

7. A Research Approach to Study the Relationship between Classroom Interaction and Interactional Identities in English Language Education

*Edgar Yead Lucero Babativa
eylucero@correo.udistrital.edu.co
Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas*

Introduction

In this chapter, I will discuss Conversation Analysis as an available research methodology to study the relationship between classroom interaction and interactional identities of participants in English-language education. As currently I am embarked on a query focused on exploring this relationship, I will include a review of some research methodologies to study this matter. This review becomes of major relevance to explain how classroom interactions and participants interactional roles have been studied within this field.

In my current research query, I see classroom interaction as dynamic, fluid, and situated. English-language teachers and students permanently and reciprocally construct their interactions in various manners by interweaving their interactional practices, identities, and individual knowledge, as well as their visions and experiences about English-language education and the world. By doing so, both participants in classroom interactions, i.e. teacher and students, enact a wide variety of interactional identities. Under this assumption, neither classroom interactions nor interactional identities can be pre-established, since one of them helps construct the other in innumerable manners within varied contents and contexts.

Tracy and Robles (2013) define interactional identities as the “specific roles that people take on in a communicative context with regard to specific other people” (p. 22). These interactional roles are not static, but fluent, multiple,

movable, multi-scale, multidimensional, and multifaceted (see Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Thornborrow, 1999; Tracy & Robles, 2012; Zimmerman, 1998). This means that interactional identities can be taken on, assigned, enacted, and challenged in line with how interactions happen in context. Based on this notion, for my current research query I will define interactional identities as what teachers and students are, do, and become as interactants in classroom interaction. There are, then, constant movements and realizations of interactional identities in consonance with the manner how these participants construct and maintain the turn-by-turn of interactions in English-language education classrooms.

My current research query has been elicited by my personal observations related to the relationships between how classroom interactions are organized, and the multiple interactional roles that participants in English-language education classroom recognize or become aware of. My analysis focuses on the *not-yet*¹⁸ of the general studies about how teachers and students construct and enact their interactional identities in the moment-by-moment of classroom interaction. In the same way, as classroom interactions may occur in many different manners, countless interactional identities may occur within the classroom, which additionally may have limitless realizations.

In this perspective, the realization of interactional identities and the organization of classroom interaction cannot simply be established by language teaching standards. In my view, the way classroom interactions and teachers and students' interactional roles have been discussed in corresponding literature, ignores the existence of conflictive tensions that might have been originated by the fact that such interactions and roles are perceived as pre-scripted or pre-established. A multiplicity of perspectives and multi-faceted interpretations about interactional identities and classroom roles might have been identified, while current studies on the matter may be omitting them (Butler, 1990). I consider that no a single set of purposes are established for interactional roles, as much as no a unique set of patterns would occur when organizing or structuring classroom interaction in English-language education. The way interactants interpret the interactional contexts of their classrooms would reveal a multiplicity of interactional roles and practices across the dimensions of time, space, and self.

18 This construct of the *not-yet* has been coined from Ernst Bloch (as cited in Hudson, 1982, pp. 19-30), in his principle of hope. For this proposal, the *not-yet* refers to the study that is yet to be conducted while it is already conceived as feasible.

In this chapter, I am going to divide the review of research methodologies into those used for classroom interaction and those for interactional identities in English-language education in Colombia. As a result of this panorama, I should set forth what is yet to be contemplated in depth regarding research methodologies. From this account, at the final section of the chapter, I will suggest a view of CA (Conversational Analysis) as an approach to study the relationship between classroom interaction and its participants' interactional identities in English-language education.

Leading Studies on Classroom Interaction and Interactional Identities in Colombia

Classroom Interaction Studies. The organization and structure of classroom interaction in English-language education have majorly been studied by following the principles of Conversation Analysis (Chappell, 2014; Gardner, 2014; Johnson, 2009; Kurhila, 2006; Rymes, 2009; Seedhouse, 2004; Sidnell & Stivers, 2014; Walsh, 2011), and Interaction Analysis (Inamullah, 2005; Li, Shouhui, & Xinying, 2011; Odiri-Amatari, 2015). By showing real-time transcripts of audio/video recorded lessons, the findings of these studies generally indicate that classroom interaction is organized in adjacency pairs, preferred responses, turn taking, repairs, and recasts, as well as in the interaction patterns of initiation-response-evaluation/feedback (IRE/F), requests, responses, code-switching, and regulatory turns.

Research studies about organization and structure of classroom interaction in English-language teaching in Colombia (see Figure 7.1 below) have shown that it also presents similar interactional structures to the ones mention just above. These are co-constructed between English-language teachers and students, being teachers mainly the managers of classroom interaction while students little by little would learn how to deal with it. However, unlike the studies mentioned above, local teacher-researchers studying the English-language classroom interaction in Colombia have used a more extensive variety of research methodologies. Figure 7.1 below lists the studies done in Colombia about classroom interaction in English-language teaching. For each study, the research methodology, data collection techniques, and main findings are shown.

Figure 7.1**English-Language Teaching Classroom Interaction Studies in Colombia**

Classroom Interaction Research Study	Research Methodology, Data Collection Techniques	Main Findings
<p>Balcárcel-Zambrano (2003)</p> <p><i>Teacher Talk at Three Colombian Higher Education Institutions</i></p> <p>Three schools – 11th grade – Bucaramanga</p>	<p>Interaction Analysis (recordings, transcriptions, and interviews)</p>	<p>English-language teachers commonly used communication strategies of giving information, asking questions, and giving directions; they did most of the classroom talk, thus impacting the students' participation process.</p>
<p>Muñoz and Mora (2006)</p> <p><i>Functions of Code-Switching: Tools for Learning and Communicating in English Classes</i></p> <p>One school – 2nd grade – Bogotá</p>	<p>Qualitative Case Study</p> <p>(video tapes, transcriptions)</p>	<p>English-language teacher's talk was permeated by code-switching strategies of Spanish and English combinations.</p>
<p>Fajardo (2008)</p> <p><i>Conversation Analysis (CA) in Primary School Classrooms</i></p> <p>One school – elementary – Bucaramanga</p>	<p>Conversation Analysis</p> <p>(video recordings, transcripts)</p>	<p>The kind of interaction promoted by a group of pre-service teachers showed highly restricted possibilities for their young learners to use English meaningfully in the classroom.</p>
<p>Gonzalez-Humaney, Arias (2009)</p> <p><i>Enhancing Oral Interaction in English as a Foreign Language through Task-Based Learning Activities</i></p> <p>One school – mid/high – Planeta Rica</p>	<p>Action Research</p> <p>(questionnaires, interviews, direct observation, student diaries, and audio/video recordings)</p>	<p>Teacher-student interaction was usually teacher-initiated and centered on providing explanations and requests.</p>

Figure 7.1 (Continued)**English-Language Teaching Classroom Interaction Studies in Colombia**

Classroom Interaction Research Study	Research Methodology, Data Collection Techniques	Main Findings
<p>Herazo-Rivera (2010)</p> <p><i>Authentic Oral Interaction in the EFL Class: What It Means, What It Does Not</i></p> <p>One school – mid/high – Montería</p>	<p>Experimental Research</p> <p>(naturalistic line of inquiry, recordings, transcripts).</p>	<p>Teachers sometimes did not clearly understand the communicative approach in EFL education for authentic oral interaction.</p>
<p>Bohórquez-Suárez, Gómez-Sará, Medina-Mosquera (2011)</p> <p><i>Pair Negotiation When Developing English Speaking Tasks</i></p> <p>One school –7th grade – Bogotá</p>	<p>Descriptive Case Study</p> <p>(video recordings, transcriptions, and interviews)</p>	<p>Found patterned combinations in the negotiations of students when working in pairs for developing speaking tasks.</p>
<p>Rosado-Mendinueta (2012)</p> <p><i>Contingent Interaction: A Case Study in a Colombian EFL Classroom</i></p> <p>One school – mid/high – Bogotá</p>	<p>Multi- Case Study (audio tapes, transcripts, and ethnographic notes)</p>	<p>Teacher-student interaction with students contained learning-generating opportunities in traditional exchange patterns.</p>
<p>Montenegro (2012)</p> <p><i>Analyzing EFL University Learners' Positionings and Participation Structures in a Collaborative Learning Environment</i></p> <p>College – Bogotá</p>	<p>Qualitative Research Inductive Analysis (audio recordings, teacher's field notes, individual conferences)</p>	<p>Students' behavior on interactions with teachers resulted from mutual acknowledgement of their skills, rights, and responsibilities during group work. Thus, certain participation structures for collaborative learning were generated, such as cross-transactions and reciprocal acknowledgement.</p>

Figure 7.1 (Continued)
English-Language Teaching Classroom Interaction Studies in Colombia

Classroom Interaction Research Study	Research Methodology, Data Collection Techniques	Main Findings
Serna Dimas and Ruíz Castellanos (2014) <i>Language-Building Activities and Variations in Interaction with Mixed-Ability ESL University Learners in a Content-Based Course</i> English-for-Specific- Purposes (ESP) College – Bogotá	Action Research (anecdotal records, sociograms, exter- nal observations)	College students displayed a variety of English-language skills while in acquisition activities and variations in interaction.
Lucero Babativa (2011, 2012, 2015) <i>Conducting Research on Classroom Interaction: Approaches, Studies, and Reasons</i> Languages College – Bogotá	Ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis (video recordings, transcripts)	Oral activities were mainly composed of interaction patterns of <i>asking about</i> and <i>adding content</i> , as well as requestes for the L2 equivalent of an L1 word (request-provision- acknowledgement – <i>RPA</i> <i>sequence</i>).

Source: Own

Studies listed above have mostly analyzed classroom interactions in English-language teaching at school level descriptively, including six studies focused on mid/high school and two on elementary level; three additional studies have been reported at college level. A variety of research methodologies have been implemented across all these studies, either with case study analyzes of interactional teacher/student actions, or by implementing oral interaction strategies. In general terms, findings reveal that classroom interaction in English-language teaching is organized and structured by interaction patterns that are usually initiated by teachers and subsequently co-constructed with students, mainly focused on improving English-language skills.

In regard to classroom interactions within the environment of teachers' education, five studies have been published to date in Colombia. Similarly to

the studies about English-language teaching discussed above, teacher education studies have also described interactions within the classroom; a common finding here is that teachers regularly come to be a model for students to follow regarding how to teach. Figure 7.2 below shows these five studies including research methodology, data collection techniques, and main findings.

Figure 7.2

English-Language Teacher Education Classroom Interaction Studies in Colombia

Classroom Interaction Research Study	Research Methodology, Data Collection Techniques	Main Findings
Álvarez (2008) <i>Instructional Sequences of English-Language Teachers: A Descriptive Attempt</i> Bogotá	Qualitative research, coding analysis. (Observation logs and interviews)	Five teacher's regular instructional sequences identified: practice, presentation, production, evaluation, and homework check. These sequences resulted from classroom administration of activities as well as interactions teacher/ students.
Castrillón-Ramírez (2010) <i>Students' Perceptions on Development of Their Oral Skills in an EFL Teaching Program</i> Pereira	Qualitative research, categorization, Likert scale (observations, interviews, questionnaires)	Classroom interaction helped students improve their ability to express and understand their ideas by developing more fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, and intonation.
Castro-Garcés and López-Olivera (2013) <i>Communication Strategies Used by Pre-Service English Teachers of Different Proficiency Levels</i> Ibagué	Qualitative approach, categorization (audio recordings, transcripts, and interviews with an open-ended questionnaire)	Mid-undergraduate ELT students used a variety of communication strategies for interactions in a conversation course (e.g. message abandonment, topic avoidance, and code-switching, among others).

Source: Own

Figure 7.2 (Continued)
English-Language Teacher Education Classroom Interaction Studies in Colombia

Classroom Interaction Research Study	Research Methodology, Data Collection Techniques	Main Findings
Lucero and Rouse (2017) <i>Classroom Interaction in ELT Undergraduate Programs: Characteristics and Pedagogical Implications</i> Bogotá	Ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis (video recordings, transcripts, SETT interviews)	Three undergraduate ELT classrooms showed transactional episodes, interaction patterns similar to EFL classrooms', and instructional paradoxes.
Lucero and Scalante- Morales (2018) <i>English-Language Teacher Educator Interactional Styles: Heterogeneity and Homogeneity in the ELT Classroom</i> Bogota	Ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis (video recordings, transcripts, SETT interviews)	Three undergraduate ELT classrooms showed homogeneous interaction patterns in varied courses and class activities, as well as heterogeneous patterns in similar courses and class activities.

Source: Own

The analysis of data resulting from these five studies focused on two main aspects: how interactional practices occurred in undergraduate English-language teachers education classrooms, and, how these practices mediated the improvement of students' communication strategies. Findings revealed that teacher educators tend to organize their practices into instructional sequences and transactional episodes that coincidentally resemble the interaction patterns identified in no-teachers English-language classrooms. These findings emerged from applying two main approaches: a) a qualitative analysis where observations and interviews with the participants were categorized into interactional practices; and, b) a Conversation Analysis where transcripts

were analyzed to unveil the organization of classroom interactions. Unlike studies listed in Figure 7.1, classroom interactions on English-language teacher education in Colombia have been considered neither a case study nor a context to implement interactional strategies when developing oral communication skills or enhancing diverse interactional practices.

A common issue among the studies cited in Figures 7.1 and 7.2, is that their varied research methodologies and data collection techniques were designed to find how interaction between teachers and students in these English-language classrooms is organized and structured. These methodologies and techniques were mainly focused on depicting what happens in the organization and structure of classroom interaction in Colombian English-language teaching. A closer view at these findings portray rather technical descriptions of how teachers and students' turns at speaking are classified into interaction patterns and organizations due to classroom activities. There are few explanations of when and why those patterns and organizations emerge within the described sets of interaction. This might give the idea that classroom interaction in Colombian English-language teacher education happens rather mechanically, thus following only planned interactional practices or orientations with pre-established pedagogical purposes of learning English or practicing how to teach it. As seen in Figures 7.1 and 7.2, the findings mostly display descriptions of how teachers' interactional practices from pre-planned pedagogical designs can build more accurate English-language speakers, develop more communication abilities in the students, and raise awareness of interactional practices in the classroom.

Other major studies outside the Colombian scholarly environment also show a descriptive analysis of classroom interaction in English-language education (see for example Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Mehan, 1979; Markee, 1995; 2004; Seedhouse, 2004; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Kasper, 2006; Rymes, 2009; Walsh, 2011; Gardner, 2014). Analyses of data from these studies majorly center on how teachers' leading instructional or interactional sequences organize interactional practices during class activities, and how those practices in turn contribute to either students' second language acquisition or involvement in the activities. A common finding is that ways of co-constructing classroom interaction are seen as if dependent on teacher's interactional practices. Regrettably, these studies may imply the belief that classroom interaction would be similar across any contexts of English-language education. Such belief may turn off intents to study the moments and reasons of classroom interaction within some other specific contexts in other manners.

All above mentioned studies, in and outside Colombia, depict a panorama where the research methodologies and data collection techniques have mainly been designed to piece together the organizational puzzle of how teachers and students interact within the English-language classroom. These designs follow a rather unique descriptive outlook of analysis. In my point of view, this perspective has yet to reach further explanations of three phenomena in the organization and structure of classroom interaction in English-language education:

- The situational moments when those interactional structures emerge and the interactants' reasons of their emergence within the interactional sets under study.
- The ways and reasons those structures emerged or are maintained in further interactional practices in the classroom.
- The explanations and descriptions of other forms of interaction in the classroom, as out-of-institutional-setting conversations (Schegloff, 1987), laminative talk (van Dam van Isselt, as cited in Richards, 2006), discorsal feedback (Cullen, 2002), off-task talk (Markee, 2004), off-the-record conversations (Richards, 2006), or extraordinary events of talk (Lucero & Rouse, 2017)¹⁹.

The study of classroom interaction nowadays demands a broader view of the socio-contextual actions and practices that participants perform in interaction (Drew, 2005; Schegloff, 2005). This broader view should cover not only the sequential description of how social actions and practices happen, but also the reasons and moments they occur as part of the social organization and order of the context under analysis (Schegloff, 1987, 1992; Wetherell, 1998). Without any doubt, interactions occurring in the variety of English-language education classrooms around the world should help understand what teachers and students situationally do and are as interactants in this variety of settings. The manner how they deal with every interaction and the reasons for doing so, in and outside the pedagogical purposes of lessons, within their situational teaching context, should also be a concern in the study of organizations of classroom interaction in English-language education.

19 Out-of-institutional-setting conversations, off-task talk, and off-the-record conversations refer to those oral exchanges that are not part of the pedagogical purposes of the classroom lesson. The laminative talk refers to comments that are understood as a frame-break of the pedagogical talk, discorsal feedback as the interventions that recall past explanations of content, and extraordinary events of talk to those oral exchanges that take place because of events that are not part of the class activities.

Studies on interactional identities. Research studies that directly focus on the interactional identities of classroom participants in English-language education, add major dilemmas to those exposed thus far. Although there are a number of published studies about teachers or students' identities in English-language education in Colombia (see for example Banegas, 2012; Fajardo-Castañeda, 2013, 2014; Quintero-Polo & Guerrero-Nieto, 2013; Ubaque, 2016), none of them consider the interactional identities that teachers or students may enact in the English-language classroom. They see other levels or facets of identity construction and constitution from other data sources as narratives and life stories. This fact opens a huge window of inquiry since teachers and students' interactional identities may be in need to be studied to see how they also help configuring English-language learning and teaching interactional practices in the classroom. With this statement, my intention is never to discredit these revealing studies on teachers and students' identities. On the contrary, my point of argument is that teachers and students' identity construction as interactants in the English-language classroom can also and complementarily be seen in the complexities of identity formations and interaction organizations in English-language education classrooms.

There are few studies on interactional identities in the English-language classroom around the world (see for example Duff, 2002; Martinez, Durán, & Hikida, 2017; Rampton & Charalambous, 2016; Rymes & Anderson, 2004; Thomas, 2013; Vetter & Schieble, 2015). By following descriptive research methodologies such as interaction analysis, conversation analysis, and linguistic ethnography, they examine the sequential organization of talk and the linguistic resources that the participants use during classroom interactions. These studies observe the realization of teachers and students' interactional roles in the emergent interactions of pedagogically-designed classroom activities.

Therefore, under a systematic application of descriptive research methodologies, plus a controlled view of classroom interaction, the cited studies on interactional identities in English-language classrooms have taken a rather structural perspective. Up-to-day research on interactional identities in English-language classrooms seems to focus regularly on the manner how teachers or students take on a series of interactional roles that come from either the pedagogical designs of the teacher-researchers doing the study (as in Duff, 2002; Rymes & Anderson, 2004; Thomas, 2013), or the doctrines of instructional designs of language teaching approaches (as in Martinez, Durán, & Hikida, 2017; Rampton & Charalambous, 2016; Vetter & Schieble, 2015).

Further studies on the matters also need to highlight the contextual aspects and factors that can openly play a relevant role in the way how interactional roles are constructed in English-language education. Those contextual aspects and factors can be class contents/topics, first language, L2 proficiency or command, power relations, classroom climate, students and teachers' conversational agendas, and the messiness of interaction, among others.

Keeping a subjacent structural perspective as in the works mentioned above, is something that, on my viewpoint, preserves the belief that studying teachers and students' interactional roles in English-language education could still be seen as constructed from predicted sequences or directions, where these participants just have to reproduce classroom interactional models and roles congruent to English language teaching methods or approaches. In other words, this perspective would keep on making teachers and students the type of individuals that mainstream English language education perspectives portray; here, any attempt to doing it differently may be seen as not having an effective²⁰ teaching-learning interaction or not being an effective teacher or student.

The study of interactional identities in English-language education may actually need non-orthodox examinations. These examinations would need to be not focused on depicting how pre-established interactional roles or sequences occur, but further explore the moments, reasons, and fluidity of the emergence of teachers and students' multiple interactional identities within the situational structures and organizations of classroom interaction, as well as in the diversity of English-language education contexts.

Specifically, in the Colombian context of English-language education, the review about up-to-day studies on classroom interaction and its participants' interactional identities²¹ displays a rather structural view. It seems that, in the research designs, the real selves of teachers and students as classroom interactants have mainly been dispossessed by, and replaced or equated to, standardized roles and interactional models, which are generally inscribed in mainstream language teaching methods and approaches. Keeping studying English-language classroom interaction and its participants' interactional identities with this view might nullify, disapprove, or annihilate situated and

20 This concept of *effective* is debatable. It is unclear for whom it is *effective*, under which contextual conditions, by doing what, how, why, and with whom in which English language educational settings.

21 See studies in Figures 7.1 and 7.2 above in this chapter and in the complementary manuscript about the state of art of classroom interaction in ELTE and its interactional identities in Colombia (Lucero, 2018).

divergent practices and identities in classroom interaction. Doing research on classroom interaction and its participants' interactional identities with more in-situ and inductive perspectives might then expand the understandings about what teachers and students may really be, become, and do as interactants in the dynamics of classroom interactions, and in the diversity of contexts where they can occur.

A Research Approach to Study Classroom Interaction and its Participants' Interactional Identities

In all the above studies, the manner how classroom interaction occurs for English-language education, is closely connected to what teachers and students do as interactants in this context. Certainly, this fact opens possibilities to study these two issues together from multiple angles. Classroom interaction researchers nowadays must indeed be able to scheme out varied research methodologies from novel views of seeing classroom interaction and interactional identities together within a context-sensitive/context-situated perspective. Emergent research approaches that intent to do that could incorporate a gradually blending mixture of defined principles and elements from correlated research methodologies, or a pertinent interweaving of multiple and novel perspectives of a research methodology across disciplines²². In either case, none of the principles, elements, or perspectives can be taken plainly from their origin, but need to be re-fabricated in consonance with the research purposes, context, and population under study.

A research methodology to explore the moments and reasons of classroom interaction in unison with its participants' interactional identities in English-language education, needs to be geared towards seeing interactional identities as what their participants are, become, and do as interactants in all the contextual and situated dynamics of classroom interaction. This type of methodology should not simply explore what the interactants may linguistically do within the mechanics of the interaction. The claim is then for a more kaleidoscopic approach for the analysis of context-situated classroom interaction where various positionings of multiple identities (interactional

22 See for example the idea of a bricolage in research designs to study inequalities (Steinberg, 2015) or the ethnomethodologically-inclined discourse analysis to account for hybridity in talk-in-interaction (Tate, 2007). These two research approaches sustainably borrow principles and elements from other research methodologies to study socio-cultural matters correlated to situated discourses and identities.

identities in this case) can jointly be addressed within it. The questions on this regard may revolve among what types or interactions and which identities occur in classroom interactions, plus why those interactions and those identities emerge at a given moment, all of that to be investigated with no pre-established premises.

Studies on individuals' identities within interactions in other social contexts (see for example Appiah, 2007; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Richards, 2006; Schegloff, 1987; Thornborrow, 1999; Tracy & Robles, 2012; Wenger, 1998; Zimmerman, 1998) have found that:

- Identities are taken-on, assigned, enacted, and challenged within interaction.
- These actions make identities fluid, multiple, movable, over-lapping, multi-scale, multidimensional, multifaceted, and context-sensitive.
- Interaction is constructed from the individuals' occurring identities.

By considering these premises, the beliefs that classroom interaction can be structured and organized in similar ways, regardless contextual aspects, or that the realization of its participants' interactional identities could be pre-established, are difficult to conceive. Neither contexts nor interactional identities are static or pre-determined. In agreement with Antaki and Widdicombe (1998), Wetherell (1998), Zimmerman (1998), Bucholtz and Hall (2005), Richards (2006), and Tracy and Robles (2013), different realizations of multiple occurring interactional identities may construct varied structures and organizations of interaction, and vice versa. Hence, there may not possibly be pre-established interactional identities that construct defined structures of classroom interaction, as there may not possibly be repetitive structures of classroom interaction that construct the same interactional identities. English-language teachers and students' interactional roles (or identities) might not be relatively pre-determined from pedagogical designs as if always occurring the same way in every context; might classroom interaction be neither structured nor organized in determined interactional sequences everywhere²³. It cannot happen this way. In concordance with Benwell and Stokoe (2006), Duff (2002), Gardner (2014), Richards (2006), Rymes (2009), Wetherell (1998), and Walsh (2011; 2013), classroom interaction always contains dynamic

23 Leading studies on classroom interaction, such as Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), Johnson (2009), Gardner (2014), Seedhouse (2004), and Wong and Zhang-Waring (2010), as well as Colombian studies on the matter (see Figures 7.1 and 7.2), present repetitive interactional sequences, mostly in teacher's talk. These studies should be taken as foundations for further similar studies, but not as fixed truths of how classroom interaction happens everywhere.

and constant negotiations of meanings that may be oriented and interpreted differently by each of its participants, who in turn have different and fluid backgrounds and visions of the world.

As a result of all considerations discussed so far, I have developed my ongoing research studies about classroom interactions and participants' interactional identities in English-language education where the classroom is taken as a social context²⁴, upon the basis of the four foundational premises below:

- The research study needs to transcend any structural description of the organization of classroom interaction in English-language education. Thus, it needs an orientation towards encouraging the analysis of reasons related to the temporal and contextual fluidity of all types of classroom interactions that may happen in this context, without following any a priori structure or organization of classroom interaction in the field.
- The research study needs to outdo any categorization of teachers or students' interactional roles (or identities) in English-language education. Instead, it needs to highlight explanations on how and why their ever-emergent and genuine interactional roles are constructed within the turn-by-turn of the occurring interactions in the classrooms.
- The research study needs to refrain from observing interactions in English-language education classrooms separated from the enactment of its participants' interactional roles. In preference, the study should analyze these participants' interactional identities within the interactional practices of these classrooms.
- The research study needs to extend the understandings of classroom interaction in English-language education from simply seeing it as composed of types of talk and interactional structures. In addition, the study needs to see classroom interaction as also composed of ever-changing aspects of its participants' first language, target language proficiency, power relations, conversational agendas, interactional behaviors, socio-cultural impregnations, and conversational contents.

This challenging four-premise endeavor implies broadening the current perspectives about classroom interaction and its participants' interactional identities. Then, I suggest taking the principles of *Conversation Analysis* (CA) and use them with a more kaleidoscopic outlook. The use of CA for

24 Based on studies from Schegloff, 1987; Weinstein, 1991; Duff, 2002; Seedhouse, 2004, 2015; Richards, 2006; Thomas, 2013; and Vetter & Schieble, 2015, among others.

the proposed study has a reason. Notwithstanding the importance of other research methodologies to study interaction²⁵, CA has primordially been the approach to figure out the structure and organization of talk-in-interaction, where identities are always in play, across different contexts and disciplines. A review of literature about research methodologies to study interaction in the classroom²⁶ situates CA as central to examine its organization and structure, and more recently its participants' multiple identities.

The constitution of CA as a methodology to study talk-in-interaction began with published studies by Harvey Sacks²⁷, Emmanuel Schegloff²⁸, and Gail Jefferson²⁹ about interactional sequences in context. They initially studied, for instance, discourse markers, timing, and gestures; openings, sequencing, and closures; routines and episodes; and telling jokes and stories, all in varied ordinary conversations. The foundational techniques of unmotivated inquiry, absence of presupposition, and conversation organization in these first studies positioned CA as a strong methodology to analyze interactional events across contexts and disciplines, which progressively made evident more and more aspects of interaction³⁰. These new aspects added to CA further up its theoretical and methodological principles. Mainly, discipline-oriented analysis of talk-in-interaction started considering aspects of social roles, race, gender, class, sexuality, gestures, and body language as part of the interactional phenomena. In addition, contextual rule-based foundations of communication (such as turn taking, utterance units and sequences), cultural practices of language use, and situated language knowledge and attitudes during different types of conversation, provided CA with indexicality to the time, place, and contextual aspects of talk-in-interaction.

- 25 See for example the reviews done by Schiffrin (1994), Benwell and Stokoe (2006), and Wetherell and Talpade-Mohanty (2010), where scholars have used other research approaches to study interaction and identities such as interactional sociolinguistics, membership categorization analysis, narrative analysis, critical discourse analysis, and ethnography of communication.
- 26 See for example the reviews done by Hua et al (2007), Sidnell and Stivers (2014), and Markee (2015), where CA is the central approach to study interaction and identities in the classroom.
- 27 See for example Sacks's studies on conversational materials to study interaction (1972), sequences in telling stories in ordinary conversations (1974), and notes on methodology to study interaction in conversation (1984), among other studies that Harvey Sacks did on interaction in context.
- 28 See for example Schegloff's studies on sequencing on conversational openings (1968), routines in conversations (1986), the manner to analyze short episodes of interaction (1987b), among other studies that Emmanuel Schegloff did on aspects related to interaction.
- 29 See for example Jefferson's studies on error correction (1974), the use of 'yeah' and 'mm hm' as interaction acknowledgement (1985), and the organization of troubles-talk in ordinary conversation (1988), among other studies that Gail Jefferson did on aspects about interaction.
- 30 See a review of other scholars using CA and their main findings across contexts and disciplines in Sidnell & Stivers's (2014) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. In Part IV, there is an account of CA studies in psychotherapy, medicine, classroom, courtroom, and news interview. In Part V, CA is considered within sociology, communication, anthropology, psychology, and linguistics.

In these CA studies across contexts and disciplines, four theoretical principles (Heritage, 1984; Sacks, 1984; Schegloff, 1987b, 2007; Seedhouse, 2005) are followed: (a) talk in interaction has a rational organization; (b) interaction is context-shaped and context-renewing; (c) no order of detail can be dismissed a priori as irrelevant; and, (d) interaction analysis is bottom-up and data-driven. These principles entail a series of methodological procedures (Drew, 2005; Maynard, 2014; Schegloff, 2007; Seedhouse, 2004): the analysis of interactional aspects in conversational events needs to begin with an unmotivated inquiry of talk-in-interaction in context; such inquiry must come absent of presuppositions of how it could be organized and structured, or what are the establishments to be found. Beginning the research study accordingly, should allow for a founding of instances of interactional organization and surrounded aspects of the conversational events for a detailed analysis of the phenomena.

Even though I adhere to these principles of CA to study the reciprocity between classroom interaction and its participants' interactional identities in English-language education, I suggest not using these principles under a unique perspective. The analysis of the interactional aspects and contextual foundations of the ever-flowing currents of interactions, along with with the multiplicity of interactional identities, requires multiple lenses if the situational moments, manners, and reasons of their emergences are to be found. This viewpoint abandons the structural perspective of seeing classroom interaction and interactional roles of its participants from standardized and predicted structures, sequences, directions, models, and roles that have been established in mainstream English-language education literature. I believe that, by keeping this kaleidoscopic perspective, I can explore what teachers and students may situationally be, do, and become as interactants in the co-constructing dynamics of classroom interactions and within the diversity of contexts of English-language education.

Recorded and transcribed data should be analyzed with each observed participant at a time, by also using notes taken during the observations/recordings. The establishment of collections of the transcribed instances of each discovered phenomenon in each observation/recording should have the validation of the observed participant as well. This validation looks for checking and recognizing interactional realizations and practices in the transcribed instances also from the observed participant. In this perspective, there should be a constant co-analysis of the transcribed instances of each phenomenon between the observed participant and the researcher with the

aim of exploring the participant's interactional identities and their enactments within the transcribed instances of each discovered phenomenon in each recording.

The collection of the participant's interactional identities should be presented to them so that to understand their *manners* and reasons for enacting in a particular way within each sequence. This is something that requires, from the observed participant, a constant check of the researcher's interpretations on the reported interactional identities and their enactments. This constant check should also seek to find out how the reported interactional identities and their enactments may relate to the co-construction of the classroom interaction in the observed sessions. These considerations to study interactional identities within classroom interaction in English-language education includes the participant, not only as the observed one, but also as a co-analyst of his/her own interactions and roles in the classroom.

Conclusion

As I have discussed above, during classroom interaction, teachers and students may take on, be assigned, and challenge fluid, multiple, and multifaceted interactional identities as they co-construct classroom interaction. At the same time, this co-construction of classroom interaction demands from its participants the enactment of interactional identities through multiple realizations. The situatedness, fluidity, and reciprocity of this phenomenon fill classroom interaction and interactional identities with different warps, interlaces, and threads. If this phenomenon were to be studied only under a structural perspective of CA, and only under the researcher's perspective, just the warps, interlaces, and threads of the fluidity and reciprocity of classroom interaction and interactional identities visible to those perspectives would be accounted. This situation would leave other aspects (such as characteristics, manners, and reasons of their situatedness, fluidity, and reciprocity, and the interactants' viewpoints), which are also part of the phenomenon, unnoticed. As if *they were not there*.

The overall purpose of this chapter has never been to institute CA as the unique research methodology to study classroom interaction in unison with its participants' interactional identities in English-language education. Following only one research methodology definitely cancels out other possibilities

to seeing these or some other matters under a different light. As discussed throughout this chapter, reciprocity has not yet been studied. The research proposal that I have outlined here intends to dig into it with the purpose to supporting that teachers and students' interactional identities (or roles) must preferably be seen from the "*who*" its participants are and do, in reciprocity with the manner how classroom interaction is co-constructed within varied situations and contexts.

References

- Álvarez, J. (2008). Instructional Sequences of English Language Teachers: An Attempt to Describe them. *HOW Journal* (15)1, pp. 29-48.
- Antaki, C., Widdicombe, S. (eds.) (1998). *Identities in Talk*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Appiah, K. (2007). *The Ethics of Identity*. UK: Princeton University Press.
- Balcárcel-Zambrano, G. (2003). Teacher Talk at Three Colombian Higher Education Institutions. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development* (4)1, pp. 9-16.
- Banegas, D. (2012). Identity of the Teacher-Researcher in Collaborative Action Research: Concerns Reflected in a Research Journal. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development* (14) 2, pp. 29-43.
- Benwell, B., Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bohórquez-Suárez, I., Gómez-Sará, M., Medina-Mosquera, S. (2011). Pair Negotiation when Developing English Speaking Tasks. *HOW Journal* (18)1, pp. 43-57.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic Approach. *Discourse Studies* (7) 4-5, pp. 585-614.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Cashman, H. R. (2005). Identities at Play: Language Preference and Group Membership in Bilingual Talk in Interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* (37), pp. 301-315.
- Castrillón-Ramírez, V. (2010). *Students' Perceptions about the Development of their Oral Skills in an English as a Foreign Language Teaching Program*

(unpublished undergraduate dissertation). Pereira, Colombia: Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira.

Castro-Garcés, A., López-Olivera, S. (2013). Communication Strategies Used by Pre-service English Teachers of Different Proficiency Levels. *HOW Journal* (21)1, pp. 10-25.

Chappell, P. (2014). *Group Work in the English Language Curriculum: Sociocultural and Ecological Perspectives on Second Language Classroom Learning*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive Teacher Talk: The Importance of the F-Move. *ELT Journal* (56), pp. 117-127.

Davies, B., Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* (20)1, pp. 12-30.

Drew, P. (2005). Conversation Analysis. In: Fitch, K., Sanders, R. (eds). *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Duff, P. (2002). The Discursive Co-Construction of Knowledge, Identity, and Difference: An Ethnography of Communication in the High School Mainstream. *Applied Linguistics* (23)3, pp. 289-322.

Fajardo, A. (2008). Conversation Analysis (CA) in Primary School Classrooms. *HOW Journal* (15)1, pp. 11-27.

Fajardo-Castañeda, J. (2013). What Makes a Teacher: Identity and Classroom Talk. *Cuadernos de lingüística hispánica* (22), pp. 127-146.

Fajardo-Castañeda, J. (2014). Learning to Teach and Professional Identity: Images of Personal and Professional Recognition. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development* (16)2, pp. 49-65.

Gardner, R. (2014). Conversation Analysis in the Classroom. In: Sidnell, J., Stivers, T. (eds). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.

Gonzalez-Humanez, L., Arias, N. (2009). Enhancing Oral Interaction in English as a Foreign Language Through Task-Based Learning Activities. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning* (2)2, pp. 1-9.

Herazo-Rivera, J. (2010). Authentic Oral Interaction in the EFL Class: What it Means, What it Does Not. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development* (12)1, pp. 47-61.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hua, Z., Seedhouse, P., Wei, L., Cook, V. (eds). (2007). *Language Learning and Teaching in Social Inter-Action*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Hudson, W. (1982). *The Marxist Philosophy of Ernst Bloch*. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.

Inamullah, M. (2005). *Patterns of Classroom Interaction at Different Educational Levels in the Light of Flanders' Interaction Analysis*. (Unpublished PhD dissertation). Retrieved from: <http://eprintshec.goal.pk>

Jefferson, G. (1974). Error Correction as an Interactional Resource. *Language in Society* (3)2, pp. 181-199.

Jefferson, G. (1985). Notes on a Systematic Deployment of the Acknowledgement Tokens 'Yeah' and 'mm hm'. *Papers in Linguistics* (17)2, pp. 197-216.

Jefferson, G. (1988). On the Sequential Organization of Troubles-Talk in Ordinary Conversation. *Social Problems* (35)4, pp. 418-441.

Johnson, K. (2009). *Second Language Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Perspective*. New York: Routledge.

Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond Repair: Conversation Analysis as an Approach to SLA. *AILA Review* (19), pp. 83-99.

Kurhila, S. (2006). *Second Language Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Li, L., Shouhui, Z., Xinying, C. (2011). *Beyond Research: Classroom Interaction Analysis Techniques for Classroom*. 4th. Redesigning Pedagogy International Conference, Singapore.

Lucero, E. (2011). Code Switching to Know a TL Equivalent of an L1 Word: Request-Provision-Acknowledgement (RPA) Sequence. *HOW Journal* (18), pp. 58-72.

Lucero, E. (2012). Asking about Content and Adding Content: Two Patterns of Classroom Interaction. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal* (14)1, pp. 28-44.

Lucero, E. (2015). Doing Research on Classroom Interaction: Approaches, Studies, and Reasons. In: Escobar, W., Castañeda-Peña (eds.). *Studies in Discourse Analysis in the Colombian Context*. Bogotá, Colombia: Editorial El Bosque.

Lucero, E. (2018). Teacher Educator Interactional Identities in English Language Teacher Education. In: Castañeda-Peña et al., *ELT Local Research Agendas I*. Bogotá, Colombia: Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas, Libros de los Énfasis del Doctorado Interinstitucional en Educación, ELT Énfasis.

Lucero, E., Rouse, M. (2017). Classroom Interaction in ELTE Undergraduate Programs: Characteristics and Pedagogical Implications. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal* (19)2, pp. 193-208.

Lucero, E., Scalante, J. (2018). English Language Teacher Educator Interactional Styles: Heterogeneity and Homogeneity in the ELTE Classroom. *HOW Journal* (25)1, pp. 11-31.

Markee, N. (1995). Teachers' Answers to Students' Questions: Problematizing the Issue of Making Meaning. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* (6)2, pp. 63-92.

Markee, N. (2004). The Organization of Off-Task Talk in Second Language Classrooms. In: Richards, K., Seedhouse, P. (eds.). *Applying Conversation Analysis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Markee, N., Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom Talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, (88)4, pp. 491-500.

Martínez, R., Durán, L., Hikida, M. (2017). Becoming "Spanish Learners": Identity and Interaction among Multilingual Children in a Spanish-English Dual Language Classroom. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, (11)3, pp. 167-183.

Maynard, D.W. (2014). Everyone and No One to Turn to: Intellectual Roots and Contexts for Conversation Analysis. In: Sidnell, J., Stivers, T. (eds). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Montenegro, A. (2012). Analyzing EFL University Learners' Positionings and Participation Structures in a Collaborative Learning Environment. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, (14)1, pp. 127-145.

Muñoz, J., Mora, Y. (2006). Functions of Code-Switching: Tools for Learning and Communicating in English Classes. *HOW Journal* (13)1, pp. 31-45.

Odiri-Amatari, V. (2015). The Instructional Process: A Review of Flanders' Interaction Analysis in a Classroom Setting. *International Journal of Secondary Education* (3)5, pp. 43-49.

Quintero-Polo, A., Guerrero-Nieto, C. (2013). "Of Being and Not Being:" Colombian Public Elementary School Teachers' Oscillating Identities. *HOW Journal* (20)1, pp. 190-205.

Ramton, B., Charalambous, C. (2016). Breaking Classroom Silences: A View from Linguistic Ethnography. *Language and Intercultural Communication* (16)1, pp. 4-21.

Richards, K. (2006). Being the Teacher: Identity and Classroom Conversation. *Applied Linguistics* (27)1, pp. 51-77.

Rosado-Mendinueta, N. (2012). Contingent Interaction: A Case Study in a Colombia EFL Classroom. *Zona Próxima* (17), pp. 154-175.

Rymes, B. (2009). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Tool for Critical Reflection*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

Rymes, B., Anderson, K. (2004). Second Language Acquisition for All: Understanding the Interactional Dynamics of Classrooms in which Spanish and AAE are Spoken. *Research in the Teaching of English* (39)2, pp. 107-135.

Sacks, H. (1972). An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Materials for Doing Sociology. In: Sudnow, D. (ed.). *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press.

Sacks, H. (1974). Some Consideration of a Story Told in Ordinary Conversations. *Poetics* (15), pp. 127-138.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on Methodology. In: Atkinson, J., Heritage, J. (eds.). *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (1968). Sequencing in Conversational Openings. *American Anthropologist* (70)6, pp. 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. (1986). The Routine as Achievement. *Human Studies* (9), pp. 111-151.

Schegloff, E. (1987a). Between Micro and Macro: Contexts and Other Connections. In: Alexander, J., Giesen, R., Smeler, N. (eds). *The Micro-Macro Link*. Berkely: University of California Press.

Schegloff, E. (1987b). Analyzing Single Episodes of Interaction: An Exercise in Conversation Analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly* (50)2, pp. 101-114.

Schegloff, E. (1992). In Another Context. In: Duranti, A., Goodwin, C. (eds). *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (2005). On Integrity in Inquiry of the Investigated, Not the Investigator. *Discourse Studies* (7)4-5, pp. 455-480.

Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Madison, USA: Language Learning Monograph Series.

Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation Analysis and Language Learning. *Language Teaching* (38), pp. 165-187.

Seedhouse, P. (2015). L2 Classroom Interaction as a Complex Adaptive System. In: Markee, N. (ed). *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction*. Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Serna-Dimas, H., Ruíz-Castellanos, E. (2014). Language-Building Activities and Variations in Interaction with Mixed-Ability ESL University Learners in a Content-Based Course. *HOW Journal* (21)1, pp. 103-121.

Sidnell, J., Stivers, T. (eds). (2014). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.

Sinclair, J., Coulthard, R.M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steinberg, S. (2015). Employing the Bricolage as Critical Research in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. In: Vicars, M., Steinberg, S., McKenna, T., Cacciattolo, M. (eds). *The Praxis of English Language Teaching and Learning (PELT): Beyond the Binaries: Researching Critically in EFL Classrooms*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Tate, S.A. (2007). Foucault, Bakhtin, Ethnomethodology: Accounting for Hybridity in Talk-in-Interaction. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* (8)2, art. 10.

Thomas, E. (2013). Dilemmatic Conversations: Some Challenges of Culturally Responsive Discourse in a High School English Classroom. *Linguistics and Education* (24)3, pp. 328-347.

Thornborrow, J. (1999). Language and Identity. In: Thomas, L., Wareing, S. (eds). *Language, Society and Power*. London: Routledge.

Tracy, K., Robles, J. (2013). *Everyday Talk: Building and Reflecting Identities*. NY, US: The Guilford Press.

Ubaque, D. (2016). Life Stories: A Way to Explore Language Learners' Narrative Experiences and Identities in an EFL Context. *Revista Folios* (43), pp. 153-164.

Vetter, A., Schieble, M. (2015). *Observing Teacher Identities Through Video Analysis: Practice and Implications*. New York: Routledge.

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

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

Weinstein, C. (1999). The Classroom as a Social Context for Learning. *Annual Review of Psychology* (42), pp. 493-525.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and Interpretative Repertoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-Structuralism in Dialogue. *Discourse & Society* (9)3, pp. 387-412.

Wetherell, M., & Talpade-Mohanty, C. (eds). (2010). *The SAGE handbook of Identities*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Wong, J., Zhang-Waring, H. (2010). *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy: A Guide for ESL/EFL Teachers*. New York: Routledge.

Zimmerman, D. (1998). Identity, Context and Interaction. In: Antaki, C., Widdicombe, S. (eds). *Identities in Talk*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.