
- 492 P1 **I think we need discussion it's a workshop**
- 493 P3 **actually I would have liked to talk about the last one a bit more about the context because we've got**
- 494 **lots of different contexts EAP even like teacher trainer what you do with your CELTA trainees what's**
- 495 **classroom interactional competence in that sense**
- 496 T **that's a really good point yeah**
- 497 P3 it would have been quite nice actually
- 498 P4 **but that could be a good question for the next workshop after you have recorded your own lesson**
- 499 **they come back because actually the activity 5.1 just um without setting the discussion in pairs or**
- 500 **small groups but individually write down two things you're gonna find in your recording and then you**
- 501 **go home and see like taking down notes what are you going to find out cos what I thought is um we**
- 502 **were discussing in a group of three and not all of us really had time to really express our feeling ideas**
- 503 **and predictions while if I had time to just think on my own (.) maybe just with that task quite down**
- 504 **some ideas well maybe it's just a good moment to reflect on the whole workshop before you go home**
- 505 **and you put into practice what you have learned**
- 506 T **yeah if I just said ok on your own look at these questions think about- yeah needed a bit more**
- 507 **thinking time really (2) this is good ok and then the action plan**
- 508 P3 uh huh
- 509 P7 **it's a nice manageable amount 10-15 minutes I mean doing a whole lesson and transcribing it would**
- 510 **be erm less helpful**
- 511 T **yeah like 10 minutes should only take you about 40 minutes for transcribing**
- 512 P3 **yeah I'm kinda annoyed cos my you know coming to the end of term now and I won't actually be**
- 513 **teaching again for another four weeks or something so I kind of wanna do this next lesson**
- 514 PP (laughs)
- 515 T **yeah actually it's something to think about when you do a workshop like this make sure-**
- 516 P3 **yeah especially if it's teachers all in the same school**
- 517 PP mmmm yeah
- 518 P3 yeah (laughs) week three or something
- 519 T **yeah**
- 520 P1 **how long would elapse between this workshop and the second workshop**
- 521 T **it would- I don't know actually I'm not sure**
- 522 P4 **two weeks? two or three weeks?**
- 523 T **yeah do you think about two weeks' interval to do it and transcribe?**
- 524 P3 yeah
- 525 P4 not too long
- 526 P2 **I don't think it should be too long otherwise it would be remember a month ago we did a workshop**
- 527 **and now I can't remember anything**
- 528 T **brilliant um so yeah the main aim of this was just to raise awareness really and give you the**
- 529 **tools to analyse it yourself and then in the next workshop we would get together (1) and go**
- 530 **ooh what did you find out and it would be quite cool actually I think I'm going to design it**
- 531 **because we're not all teaching either ok I think that's brilliant for now**

Appendix J: Self-evaluation (SE)

Colour-coded key of themes

Outcomes

Classroom modes

Discussion

Metalanguage

Organisation and cohesion

Which aims were achieved in the workshop?

1 The workshop's aim of raising participants' awareness of classroom interactional processes was achieved by
2 the end of the session. At the beginning, although participants seemed to know a little about how teachers can
3 use language to create learning opportunities in the classroom, they were not aware of the concept of CIC or
4 exactly how interaction affects learning. The class discussion near the end of the workshop revealed how they
5 were more aware of classroom interactional processes. The jigsaw reading activity with the texts about
6 Walsh's concept of CIC was particularly helpful for raising participants' awareness and it consolidated what
7 we had been talking about earlier in the workshop. After the jigsaw reading, the participants were better able
8 to critically evaluate the teacher's classroom interaction.

9 The aim of equipping participants with the tools to evaluate their own CIC was partly achieved. The
10 participants seemed to have a good grasp of the four different classroom modes by the end of the workshop,
11 and they were enthusiastic about learning about the modes, but they seemed a little confused about the
12 differences between some of the interactional features. For example, some participants were confused by the
13 features of 'direct repair' and 'modelling', assuming both were a type of recast. There was a lot of scaffolding
14 in the video, and it would have been more helpful if the terms 'modelling', 'extension' and 'reformulation' were
15 better-defined in the framework. I think participants would be able to use the framework to analyse their own
16 interaction, but they might not be fully equipped with the tools, or the discourse, to identify some of the
17 features.

18 Participants appeared motivated to record their own classroom interaction at the end of the workshop. They
19 all commented on how they were excited to record themselves and evaluate their own CIC. I think the
20 workshop effectively prepared them to analyse their own classroom interaction, and they seemed confident in
21 their abilities to do so. The fact that participants actually went through the process of identifying modes,
22 analysing features and evaluating CIC with the teacher's classroom interaction in the video, helped them see
23 how they could do the same with their recordings.

Which part/s of the workshop went well? Why?

24 The video and the video-observation activities worked well in the workshop. The participants seemed
25 interested in the lesson that was featured in the video, and some participants commented on how the teaching
26 context was similar to their own, which made the content even more relevant to them. I felt like this part of the
27 lesson went really smoothly and flowed well. Each video-observation activity effectively built on the previous
28 one and participants were engaged the whole time. The video extract was the perfect length and participants
29 only watched the whole 10-minute extract once (for the modes analysis), and then the shorter 2-minute
30 extract once (for analysis of interactional features), meaning that this part of the lesson wasn't too time-
31 consuming. Participants particularly enjoyed doing the modes analysis of the video extract, as they said that
32 they had never thought about different stages of the lesson in that way before. The initial gist task (Activity
33 2.4) helped to consolidate the meaning of the different classroom modes and it imitated what participants
34 would have to do after the workshop. Participants were also very enthusiastic about transcript analysis, as
35 they noticed features they missed when just watching the video. They seemed to really like highlighting
36 interactional features in the transcript and they spotted a lot more features in this section than they did just
37 watching the video.

Self-evaluation (SE)

38 The analysis of the two extracts in Activity 1.2 was particularly effective. The activity served its purpose of
39 allowing me to see what the participants already knew about classroom interactional processes. I was
40 surprised that some of the participants used metalanguage such as 'display questions' and 'IRF' to describe
41 classroom interaction in the extracts. The two extracts also made it very clear to participants from the very
42 beginning of the workshop what the content of the workshop was and it seemed to engage their interest.
43 Participants were very enthusiastic about the topic of classroom interaction, and I felt that this activity
44 activated their interest. As an initial awareness-raising task, it succeeded, as participants had a visual
45 representation of the differences between a teacher who used interaction to create learning opportunities, and
46 a teacher who did not. This provided a good foundation for the rest of the workshop.

47 The pair and group discussions were very productive, as participants had prior experience and ideas to share.
48 I think the fact that most participants knew each other and knew me helped a lot as they felt comfortable
49 expressing their ideas in front of the group. They seemed to enjoy evaluating Laura's classroom interaction in
50 pairs and I could see that they were learning a lot from discussing the transcript with each other. The
51 atmosphere of the training room was very relaxed and informal. Even though I was the teacher educator
52 facilitating the workshop, I felt like I was engaging in discussion with participants as an equal. As we shared
53 our ideas with each other, I felt like I was learning from them too. The process of discussing the features of
54 interaction with the participants helped to consolidate the concepts in my own head, and I found that I noticed
55 more about the classroom interaction than I did when I analysed it on my own.

Which part/s of the workshop didn't go well? Why?

56 Even though the discussions were fruitful, I think there were a few too many discussion-type activities in the
57 workshop. During the workshop, I was very aware that there were a lot of questions for participants to answer
58 in pairs. Some of the questions were a little repetitive and I realised this during the workshop and I was
59 worried that participants might get bored. Near the end of the workshop, I skipped some of the questions in
60 the final sections as I was concerned about the repetition as well as the timing. I missed out the final
61 discussion question in Activity 5.1 that asked participants to think about CIC their own contexts as I was
62 aware that the time was running out. However, in retrospect, this was not a good question to skip as it would
63 have been useful for participants to discuss their own teaching contexts.

64 I feel like I rushed through part of Activity 2.1, perhaps unnecessarily, when I explained about Walsh's theory
65 and the theoretical underpinnings of classroom interaction. I was unsure about how much of the theory to
66 explain to participants in the workshop, and whether participants would appreciate knowing the theory behind
67 the concepts. As it turns out, the participants were very receptive to the theory and I could have spent more
68 time on this section. Yet with a different group of participants, perhaps who were not studying for an MA,
69 might be different. I was also uncomfortable with the teacher-centred part of the workshop, using the
70 PowerPoint presentation to talk through the theory. As a result, I don't think I explained very clearly the
71 concept of CIC and why it is so important. However, the jigsaw reading activity later in the workshop seemed
72 to clarify the concept for participants.

73 Although the matching activity involving the interactional features and descriptions worked well in Activity 3.1,
74 I don't think the descriptions were detailed enough to give participants a clear idea of the differences between
75 features. I feel like I should have clarified the meaning of each feature, or elicited some examples to check
76 understanding. At one point, one of the participants asked me what the differences between some of the
77 features were and I didn't give him a clear answer. I didn't feel like I was prepared to define the difference
78 between a direct repair and a modelling, for example. Also, I think there may have been too many
79 interactional features in the SETT framework, and some of them were overlapping. As most of the
80 interactional features (except display questions) were new concepts for participants, I think they could have

Self-evaluation (SE)

81 been overwhelmed with the amount of new metalanguage. As a result, I don't think participants understood
82 the meaning of all the features by the end of the workshop.

How would you improve the workshop?

83 • To avoid repetition of activity-types, I would reduce the number of discussions in the workshop and
84 make sure there is no repetition of particular questions. I would make sure there is no duplication of
85 questions in Activity 4.2 and Activity 5.1.

86 • A clearer description of each interactional feature with an example of each one in context would
87 ensure that participants would have a better understanding of the meaning of each feature.

88 • I would spend more time clearly explaining Walsh's theory to participants in Activity 2.1, rather than
89 rushing through it and not explaining it properly. It might be better to have some pre-prepared notes in
90 the training plan to remind me of points to cover when talking through the theory.

Appendix K: Observation notes (ON) and video of workshop

Link to recording of workshop: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B-IVGiEnYVywNV15RnpCVDF5OFk>

Colour-coded key of themes

Outcomes

Classroom modes

Discussion

Metalanguage

Organisation and cohesion

Time Observation notes

Activity 1.1: Discussion

1	0.00	T sits on a chair in the middle of the horseshoe. Atmosphere seems very relaxed and informal. T sets up Activity 1.1 in pairs and introduces the three questions. T talks to Ps in a very natural way, promoting a more equal relationship than a hierarchical one. T asks Ps to discuss the three questions in pairs.
2		
3		
4		
5	1.00	Ps think about their answers before discussing in pairs. Ps start talking to each other with enthusiasm. There is some laughter and the Ps seem very relaxed and comfortable. Ps are engaged in answering the first two questions. Ps seem to enjoy sharing their prior experiences with each other. Only one pair attempts to answer question 3 and they seem unsure about what to say – lots of hesitation. Other pairs continue discussing question 2.
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	3.50	T conducts feedback and asks Ps about their teaching contexts. Ps say that they teach in language schools, colleges and universities and some teach EAP. T elicits who has recorded themselves teaching. P1 and P2 share their experiences. P1 mentions how recording can be reassuring that you're doing the right things. P2 talks about analysing recordings in front of other teachers in his school and how it was quite embarrassing analysing in front of other people. P2 also mentions how other teachers in his school were reluctant to record themselves. T elicits what they found out. Ps do not give much detail. T asks about the question 3 and some Ps say they didn't get around to discussing. P3 mentions recasts and reformulations and saying things in an idiomatic way. T links this with the overview of the workshop. Ps seem ready to take on new ideas and are very receptive at this point.
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		

Overview and Activity 1.2: Two extracts

20	7.30	T presents questions on the PowerPoint (PP) that Ps will be able to answer before the end of the workshop. T signposts clearly and Ps seem clear about what to expect in the workshop. T shows Ps the two extracts. T gives instructions for Activity 1.2 and hands out one Participant book to each P. T asks Ps to read extracts and discuss the questions in pairs.
21		
22		
23		
24	8.30	Ps read the two extracts silently. After about a minute, T asks Ps to start discussing.
25	9.50	Ps start discussing. Some participants are still reading. T sits next to the Ps who are not discussing it so much. Ps using metalanguage such as 'recast'. Group 1 are discussing a lot, Group 2 are reading again. P7 asks the T if the extracts are real or adapted. T says they are adapted. T listens to discussions and makes notes. P4 is very engaged in this activity and appears to enjoy analysing the two extracts. Other groups have finished speaking while Group 1 is still discussing the two extracts.
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31	13.00	Ps stop discussing. T elicits feedback – asks each group what they talked about. Ps use metalanguage such as display question, direct correction etc. Discuss the differences between display question and a genuine question, and also how some genuine questions which serve the purpose of a display question. P4 and P6 are very interested in expressing their ideas about the two extracts. T elicits IRF from the Ps. Ps seem interested in this and they write lots of notes. Ps give examples themselves. P4 talks about scaffolding but without using the metalanguage – T feeds in the term. Ps have a good knowledge of some basic interactional features.
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		

Observation notes (ON)

39 17.30 T says this is what we're talking about today. T signposts and links this with the content of the
40 rest of the workshop. Gives quote of CIC. Elicits if anyone has heard about Steve Walsh. No
41 one has heard about him or CIC before. T links the quote with what Ps were discussing in the
42 two extracts. T shows triangle of interaction, language and learning. T does not explain the
43 relationship very clearly. T appears not to be very sure about what to say about the theory
44 and reads out the quotations. TPs look interested in the quotations and make notes. P3 asks
45 if it extends to writing. T says we're talking about Teacher-student verbal interaction.

Activity 2.1: Teaching context

46 21.20 T introduces the importance of context. Links this with the question at the beginning. Lots of
47 signposting – links the different sections. Elicits the teaching context in the picture. P2 has
48 seen the video before so he shares the context with everyone. Does this as a whole class. T
49 asks if it's similar to their teaching context. Ps say yes, but in EAP the seating is different –
50 behind desks in rows or cafeteria style. P7 comments on how EAP has a written focus rather
51 than a spoken focus. T tells Ss about the context of the stages of the lesson.

Activity 2.2: Teaching microcontexts

52 24.40 T asks Ps to discuss the four pictures and what stage of the lesson it is. Ps are engaged in
53 discussion immediately. Ps are on task and all Ps are actively participating in discussion. T
54 listens but does not make notes. When the room becomes quieter, T starts feedback.
55 26.00 T elicits what Ps think about each picture. T accepts all ideas, even if the predictions are not
56 right. The same participants seem to be speaking during feedback – P1, P2 and P3. Males
57 seem to dominate a bit – the women are quieter.

Activity 2.3: Classroom modes

58 28.00 T introduces the four classroom modes. T talks through each mode that is listed on page 3,
59 describing each one. Ps look really interested and make notes in the Participant book. T asks
60 participants to go back to the four pictures in Activity 2.2 and asks them to identify the mode.
61 The link works well. T checks understanding of the modes by giving different situations and
62 eliciting the mode. Ps seem responsive and understand the differences between the modes.
63 This seems to clarify the terms for them and makes it very clear. All participants contribute to
64 this discussion. Elicits the kinds of language used in each mode. There's lots of linking with
65 previous parts of the workshop and what Ps discussed previously, which makes the workshop
66 very cohesive. T feeds in some metalanguage into the discussion e.g. referential questions. T
67 explains the importance of modes when analysing classroom interaction.

Activity 2.4: Video observation task

68 33.00 T introduces the video. Gives clear instructions for the first watching. T asks Ps to watch and
69 decide which modes are in operation. T gives a clear example of how to identify the modes.
70 Ps seem ready to do the first task.
71 34.10 Ps watch video and write down the modes. Ps seem to enjoy watching the video – they are
72 very interested in the lesson. Most Ps are listing the modes at the same time as writing down
73 examples of language that the teacher uses. All participants are on task.
74 44.50 T asks Ps what they thought about the lesson. P3 comments on how good the lesson was. T
75 asks Ps to share their lists of modes with each other. All Ps engaged in lively discussion.
76 They discuss any differences that they have and discuss overlaps with modes. Ps have noted
77 down things she says which indicates the different modes. They seem to agree with each
78 other on the mode identification. T sits with one of the groups and answers a question about
79 other modes involving student-student interaction. Lots of productive discussion.

Observation notes (ON)

80 48.30 T stops participants and presents them with the order that she identified on the PowerPoint.
81 Ps seem to agree with the order. P3 says that he though mode number five was materials
82 mode as the teacher was focused on the questions on the handout. P4 argues that the
83 teacher was in skills and systems mode, but T mentions how the teacher switches in and out
84 of different modes all the time. T says that they were genuine questions so overall classroom
85 context is the main mode. P4 points out that one mode can be skills and systems mode as
86 well. T says that modes overlap all the time. T shows the transcript to illustrate a teacher turn
87 and learner turn. T explains the importance of modes analysis.

Activity 3.1: Interactional features

88 51.10 T introduces metalanguage of interactional features. More linking with the previous activity.
89 The activities are building on each other well and the workshop seems to be going very
90 smoothly. T gives Ps the option of matching the cut-ups or just doing it in the Participant book.
91 Ps are enthusiastic about the matching activity and choose to do that in pairs. Ps laugh at the
92 features that have simple descriptions that are easy to match. Ps work well in their groups
93 and discuss. Group 3 comments to the T about how interesting this is and how it's better to
94 look at the quality of teacher talk rather than the quantity of teacher talk. Ps seem very excited
95 to learn about a way to analyse interaction that focuses on quality rather than quantity.
96 Whenever they get a chance, participants comment on how useful the modes analysis will be
97 when they listen to their own teaching. T asks participants to make a record of the
98 metalanguage in the Participant book. T doesn't check answers or check Ps' understanding of
99 the meaning of the new metalanguage. Ps are silent as they write down the terms in their
100 Participant books. This part of the workshop seems a bit unnecessarily slow. It takes quite a
101 long time for Ps to write the terms in the blanks.

102 56.50 T asks participants who have finished to look at the three questions at the bottom of the
103 Participant book and discuss with partners. Group three is slower than other groups. T sits
104 with Group 1 and joins in discussion. P2 asks the T what's the opposite of direct repair. P2
105 asks if it is delayed repair and the T agrees. All participants are engaged in discussion. Then
106 sits with Group 3 and asks them which features help or hinder learning opportunities. T then
107 joins in almost like another participant – T seems very comfortable and shares her experience
108 of prior experience of analysing classroom interaction with Group 3.

109 62.00 T stops the discussion and elicits features that might hinder learning opportunities. P3
110 mentions teacher interruption and turn completion. P5 says that direct repair and display
111 questions might, but it depends of the context and the stage of the lesson. T links it back to
112 the video. P4 says about extended teacher turn, but then mentions about the mode and
113 context of the lesson. If the extended teacher turn is in managerial mode, then it's ok. If it's in
114 classroom context mode, then it's not appropriate. Ps share experiences with each other
115 about TTT and being observed in the past. T highlights the importance of context. All
116 participants are on board with this idea and are very enthusiastic, particularly about the
117 modes analysis.

Activity 3.2: Video observation task

118 66.00 T asks Ps to watch an extract from the video again. T elicits the mode of the lesson. Asks Ps
119 to predict features of interaction. Ps give appropriate predictions. T asks Ps to watch and tick
120 the features that they see. The task is well set up and T gives clear instructions. Ps are told
121 the reason why they are doing tasks and activities and they are on board.

122 68.00 Ps watch extract and complete video observation task

123 70.10 T stops the video and asks Ps to check with a partner to see if they ticked the same features.
124 Ps engaged and on task. Ps discuss whether she is asking display questions or referential
125 questions. Ps point out some of the most noticeable things such as teacher echo.

Observation notes (ON)

126 72.00 T clarifies the kinds of questions the teacher in the video was using after she hears some
127 participants saying they were display questions. Ps think about it and decide that they were
128 referential questions. Distinguishes between the two types of questions and mentions that the
129 teacher doesn't know the answer to them. Ps mention how much they notice the teacher
130 echo. P3 said he doesn't notice it during the first watch of the video. The teacher then echoes
131 one of the participants and points out that the T echoed too. Lots of laughter – makes the
132 class seem very relaxed and informal. T elicits if it's always echo and elicits the three different
133 types of scaffolding. T mentions that reformulation could be seen as teacher echo. P1 asks
134 what extension is and says that he didn't quite understand what it meant. T asks P7 if he can
135 explain it. He says they extend what the participants are saying. T then says it can be quite
136 similar to modelling, when modelling new language. Ps seem a little confused by the
137 differences between extension and modelling. P4 says about the differences between
138 modelling, form-focused feedback and direct repair. She mentions how they are overlapping
139 and could be considered the same thing. T agrees and then moves on. T says how they can
140 be interpreted in different ways.

Activity 3.3: Transcript analysis

141 76.00 T says that it might help them to look at the transcript. T comments on the usefulness of
142 transcribing. Hands out transcripts and highlighters. Ps are excited about using the
143 highlighters.

144 77.00 Ps annotate the transcripts individually. They use colours to highlight different features. One
145 pair annotate the transcript as they discuss it together. P3 asks about some of the transcript
146 conventions – e.g. latching. T asks if Ps need transcript conventions but they say they're ok. T
147 asks if they want to watch the video extract again and then say it's unnecessary. T is there as
148 a facilitator answering any questions.

149 83.20 T elicits if there's anything they notice in the transcript that they didn't notice from just
150 watching. P7 mentions reformulation – they thought it was just echo in the video, but it was
151 clearly reformulation in the transcript. P4 then brings up the differences between reformulation
152 and direct repair and form-focused feedback. She says it's difficult to see the differences. T
153 says that it looks like scaffolding. Clearly quite a lot of confusion when distinguishing between
154 reformulation, direct repair, and form-focused feedback. P6 says how the reformulation
155 doesn't actually work. T says it's like a recast that doesn't actually work. P3 says how the
156 student might not be developmentally ready. T mentions the usefulness of transcription for
157 noticing. T elicits what the teacher does to help learning.

Activity 4.1: Jigsaw reading

158 87.00 T recaps what they have looked at so far. She says that they have looked at the tools for
159 analysing interaction, but not evaluating interaction. T introduces the three features of
160 Classroom Interactional Competence. T introduces jigsaw reading texts and asks them to
161 work in pairs and groups and highlight the main points.

162 89.00 Ps read jigsaw reading texts silently. Ps highlight the main points in the texts. They do this on
163 their own. Some Ps finish early and seem to be waiting for the instructions of what to do next.
164 Ps do not discuss the texts with their partner first, perhaps because they all have one text
165 each and they do not share texts.

166 91.30 T regroups participants into two groups. Ps share the main points from their texts. Both
167 groups are on task with sharing texts with each other and Ps ask questions to clarify things
168 before making notes in their participant books. Participants are engaged and interested in the
169 texts. They seem to be enjoying 'teaching' each other and explaining what was in their texts.
170 Ps seem to enjoy talking to new people in their new groups. When Group 1 has finished
171 discussing the text they start discussing their experiences of interacting with students in the

Observation notes (ON)

172 classroom. Although they have finished the task, Ps are still discussing the topic of classroom
173 interaction.

Activity 4.2: Discussion

174 99.40 T asks Ps to go back to their groups. T asks Ps what they think about the teacher's interaction
175 in light of the concept of CIC. Asks Ps to discuss in pairs.

176 100.00 Ps engage in the discussion immediately. They are using metalanguage such as shaping,
177 paraphrasing, summarising that they read about in the text. T joins in on a discussion with
178 one pair of participants.

179 103.20 T elicits information about what Ps think about the teachers' CIC. Participants have some
180 constructive ideas about how the teacher could improve her classroom interaction. Ps
181 mention about how the teacher effectively shapes the interaction but doesn't give learners
182 much space for learning. T engages in the feedback discussion like another participant would,
183 but manages it effectively.

Activity 5.1: Discussion

184 105.30 T changes to the final part of the workshop in which they thinking about how to develop their
185 own CIC. T spontaneously shares an anecdote about her own experience about analysing
186 her own CIC in an EAP context. Participants respond well to this. They seem to like hearing
187 about the T's experiences.

188 107.00 Ps discuss the discussion questions as a whole group instead of in pairs. P1 shares
189 something positive about his own interaction. He says how he gives participants space for
190 learning by extending wait time. He says how he is willing to sit in silence. P3 points out that
191 you need to be careful not to just ask participants to guess what you're thinking, which is
192 impossible. P6 shares how she is motivated to analyse her interaction after this workshop and
193 see the quality of her interaction instead of focusing on the quantity of teacher talk like she
194 has done before. Other Ps mention how they think they would echo too much. P4 mentions
195 how echoing could be very supportive and it's quite authentic. P6 says she is interested in
196 finding out how she interacts. T misses out question 3 of the discussion that talks about
197 different teaching contexts.

Activity 5.2: Action plan

198 109.40 T introduces the action plan. T talks through the process and asks Ps to record their own
199 teaching and bring transcriptions and recordings to the next workshop. As the procedure is
200 the same as what Ps have just done in the workshop, it all seems very clear. Ps seem
201 receptive to the action plan and are motivated to record themselves teaching.

Activity 6: Conclusion

202 111.50 T concludes the workshop and finds out in Ps can answer the four questions from the
203 beginning of the workshop. T asks Ps the questions directly, without giving participants time
204 to think about the answers in pairs or groups. Ps answer the questions well, but the same
205 participants seem to be responding all the time. Some of the quieter Ps do not contribute
206 much to the discussion, perhaps because they haven't had enough thinking time. T asks what
207 is CIC? P3 - it's the ability to promote interaction in the classroom well and effectively. It can
208 be on a scale of how competent you are at promoting, so you want to get more competent. P4
209 - Promoting interaction which is student-centred. P7 - Managing interaction in relation to
210 pedagogic goals and the context at the time. P2 - How to make interaction effective for
211 pedagogical reasons and as a tool for communication and also as a tool for language
212 learning. T asks how is it linked to context? P3 - You need to have different competence

Observation notes (ON)

213 depending on the mode you're in. P4 – depending on the stage of the lesson, depending on
214 the type of lesson. P6 – depending on the students P5 – depending on the level of the
215 students. Ps have a discussion about different levels. T asks what are the features of CIC? –
216 P3- extending wait time. P7 - opening the space P3 - co-constructing meaning to allow the
217 space. P4 - teacher's awareness of CIC. P3 - shaping. T asks how can you develop it? – P3 -
218 finding that balance between shaping and allowing space. P3 says they came to the
219 conclusion that the teacher in the video shaped a bit too much so it's finding the balance. P4 -
220 Identifying your strengths and weaknesses by using the action plan and then trying to
221 improve.

117.00 **End of workshop.**

Appendix L: Email feedback (EF)

Colour-coded key of themes

Outcomes

Classroom modes

Discussion

Metalanguage

Organisation and cohesion

Participant 1

What did you like most about the workshop?

- 1 I thought it was very well prepared in terms of material and staging, and that your questions and activities
2 were well devised, well composed, and well executed.

If you could change one thing about the workshop, what would it be?

- 3 Where there was anything at all, I'd say possibly a little more time for feedback from more people - there were
4 one or two instances where I had something to say, but didn't get a chance.

Have you recorded yourself teaching since attending the workshop?

- 5 No

Do you intend to record yourself teaching in the near future?

- 6 Yes - I am presenting a lecture this week that I have asked a colleague to film.

Participant 2

What did you like most about the workshop?

- 7 I like how all of the theory and terminology used (which was useful and interesting) was tied back to actual
8 classroom practice. This showed how relevant it is for teachers and allowed us to apply it to our own teaching
9 very easily.

If you could change one thing about the workshop, what would it be?

- 10 When we were discussing modes and some of the features of CIC it might have been interesting to discuss
11 how we do these different things in our own teaching contexts. (e.g. - When you're in managerial mode what
12 do you normally do? Which of these features do you think you use most/ least in your own teaching?)

Have you recorded yourself teaching since attending the workshop?

- 13 No. I'm not teaching at the moment.

Do you intend to record yourself teaching in the near future?

- 14 Yes.

Participant 3

What did you like most about the workshop?

- 15 I liked the professionalism and the smoothness of the workshop - genuinely one of the best organised
16 workshops I've been to!

If you could change one thing about the workshop, what would it be?

- 17 If I had to change one thing, I think I would have liked more of a discussion of contexts and how this might be
18 different for the range of people we had in the class.

Have you recorded yourself teaching since attending the workshop?

- 19 No.

Do you intend to record yourself teaching in the near future?

- 20 Yes definitely, when I start teaching at my university in three weeks' time.

Email feedback (EF)

Participant 4

What did you like most about the workshop?

21 - I liked the fact that there was a good balance between theory and practical applications. I think that this is a
22 crucial element in teacher education, especially in in-service courses. Indeed, I find that knowing the theory
23 helps me create links with what I already know about language teaching, activating some background
24 knowledge related to previous readings or personal experience. It also gives credibility to practice, by
25 providing a rationale for it. Moreover, theory makes me reflect on the role of continuing professional
26 development, by supporting and valuing it. Finally, the focus on theory during the workshop gave me the idea
27 that teachers' professionalism and their role as researchers was valued and this allowed me to be more open-
28 minded and willing to critically analyse my practice during the activities.

29 - The workshop created links to the participants' teaching contexts during group discussions. The focus on our
30 context was explicit especially at the beginning and at the end of the workshop, creating a "learning circle"
31 which helped me link the workshop content to my teaching reality. The possibility of talking about both my
32 context and possible implementation of CIC in my classes with other participants was an effective way to raise
33 self-awareness. The process of verbalising my impressions and beliefs about CIC was helpful to reflect more
34 deeply on it.

If you could change one thing about the workshop, what would it be?

35 I would have included more space to reflect on how a weak CIC from the teacher's side could affect learning
36 opportunities, learners' and teachers' role, activities, classroom dynamics and management. At the beginning
37 of the workshop we did compare two transcripts which highlighted different classroom interactions depending
38 on the teacher's CIC. However, I feel like that aspect could have been expanded. For example, in the second
39 part of the workshop, watching the video of a lesson where features of CIC were integrated was helpful to
40 understand practical implications. Similarly, watching the video of a less effective lesson, with typical problems
41 related to poor CIC could have provided a useful comparison. It would have probably highlighted the
42 importance of CIC and helped me identify personal weaknesses.

Have you recorded yourself teaching since attending the workshop?

43 No

Do you intend to record yourself teaching in the near future?

44 Yes!!!

Participant 5

What did you like most about the workshop?

45 I think starting with some theoretical information about classroom communicative competence and gradually
46 moving towards actual classroom videos and the follow-up activities was well-thought out and helped me
47 follow the session attentively. In addition, providing classroom videos and working on them was very helpful to
48 see what actually goes on in classrooms and made me think about my teaching.

If you could change one thing about the workshop, what would it be?

49 Alternatively, the session(s) could be done while the participants are still teaching so that after the first
50 session, they could record and analyze their lessons.

Have you recorded yourself teaching since attending the workshop?

51 No

Do you intend to record yourself teaching in the near future?

52 Yes

Email feedback (EF)

Participant 6

What did you like most about the workshop?

53 It was good to know that Teacher Talking Time can be seen in a positive light and it actually goes beyond just
54 talking.

If you could change one thing about the workshop, what would it be?

55 I wish we'd done it earlier and had a chance to record ourselves and discuss it with you. Hope this helps.

Have you recorded yourself teaching since attending the workshop?

56 No

Do you intend to record yourself teaching in the near future?

57 Yes

Participant 7

What did you like most about the workshop?

58 The framework of modes and the three part analysis of CIC both seem very important in teaching. We spend
59 so much time handling feedback and facilitating discussion but the latter is mostly left to your intuition and
60 learning from experience. The categories you introduced seem helpful in terms of clarifying your own thinking
61 about what is happening in the class. I will do the workshop activity when I start at my university.

If you could change one thing about the workshop, what would it be?

62 As was mentioned in class, the interactional features list seemed a bit long and messy with a lot of overlap. I
63 wonder if there is a better classification. Also, in the first exercise, I'd seen something almost identical before
64 in a teaching textbook arguing for the use of mostly referential questions in class, so an authentic example
65 would have been more interesting. It's probably good to have such a clear example with people who haven't
66 looked at form-focused and content-focused feedback on a DELTA though.

Have you recorded yourself teaching since attending the workshop?

67 No.

Do you intend to record yourself teaching in the near future?

68 Yes, when I start at my university again.

Appendix M: Improved list of interactional features

3. Features of interaction

3.1 Interactional features

Complete the table with 'interactional features' (Walsh 2006: 67) from the box below:

Referential questions	Display questions	Seeking clarification
Content feedback	Scaffolding	Turn-completion
Extended wait-time	Teacher echo	Direct repair
	Form-focused feedback	

Feature	Description
	Providing the learner with linguistic support during feedback through: (1) Reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution <u>without disrupting the flow of discourse</u>). (2) Extension (extending or adding to a learner's contribution). (3) Modelling (providing an example for learners).
	Correcting an error, <u>an unintended form or a misunderstanding</u> quickly and directly.
	Giving feedback <u>on a learner's contribution that focuses on the content of the message rather than the language used</u> .
	Allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for learners to respond or formulate a response.
	Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer.
	(1) Teacher asks a learner to clarify something the learner has said. (2) Learner asks the teacher to clarify something the teacher has said.
	(1) Teacher repeats a previous utterance. (2) Teacher repeats a learner's contribution.
	Completing a learner's contribution for the learner.
<i>Display questions</i>	Asking questions to which the teacher knows the answer.
	Giving feedback <u>on a learner's contribution that focuses on the language used rather than the content of the message</u> .

Adapted from Walsh (2006: 67)

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: Extended teacher turn



Lauren Perkins
Deleted: Confirmation checks



Lauren Perkins
Deleted: Extended learner turn

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: Teacher interruptions

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: correcting a learner's contribution

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: to the message rather than the words used.

Lauren Perkins
Deleted:  Making sure that the teacher has correctly understood the learner's contribution. 

Lauren Perkins
Deleted:  Interrupting a learner's contribution. 

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: on the words used, not the message.

Appendix N: Improved discussion questions

1.1 Discussion

- What is your teaching context? Who / where / what do you teach?
- Have you ever watched or listened to yourself teaching? If so, what did you find out?
- How do you think your choice of language affects student learning?

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: In what ways do teachers create opportunities for learning through their choice of language

3.1 Interactional features

Work in pairs. Comment on what you understand by each of the features. Discuss:

- Which features would you expect to help learner contributions? In which mode?
- Which features would you expect to hinder learner contributions? In which mode?
- Which of these features did you see in the video?

Lauren Perkins
Formatted: Font:italic, Complex Script Font: Italic

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: or hinder

Lauren Perkins
Formatted: Font:italic, Complex Script Font: Italic

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: <#>Which features would you expect to see in each of the classroom modes? ⁴

4.2 Discussion

Work in groups. Considering the features of CIC outlined above, look at the video transcript again. Discuss:

- What are the teacher's strengths and weaknesses?
- How could the teacher improve her CIC?

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: Are the teacher's pedagogic goals and language use aligned? How appropriate is the teacher's language use in this extract?

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: <#>Does the teacher shape learner contributions in feedback? If so, how? ⁴
Does the teacher create space for learning? If so, how? ⁴

5. Developing our CIC

5.1 Reflection

Work alone. Think about your answers to the following questions:

- How do you interact with your learners? How similar / different is your classroom interaction to the classroom interaction in the video?
- What features of interaction do you think you would find in a video recording of your one of your lessons? Write down your predictions.
- How would you describe classroom interactional competence in your teaching context?

Share your reflections with a partner.

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: Discussion

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: in pairs

Lauren Perkins
Deleted: Discuss