

## **RAISING AWARENESS ON CLASSROOM INTERACTION COMPETENCE THROUGH SETT**

Buket Demirbüken<sup>1\*</sup> and Gizem Mutlu-Gülbak<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Marmara University, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Biruni University, Turkey

[buk.dbuken@gmail.com](mailto:buk.dbuken@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup> and [mutlugzm@gmail.com](mailto:mutlugzm@gmail.com)<sup>2</sup>

\*correspondence: [buk.dbuken@gmail.com](mailto:buk.dbuken@gmail.com)

<https://doi.org/10.37147/eltr.v9i1.224>

received 24 September 2024; accepted 28 January 2025

### **Abstract**

This case study aimed at raising teacher awareness of classroom interactional competence regarding pedagogical goals and interactional features in Walsh's (2003) Self Evaluation Teacher Talk (SETT) framework. To this end, the data were obtained from an in-service EFL teacher's video-recorded teaching in two main phases: 1) the teacher's four hours of classes were analyzed to characterize the modes by the researchers, after which the teacher was informed about the modes and SETT framework in an interview, and 2) the teacher was self-reflected on his another four hours of teaching by characterizing the modes. The findings analyzed through content analysis revealed that the meetings were insightful in fostering teachers' awareness of classroom interaction skills since the teacher performed a high level of accuracy in characterizing classroom modes and the deployment of related terminology. In addition, self-talk had a positive contribution to the reflection process, enabling a dialogue on troubles in classroom interaction and the teacher's resistance with justification in dialogues signposted a need to highlight the value of dialogue besides teacher awareness.

**Keywords:** classroom mode, dialogic reflection, self-talk, SETT framework, teacher awareness

### **Introduction**

Classroom interaction has been an interest of studies for more than fifty years (Walsh, 2011). It aims to unveil the interaction in the classroom by establishing an "emic perspective", which relates the analyses to the interactants' responses within the scope of "turn-allocation" (Seedhouse, 2005). It explains interactional situations through "a participant-relevant perspective" (Sert, 2010). Conversation Analysis (CA) uncovers classroom interaction and displays what is happening in the classroom with data-led evidence to reveal the successes and failures in the course of interaction. The teachers in time respond to their students reflexively and the interaction flows without much attention to details which may lead to missing out the important opportunities for mutual understanding. Self-evaluation was asserted as a suggestion to support teacher development (Walsh, 2003) and raise



teacher awareness with a set of skills named Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC). Being dynamic, interactive, and reflective (Seedhouse, 2004), CIC is defined as teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction (e.g. turn-taking, speech-acts) as a tool to maximize the space to increase participation (Walsh, 2006). That classroom interactional space focuses on encouraging extended learner turns, reducing teacher echo, increasing wait time, and seeking ways to maximize learner contribution through various teaching acts such as clarification, scaffolding, paraphrasing, summarizing, repairing learner input, and checking information (Walsh, 2014). It is highlighted that "how teachers and learners' interactional decisions and subsequent actions enhance learning and learning opportunities" (Walsh, 2012, p.5).

CIC is a significant teaching component of the dynamic classroom context. Given that enriched CIC allows for more learning opportunities, it is crucial to raise teachers' awareness of CIC to improve their resources to understand and improve the interaction in the classroom. With this concern, different interactional strategies like fostering a collaborative learning environment, encouraging student contributions, and involving students in discussions have been suggested (Walsh, 2011). By implementing these strategies, teachers can enhance their classroom interaction competence, leading to more effective and engaging learning experiences. However, to fully capitalize on these strategies, it is essential to raise teachers' awareness of CIC, enabling them to recognize and refine the interactional nuances in their classrooms. Thus, this paper aims to investigate the impact of self-talk on teacher awareness about CIC, namely pedagogical goals and interactional features. It aims to contribute to the broader discourse on CIC and teacher language awareness by offering insights into the successful and challenging aspects of classroom interactions and evidence-based strategies to improve educational outcomes.

## Literature Review

After the huge impact of Firth and Wagner's (1997) seminal paper on the field of SLA, the focus on interactional dimensions in English language teaching accelerated. As an outcome of increased emic sensitivity, CA studies have focused on CIC in the classroom which was encouraged by Markee (2015) as CA-for-SLA. CA suggests that interactional competence is context-specific, meaning that competence can only be specific to one context; as such classroom interaction can not be transferred to any other context. In that sense, classroom contexts were categorized into four different contexts accuracy context, meaning-and-fluency context, task-oriented, and process context (Seedhouse, 2004). As a useful application of CA in language classrooms (Sert & Seedhouse, 2011), Walsh (2003; 2006) suggested classroom modes in his SETT model to explain the true nature of interaction in the classroom and self-reflection for teachers.

SETT model (Figure 1) aims to raise teacher awareness through reflection on teaching with four classroom modes: *managerial mode*, *materials mode*, *skills and systems mode*, and *classroom mode*. Each mode is described with "interactional features" that guide teachers to facilitate the interaction in the classroom by setting some pedagogical goals and constitutes a tool to reflect on their teaching. The SETT frame serves to converge between pedagogical goals and interactional features by unfolding classroom interaction and describing the modes.

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

Figure 1. SETT Grid (Walsh, 2003)

In managerial mode, extended-teacher turns are expected to ensue saliently and it stands as being the most homogenous interaction in which the teacher mostly holds the floor. In materials mode, the interaction is expected to orient around the material and the interaction is mostly determined by the material. Initiation-Repair-Feedback (IRF) cycle is likely to be salient in material mode and repairs or feedback in F-turn tends to be dominant. Skills and systems mode is controlled by the skills in question and the interaction mostly appears in the form of IRF with repairs, corrections, teacher echo, and display questions in feedback turn. In classroom mode, the interaction tends to appear between learners including extended learner turns and short teacher turns with mostly clarification requests and referential questions or minimal contributions to promote the interaction.

SETT frame unfolds classroom interaction to raise awareness for CIC as resources to promote it. Considering this, Shamsipour and Allami (2012) investigated the ways through which teacher talk can create learning opportunities. The analysis of audio-recorded teacher talks by three experienced English teachers underlined the important role of teacher talks in learner contribution. Thus, it was suggested that teachers should reflect on their language use to improve learner performance. Yang (2014) focused on classroom interaction and teacher-reflective talk. Discourse markers in teacher talk were studied by utilizing SETT and revealed the role of discourse markers in promoting interaction in the classrooms. Ghafarpour (2017) also employed SETT to investigate language classes at the university level to determine SETT modes and their significance for teachers' critical reflecting practices. The results highlighted the realities of language classrooms as well as the context-specificity of classroom modes to the pedagogical

focus of the lesson. The researcher suggested that the focus or contextual factors could prevent or increase the requirement for one mode to predominate at the expense of the others. Similarly, Skinner (2021) employed the SETT framework in her study that aimed to raise awareness among trainees through the analysis of their teacher talk. The findings showed that trainees used interactional features that limited the learners' space for interaction, which they attributed to continuing the lesson without any interruption. Khatib & Kardoust (2022) also studied teacher talk by three novice and three experienced teachers in nine hours video video-recorded classroom data. It indicated that both novice and experienced teachers provided more data for materials and skills and systems mode and less data for classroom context, indicating that both groups might have avoided classroom talk. In addition, in terms of student-teacher participation novice teachers had more overlappings while experienced teachers were more patient with teacher wait time by providing more space. From a different perspective, Howard (2010) considered the observer's paradox in the analysis of classroom interaction and investigated how an observer makes a change in classroom data by studying observed and non-observed classroom transcriptions based on SETT. The findings suggested that pedagogical lessons without an observer seemed to be more atypical with more mode-switching, dominance of managerial mode, and more complexity while model lessons with an observer seemed to be more structured with classroom modes.

In the local context, Aşık and Kuru Gönen (2016) investigated the reflectivity of pre-service teachers through the SETT framework in an experimental design and found the benefit of training in favor of the experimental group. Similarly, Yeşilbursa (2017) focused on the significance of CIC awareness and how CIC runs with its strengths and weaknesses. The data from a postgraduate class that aimed to raise awareness of interaction in the classroom was presented to describe interactive skills. With a closer look at the data, the students were able to understand which patterns promoted interaction and learning. Ünal et al. (2018) aimed to explore the needs of 22 pre-service and 41 in-service language teachers in terms of improving their CIC and interactional features described by Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) through a survey. The results indicated an overlap of the needs and frequency of using CIC features. The results also highlight the significance and the necessity of CIC training for both pre-service and in-service teachers. With a concern to gain insights into classroom practices, Ekinçi (2020) investigated the functions of classroom interaction based on SETT about teacher echo in the lessons. The results indicated that the most common interactions were teacher echo, extended teacher turn, and wait time. The researcher concluded that the analysis helped the teacher realize the different functions of teacher echo and increased awareness of the micro-components of the classroom.

The studies overall provided evidence for the positive influence and the necessity of raising awareness of CIC. With a concern to bring CIC into teaching in the form of training and to raise awareness on the resources for promoting and understanding the interaction in the classroom, the present study adopted the SETT framework. Given the limited number of studies on CIC, leaving the role of training or meeting unanswered, the current study adopts a case study design to understand the impact of self-talk on teacher awareness of classroom modes about CIC, pedagogical goals, and interactional features. The following research question

guided the study: Does self-talk have an impact on teacher awareness of CIC, namely pedagogical goals and interactional features?

## **Method**

### ***Research design and participants***

The current study adopted a case study design to “..look for the detail of interaction with its contexts” (Stake, 1995, p.6). As a case study allows the researcher to further understand the case with whys and hows (Creswell, 2012), an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teacher was invited for the present study to reveal their experiences and opinions through qualitative data collection. The participant teacher (PT) was an EFL teacher with more than ten years of teaching experience. He holds a PhD degree in the ELT field. At the time of the study, he was working at a language preparatory school of a state university in İstanbul, Türkiye. He had also experience in researching language skills. PT had no classes regarding CA or classroom modes before.

The class PT taught consisted of 21 students who were all native speakers of Turkish and were learning English to be able to pursue their academic studies. Students’ proficiency level was A2 progressing towards B1. They had 22 hours of English weekly and they were assigned to classes based on a language proficiency exam. They had three different teachers and 13 hours were designed as integrated language skills; 9 hours for reading and writing skills. PT was teaching for three days (13 hours) integrated skills to the class.

The main classroom activities were designed around the main coursebook Language Hub, whereas reading activities passages were specifically selected from the textbook titled Skillful.

### ***Data collection and analysis procedures***

The data for the study came from a total of eight-hour video recordings of PT’s classes and analyzed through content analysis. The data collection process was completed in two phases (see Table 1): Researchers’ characterizing the modes in PT’s data (Phase 1) and self-reflection of PT’s on his teaching (Phase 2). The preparatory work and each phase are explained below.

Table 1. Data collection in steps

Preparatory Work	<p><b>Step 1.</b> Four hours of video recordings of teachers’ online courses were collected.</p> <p><b>Step 2.</b> The sessions were transcribed.</p> <p><b>Step 3.</b> The modes described in SETT GRID were characterized in the data with samples, the first four hours of recordings were analyzed utilizing CA with a reference to Interactional Features in SETT and CIC.</p> <p><b>Step 4.</b> Relevant articles were shared with PT.</p> <p><b>Step 5.</b> MEETING 1 (one hour): PT was trained about SETT and CIC; the modes in his data were shared and discussed.</p> <p><b>Step 6.</b> A file including relevant articles, the sample modes and analysis by the researchers, and transcripts of another four hours of teaching was given to PT.</p>
------------------	---

<b>Phase 1:</b> Characterizing the modes in PTs' data	<b>Step 7.</b> PT was assigned to watch another 4 hours of his own recorded sessions and characterize the modes in his teaching. PT was asked to note down these samples to further analyze with a reference to CIC, and he was instructed to make comments on his samples in reference to SETT GRID and CIC.
<b>Phase 2:</b> Sharing the modes and self-reflection of PTs on their teaching	<b>Step 8. MEETING 2</b> (one hour): PT shared the modes he characterized in his teaching and self-reflected on the situations.

---

The researchers transcribed the first four hours of video recordings to characterize the modes in PT's teaching. In the meantime, as a part of preparatory work, PT shared relevant articles on CIC to be able to understand the characterized modes in Phase 1. An example of characterized classroom modes (skills and systems mode) shared with PT is presented below with the necessary explanation on the right side of the transcript. In the extract, the class was engaging in a speaking task, which was about what jobs would be most affected by robots in the future:

Extract 1.

- 1 T1 : The::n we move on to the next page
- 2 (.) So work in groups <which jobs do
- 3 you think will be most affected> by
- 4 robots in the future and why?
- 5 (0.3)
- 6 ((T1 does not nominate any students,
- 7 student self nominates))
- 8 M1 : I think basic jobs umm (.) such as
- 9 cashier in stores [or ]
- 10 T1 : [h1 h1] good= yes
- 11 M1 : or in (0.2 ) [immm I]
- 12 T1 : [I think] they have already been
- 13 affected <by the way> because in
- 14 some supermarkets like MIGros
- 15 have jet cashiers they are automatic
- 16 so you just um make the barcode read
- 17 and then pay by yourself and you do
- 18 not need a cashier (.) you know to get
- 19 out of (.)the supermarket (.) to pay
- 20 your bill
- 21 M1 : I have seen an Amazon store I do not
- 22 know which country it is like= it is
- 23 like Migros but when you go inside
- 24 you (.) first of all you get sign in your
- 25 name (.)your card and everything
- 26 when you go in you just get a basket
- 27 and like cameras sensors they know
- 28 what 15 you get from there you
- 29 just get what you want the sensors
- 30 detect you got this(.) and YOU

In extract 5, the main focus is on speaking as a skill and teachers' institutional goal is to practice speaking (language itself) so it represents *skills and systems mode*. Traditional turn-taking sequence IRF takes place and teacher turns employ interactional features of giving feedback in the form of positive confirmation, referential questions, and teacher echo.

- 31 JUST get out of the store it  
 32 automatically gets out of in your  
 33 card you do not even go to the  
 34 cashier you just get anything you  
 35 want you go out and so him it  
 36 removes that amount from your card  
 37 T1 : very good, whe where? Was it?  
 38 M1 : I do not know <I forgot> I've seen it  
 (.)one year ago on the internet  
 T1 : haaa <on the internet> him on the  
 internet okay.  
 M1 : yes

At the end of the discussion in the first meeting, PT was assigned to complete a similar characterizing task for the second meeting. He was given a file that included relevant articles, the sample modes and analysis, and the transcripts of another four hours of teaching. He was asked to take notes and make comments on his samples in reference to SETT and CIC. Later, the data -entitled samplers with classroom modes- was analyzed firstly to see whether PT characterized the modes accurately which potentially stands as a testament to teachers' enhanced knowledge and awareness. Secondly, PT's self-talk was analyzed by employing content analysis (Cohen et al, 2007), and the keywords referring to CIC or pedagogical goals and interactional features in SETT Grid were accepted as evidence for PT's knowledge and raising awareness on the subject matter. In addition, the statements imbued with self-criticism were highlighted and analyzed by employing theme analysis. The two researchers met to compare their classifications for inter-rater reliability. The agreement rate among the raters for the classified instances was over 90%.

### ***Ethical considerations***

To respect the rights of the participants, the researchers addressed ethical considerations before performing the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The participant provided informed consent following their explanation of the purpose and methodology of the study to ensure ethical integrity. The participant's right to anonymity was highly respected by using a code (PT). Additionally, all information obtained and examined for the study was kept confidential.

## **Findings and Discussion**

### ***Classroom modes***

The modes characterized by the PT as assigned in the first meeting are presented in Table 2. He was able to characterize the classroom samplers for all modes (managerial, material, skills, and system and classroom context modes) accurately inclusive of supportings consistent with the SETT Grid. In addition, the recurring-framed- terminology was observed in PT's comments since he often referred to CIC, pedagogical goals, and interactional features in SETT Grid.

Table 2. Extracts from PT's self-evaluation teacher talk

<b>Key Words</b>	<b>f</b>
Managerial Mode	1

Material Mode	1	Classroom Modes
Skills and System Mode	1	
Classroom Context Mode	1	
Organizing the class	1	pedagogical goals
Refer learners to materials	1	pedagogical goals
Extended teacher turn	5	interactional features
Extended learner turn	2	interactional features
Transitional markers	1	interactional features
Predominance of IRF	1	interactional features
Give feedback/ give form-focused feedback	2	pedagogical goals
Scaffolding	2	interactional features
Practice subskills	1	pedagogical goals
Elicit responses	1	pedagogical goals
Teacher echo	1	interactional features
Referential question	3	interactional features
Establish a context	1	pedagogical goals
Extending the topic	1	interactional features
Clarification	1	interactional features
Confirmation checks	1	interactional features
Shift the mode	1	pedagogical goals

Table 2 summarizes the employed keywords and the ones iteratively employed as a signpost for the existence of targeted knowledge, albeit the level was subject to experimentation. In more precise terms, it served as indicators for increased understanding and awareness of the knowledge at hand. His self-talk along with the characterized modes in his teaching further elaborated his analysis. The self-critical statements categorized in his self-talk are presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Extracts from PT's self-talk

<b>Self-talk on his own pedagogy/ negative</b>	
lacking transitional markers in managerial mode <i>interactional features</i> (managerial mode)	<i>"It would be better if I paraphrased the instruction, ...use more transitional markers"</i>
(exaggerated) extended turns <i>interactional features</i> (skills and systems mode)	<i>"I have some extended teacher turns, even exaggerated extended turns"</i> <i>" Now I see it would have been better if I directed the discussion to the entire class and made the class comment on it"</i>
teacher waiting time (TWT) CIC	<i>" I wish I stopped after I asked the referential question"</i>
<b>Self-talk on his own pedagogy/ positive</b>	
Use of L1 CIC	<i>" I use L1 because my aim here is to elicit responses...it is fine to use L1 when necessary"</i>
Initiating student participation CIC	<i>"I see that students participate and I use interactional features such as scaffolding, teacher echo, clarification, and confirmation checks"</i>

---

	<i>“I genuinely join in the talk to enable learners to express themselves”</i>
Employing confirmation tokens CIC	<i>“I use ‘hi hi’ which is good to encourage students as they feel they are on the right track”</i>

---

As can be seen in Table 3, the detailed analysis of teacher comments in categories indicates that PT self-evaluated his pedagogy by drawing reference from both CIC strategies and the SETT grid, albeit not all strategies were entitled to the corresponding conceptual framework. The discernible categories, wording, phraseology, and terminology employed serve as tangible indicators of PT’s self-critical stance by utilizing the SETT grid and CIC. The themes in his self-talk based on the characterized modes are presented in the following sections to exemplify the findings.

### *Managerial mode*

PT correctly picked extract 2 below from his teaching as a sample for the managerial mode. In the extract, they are in meaning and fluency context and PT is instructing ranking their life priorities.

#### Extract 2.

- 1 PT :here it says (0.2) look at  
 2 the pictures æy to (0.2) e rank these  
 3 life decisions(0.2) <from most to  
 4 least important> life decisions  
 5 what do you think  
 6 (1.34)  
 7 M1 :hocam bunları önceliğimize göre  
 8 mi yoksa  
 9 hani bizim için [hangisi önemliyse mi  
 10 PT : [TABİİ Kİ tabiiki  
 11 according to your  
 12 choice  
 13 M1 :°okay °  
 14  
 15

#### ***Teacher Self-talk***

*I think this sampler represents managerial mode because I am managing, and organizing the class here and I am trying to lead them to the activity. Also, in a way I can say that I am making them ready for the activity with the instructions, actually, I refer learners to materials. My instruction is short in this sample, but in general, I noticed I have some extended teacher turns, even exaggerated extended turns in my teaching. Here I see that student is confused with my instruction and asks again in L1. Maybe it would be better if I paraphrased the instruction before asking my referential question and use more transitional markers.*

He maintained the argument by stating that “*managing the class*” and “*lead to the activity*”, which refers to pedagogical goals “to organize the physical learning environment” in SETT Grid. PT critically evaluates his involvement in the managerial mode by acknowledging that his turn is brief in this sampler (lines 1-6), whereas in routine it was excessively prolonged in his instructional practice. PT noticed that student (M1) got confused with his instruction in lines 8-11 and self-criticized on missing paraphrasing in his TCU and the absence of transitional markers in the instruction, referring to *interactional features of managerial mode*.

*Materials mode*

In the extract, PT selected as an example of materials mode, the class was checking their responses on the practice in their coursebook about future tense and PT was explaining the contrast between *going to* and *will* upon students' questions.

Extract 3.

<p>1 T1 : e belli ↑ ya (.) evet belli ↑ yani o gün                  2 kesin buluşuruz diyor o yüzden will                  3 yine çok şey olurdu düşük olurdu. A                  4 dan var mı ↑ başka yine A dan                  5 arkadaşlar (0.3) A kısmından yok                  6 mı B ye geçtik şu an (.) °nisa mı                  7 demişti° &gt;kaç? demiştin Nisa&lt;                  8 F1 : dört hocam                  9 T1 : DÖRT(.) diyor ki(.) &gt;şeyden                  10 almamız lazım tabii ki&lt; (.) üçten aa                  11 I will definitely have to get a job(.)                  12 yani evet kesinlikle yapmam                  13 gerekecek to pay the rent ödemem                  14 için but it will be nice to have my                  15 own space (.) iyi de olacak kendi                  16 yerim olması (.) I HAVE <u>never lived</u>                  17 <u>abroad before</u> &gt;daha önce him                  18 yaşamamıştım&lt; SO↑ bak işte                  19 evidence orda nisa(0.1)                  20 <u>yaşAMAMış</u> e bundan dolayı it is                  21 going to be difficult ZOR <u>olacak</u> (.)                  22 kanıtım net daha önce yaşamamış                  23 olmak=                  24 F1 : =hı ben de şey düşündüm \$belli                  25 olmaz hani\$=                  T1 : = NO NO NO olur mu ↑yok                  artık(.)hayatta il- ilk yaptığın her şey                  zordur                  F1 : tamam hocam</p>	<p><b>Teacher Self-talk</b>  <i>That dialogue simplifies materials mode because in my turn I ask whether there is any question form A or B which shows that we are on the material. In this sample there is predominance of IRF. I give the response and after students response I give feedback. Here, there is also a shift to skills and system mode in line 5-10. I have an extended turn and it represents skills and system mode as I am trying to explain the grammar point and the contrast between will and going to. Actually, I can say that it is the use of scaffolding as interactional features or practicing the subskills as a pedagogical goal. I give form-focused feedback but we are on the material. I use L1 because my aim here is to elicit responses about the practice and enable learners to produce correct forms so I think it is fine to use L1 when it is necessary. I do not think it is a problem and F1 understands.</i></p>
--	---

In the comment, PT acknowledged that the sampler was in material mode. He explains the reason for the material mode by saying that *we are on the material* referring to the pedagogical goals in Grid and the teacher's knowledge to entitle the mode in a rational manner. More importantly, PT used a pivotal term "*predominance of IRF*" and basic turn-taking cycle that may indicate PT's ability to understand and interpret the classroom interaction. Also, the teacher explained the cycle in turns from his initiation a response to the feedback turn and mentioned a shift in modes from material to skills and system mode. On that point, PT tried to explain his turn and his use of interactional features such as scaffolding with a reference to interactional features and practicing subskills touching on pedagogical goals. Regardless of the framework, PT used scaffolding in lines 9-20 but practicing subskills seemed to be from memory as they were only practicing grammar and explanations in L1. PT also highlighted his purpose to "*elicit responses*" and "*enable learners to produce correct forms*", offering substantiation of his

awareness of going interaction. PT bestowed a positive interpretation concerning his own L1 utilization by showcasing the student's grasp and offering justification for its usage when deemed necessary.

### *Skills and systems mode*

For skills and systems mode, PT preferred to focus on extract 4 below, in which the class was in meaning and fluency context and discussing future inventions.

Extract 4.

- 1 T1 : anyone else (0.3) anyone else=  
 2 F1 : =I disagree with Can and Yiğit n the  
 3 second one I think its- not will  
 4 happen  
 5 T1 : the second one will not hapPEN↑  
 6 F1 : yes(.) because human n.(0.2)  
 7 invented plane for hundred years  
 8 ago  
 9 T1 : °yes°  
 10 F1 : ee it could be happen many years  
 11 ago but m(0.2) the planes has not  
 12 change since m human invented it  
 13 (unincredible speech)  
 14 T1 : [hı hı]  
 15 F1 : [they] will just (unincredible  
 16 speech) invent in it so I think it will  
 17 not change  
 18 T1 : but(.) second it is a <CARGO>  
 19 plane or something like that so (.) it-  
 20 its still available  
 21 F1 : it is like a plane but(.) form of plane  
 22 like change  
 23 T1 : (0.3) what do you mean ↑ what do  
 24 you mean it looks like a plane as it  
 25 is a plane actually  
 26 F1 : [exactly ]  
 27 T1 : [ the second one ] right?  
 28 F1 : yes  
 29 T1 : hı hı it is a plane  
 30 F1 : but I see it is not possible  
 31 T1 : aaa it is a cargo plane and we still  
 32 use it cargo plane dont we have what  
 33 cargo plane (0.3)I do not know do  
 34 you have cargo plane that m carries  
 35 other planes (.) ah sorry yea other  
 36 planes(.) doN't we have such a  
 37 possibility (.) right now↑ may be I  
 38 am just making up \$maybe you are  
 39 making up I can't decide right now\$  
 40 F1 : I dont know [but]

### **Teacher Comments**

*In this sample, I think we are in skills and systems mode because we practice speaking as a skill but I start with material mode: the second one. In the dialogue, I see that students participate and I use interactional features such as scaffolding, teacher echo (yes), clarification, confirmation checks ( right ?). I use all of them and I also ask referential question to make students talk more but I wish I stopped after I ask referential question. I also have extended teacher turn. In skills and systems mode, extended teacher turn is acceptable. There, I express my ideas to motivate students to participate more. I use hı hı which is good to encourage student as they feel they are on the right track.*

- T1 : [dont ] but as far as I know we have  
 cargo planes yes(.) bu MAYBE  
 maybe we do not have <cargo  
 planes ↑THAT transport planes>=  
 F1 : =°maybe°

PT's characterization of the exemplar as skills and systems mode was apt, substantiated by the application of the SETT framework and imparted this by asserting that they are practicing speaking. T1 indicates a shift from material to skills and systems mode which was precise and may demonstrate PT's command of modes. PT interpreted his deployment of interactional features and listed them as *scaffolding, teacher echo (yes), clarification, and confirmation check (right)*, which may demonstrate his at least incremental establishment of aptitude in this particular realm of CIC), notwithstanding its shortage of being ideal as there was a mismatch with the samples for teacher echo and confirmation check. However, there seemed to be a partial and gradual refinement of the subject matter regarding interpreting interactional features. PT also referred to his utilization of *hi hi* as a motivator to make students participate more and delivered constructive appraisal about his strategy.

### ***Classroom context mode***

Extract 5 was chosen by the PT as an example of classroom context mode. In the extract, they were in meaning and fluency context and as a class, they were discussing about marriage upon PT's anecdote on one of his student's early marriage.

Extract 5.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1 T1 : I have just heard(0.2) one of &lt;my<br/>                 2 students&gt; eeee &gt;friend&lt; is:: getting<br/>                 3 married(.) and he is I mean (.) he has<br/>                 4 just started the process(.) right now<br/>                 5 you know söz(.) nişan kind of thing<br/>                 6 [proposal]<br/>                 7 F1 : [yes my friend] too<br/>                 8 T1 : yaaa and:: he was born in &lt;two::<br/>                 9 thousand one&gt; which means (0.2)<br/>                 10 he is twenty two<br/>                 11 M1 : twenty two yea<br/>                 12 (0.2)<br/>                 13 T1 : incredible ↑ (.) twenty two and he is<br/>                 14 getting married<br/>                 15 M2 : is it a GiRL or is it a GUY ↑<br/>                 16 T1 : he is a he is a guy but I mean<br/>                 17 ((lines omitted. some problems<br/>                 18 about the microphone))<br/>                 19 T1 : rasim? Does it matter by the way(.)<br/>                 20 does it matter whether &lt;HE is or<br/>                 21 SHE is&gt; getting married because bu<br/>                 22 arada they are they are at the same<br/>                 23</p> | <p><b><i>Teacher Comments</i></b><br/> <i>In this sample, we are in classroom context and the atmosphere is sincere. I <u>establish a context</u> by <u>extending the topic</u> of life priorities. The <u>atmosphere is sincere</u> and students participate. I am not sure my turns are too long but I think it is fine as I genuinely join in the talk and try to <u>enable learners to express themselves</u>. I use L1 because the context is sincere and we share our ideas like <u>a daily out-of-class chat</u>. Also, I remember that I get shocked with M2's comment on "the best time to get married for girls" so <u>it became inevitable for me to take an extended turn</u> and make a comment but now <u>I see it would have been better if I direct the discussion to the entire class</u> and make the class comment on it. I would have</i></p> |
|---|---|

- 24 age(.) the girl and the boy is are at *motivated extended learner turn.*  
 25 the same age=  
 26 M2 : =no the boy I think twenty year old *Now I see that I made M1 talk but*  
 27 it depends on income like if you [get *missed the opportunity to involve the*  
 28 good income] *class because the topic fascinated*  
 29 T1 : *me and the response was shocking*  
 30 [yea yea no problem] *for me.*  
 31 M2 : for a girl for girls it is not early for  
 32 girls I think the best time  
 33 T1 : the BEST time↑?  
 34 M2 : yea from nineteen to (.) not  
 35 nineteen okay twenty one to twenty  
 36 five best time  
 T1 : waaw girls:: do not miss the best  
 time(.) to get married (0.2) you do  
 not have much time ((sarcastically  
 laughs)) left <according to Rasim's  
 ru:::less> (0.3) don't don't miss::

Based on the SETT framework, PT's characterization of the sample as classroom context mode stood as correct attribution and PT lent credence to his categorization by stating that *I establish a context* which refers to the pedagogical context of Grid. PT stated that the classroom *atmosphere is sincere* and delivers positive comments regarding learner participation and interprets his turns as positive by exhibiting his genuine participation into talks and his effort of *enabling learners to express themselves*. Despite its prevailing positivity, PT's assessment of his interactional skills in the incorporation of CIC and SETT framework terminology may provide empirical evidence to validate the presence of self-awareness. PT engaged in self-reflection by recognizing his elongated turns, suggesting that a more optimal approach would involve encouraging the active participation of the entire class instead of solely relying on his contribution, notwithstanding noting his surprise upon hearing the response he willingly chose to extend his turn.

### **Discussion**

This case study was conducted to raise awareness of an in-service EFL teacher on the classroom interaction in the scope of SETT. After the first meeting in which the PT explained the framework and provided necessary readings on the target topic, he was able to successfully pick up the extracts from his teaching and match them to the related classroom modes together with their pedagogical goals and interactional features. It demonstrated the efficacy of the first meeting, where the modes were studied with samples, in fostering both awareness and the construction of knowledge. Thus, the findings overall revealed an appreciable and favorable difference in PT's self-talk regarding classroom modes, pedagogical goals, and interactional features of the SETT frame, besides correct entitlement of modes, which is in line with previous studies (e.g. Skinner (2021) and Walsh (2003)). This finding further supported Yang (2014) and Skinner (2021), who highlight the importance of discourse markers and interactional features within teacher talk, using the SETT framework as a tool to raise awareness among

teachers. Based on all these results, it is possible to suggest that deliberate reflection and analysis of classroom interaction through frameworks like SETT can reveal critical insights into how teacher talk shapes the learning environment, making it an essential practice for both experienced and novice teachers.

A substantial amount of terminology relevant to CIC and SETT Grid appeared in PT's self-talk as a testament to the existence of targeted knowledge as a result of the small intervention, which was compatible with previous studies (Aşık et. al., 2016; Seedhouse & Walsh, 2010). The repeated words and terms for all modes validated the emerging awareness regarding CIC and SETT Grid. Although this study was not concerned with the frequency of modes, goals, or interactions, the finding that the participant teacher was able to characterize the classroom samplers for all modes (*managerial, material, skills and system, and classroom mode*) showcased the teacher's knowledge of the classroom modes as well as the nature of a university level language class. Nevertheless, the results should be approached cautiously given the PT's experience and knowledge in the field. Khatib and Kardoust (2022), for example, demonstrated that the level of experience of teachers affects their use of different classroom modes, with novice teachers often creating more overlaps during interactions, while experienced teachers allow for more structured wait time. As their findings point to the need for targeted training and reflection that considers both the contextual and experiential factors influencing teacher talk, the use of interactional patterns and the correct identification might also be attributed to PT's teacher characteristics in addition to self-talk. In addition, since the context and mode of classroom interaction are highly specific and can vary significantly depending on the pedagogical goals of the lesson (Ghafarpour, 2017; Howard, 2010), the results also may be due to university-level class, influencing how teacher talk was utilized.

The importance of raising awareness about CIC among both pre-service and in-service teachers is evident across multiple studies. Aşık and Kuru Gönen (2016) and Ünal et al. (2018) both highlight the benefits of explicit CIC training, demonstrating its positive impact on teachers' reflective practices and interactional awareness. This awareness is crucial as it helps teachers to recognize and respond effectively to the dynamics of classroom interactions, ultimately fostering a more supportive and engaging learning environment. Similarly, PT in this study was able to adopt a different lens into his classes after the explanation of different classroom modes with different functions. This shift in perspective has the potential to not only enhance his ability to tailor his teaching strategies to meet the specific needs of students but also encourage a more mindful approach to the pedagogical choices to be made during instruction.

By understanding the nuanced roles of various classroom interactional features, teachers are better equipped to create opportunities for meaningful student participation and engagement, which are essential for effective learning. Raising awareness about CIC aligns with the broader goals of teacher education, which emphasize the importance of developing reflective practitioners who are capable of critically analyzing and improving their teaching practices. Building on the foundation of CIC awareness, Shamsipour and Allami (2012) emphasized that teacher talk creates significant learning opportunities, shaping learner contributions and classroom dynamics. Their research suggests that when teachers engage in reflective practices concerning their language use, it can lead to enhanced learner

performance by encouraging more meaningful and interactive participation. Additionally, Yeşilbursa (2017) and Ekinçi (2020) highlight the practical implications of this awareness, demonstrating how a deeper understanding of classroom interaction patterns can lead to the development of more effective teaching strategies. Similarly, the self-reflections captured in PT's self-talk underscore the role of CIC in effective teaching. PT's awareness of the need for more transitional markers in the managerial mode and the recognition of overly extended teacher turns in the skills and systems mode reveal a thoughtful engagement with interactional features that could be improved. This awareness demonstrates a commitment to refining instructional strategies for better classroom management and more meaningful student engagement (Walsh, 2014). Moreover, PT's reflections on the appropriate use of L1 to elicit student responses and the effective use of interactional features like scaffolding and confirmation checks highlight the positive aspects of their teaching practice. These reflections affirm the value of employing CIC strategies to enhance student participation and support learning (Walsh, 2012). Through this process of self-reflection in the form of a participant-relevant perspective (Sert, 2010), PT exemplifies the potential of enhanced CIC awareness to contribute to more responsive and effective teaching practices, ultimately fostering a richer learning environment for students. These insights affirm the importance of ongoing reflective practice in teacher development, suggesting that such awareness can lead to substantial improvements in pedagogical effectiveness and learner outcomes.

## **Conclusion**

The results were promising in that raising awareness of classroom interaction may be possible through self-talk and designed meetings on the SETT Grid, and once provided with the opportunity, in-service teachers may display a willingness to participate in reflection practices and to learn about classroom interaction. The participant teacher employed the pivotal terms which could be indicative of adeptness in his knowledge of understanding classroom modes, pedagogical goals, and interactional features elucidated in the SETT frame. An effort to raise awareness of classroom interaction is worth nurturing self-talk, and knowledge of classroom modes (Walsh, 2003), potentially engendering to analyze classroom interaction and reflecting on the pedagogy. In addition, the study may suggest some fruitful pedagogical implementations; as such raising awareness of classroom interaction among in-service teachers may serve to detect the troubles, which could be achieved through discussing the model samplers by utilizing corresponding pedagogical goals and interactional features. More importantly, unearthing PT's self-talk, and advertent to interactional features, can be seen as an achievement. In addition, acquired knowledge regarding modes and terminology may likely have the potential to grow into practice.

Upgrading self-reflection to a training model may give a chance to practitioners to bridge the gap between theory and reality as previously suggested by Skinner (2021). Considering the optimistic results of the study, the integration of reflection into the pedagogical routine may become useful by facilitating the exchange of insights to understand the troubles in interaction and motivate thinking critically on the problems.

The study provided insights into the ways of raising awareness of CIC and evidence for the positive impact of self-talk to achieve it. However, there are several limitations to address for further research. Firstly, the study employed only one participant teacher which could be increased to get more generalizable results. It was conducted with the participation of a preparatory school EFL teacher, calling for the replication of the study with teachers teaching at different educational levels. Also, PT exhibited remarkable cooperation in engaging in all readings and meetings. However, it is important to note that this favorable scenario may not be replicated in the same way across all teachers, thereby, the motivation and receptiveness of the teachers to collaborate may become a noteworthy limitation that needs careful consideration for future studies. Time was another constraining factor; enhancing the number of meetings and spreading them throughout the year could be more advantageous and may yield different results. Additionally, the study left the delayed impact of such training unanswered, which should be answered through longitudinal studies.

### References

- Aşık, A., & Kuru Gönen, S. İ. (2016.) Pre-service EFL teachers' reported perceptions of their development through SETT experience. *Classroom Discourse*, 7(2), 164-183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2016.1150865>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203029053>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, evaluating, quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Ekinci, M. (2020). Examining teacher echo in an EFL classroom based on SETT framework: A case study. In B. Kırmızı, A. Alhrdan, B. Yapıcı & M. Ekinci (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary language and literature studies* (pp. 322-329). Konya: Aybil Yayınları.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285–300. <https://doi.org/10.2307/329302>
- Ghafarpour, H. (2017). Classroom conversation analysis and critical reflective practice: Self-evaluation of teacher talk framework in focus. *RELC Journal*, 48(2), 210-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216631173>
- Howard, A. (2010). Is there such a thing as a typical language lesson?. *Classroom Discourse*, 1(1), 82-100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463011003750699>
- Khatib, M., & Kardoust, A. (2022). Representation of scaffolding in different modes of self-evaluation of teacher talk framework for Iranian novice and experienced EFL teachers. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(4), 123-136. <https://dor.isc.ac/dor/20.1001.1.24763187.2021.10.4.8.8>
- Markee, N. (Ed.) (2015). *Handbook of classroom discourse and interaction*. Malden, MA: Wiley/Blackwell.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the second language classroom: A conversational analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 38(4), 165-187. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444805003010>
- Seedhouse, P., & Walsh, S. (2010). Learning a second language through classroom interaction. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising learning in applied linguistics* (pp. 127-146). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sert, O. (2010). A proposal for a CA-integrated English language teacher education program in Turkey. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12(3), 62-97.
- Sert, O., & Seedhouse, P. (2011). Introduction: Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 5(1), 1-14.
- Shamsipour, A., & Allami, H. (2012). Teacher talk and learner involvement in EFL classroom: The case of Iranian setting. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(11), 2262-2268. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.11.2262-2268>
- Skinner, B. (2021). 'Let's move on': Second language trainee teachers' talk and its impact on learner interaction. *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(5), 513-526. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1642371>
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Ünal, D. Ç., Bozbiyık, M., & Acar, Y. (2018). A situation and needs analysis on classroom interactional competence in German language teaching. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 34, 1-26. <http://doi.org/10.16986/huje.2018040663>
- Walsh, S. (2003). Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom through teacher self-evaluation. *Language Awareness*, 12(2), 124-142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410308667071>
- Walsh, S. (2006). Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 60(2), 133-141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci100>
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203827826>
- Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualizing classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 6(1), 1-14.
- Walsh, S. (2014). *Classroom interaction for language teachers*. Alexandria: TESOL Press.
- Yang, S. (2014). *Investigating discourse markers in Chinese college EFL teacher talk: a multi-layered analytical approach* (Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University).
- Yeşilbursa, A. A. (2017). Reflections from the EFL classroom: Classroom interaction and reflective teacher development. *Journal of Language Research (JLR)*, 1(1), 19-24.