

# Teacher Educator Interactional Identities in English Language Teacher Education

*Edgar Yead Lucero Babativa*

## Abstract

---

This chapter presents the interface between teacher educator interactional identities and three fields of inquiry: English language teaching education (ELTE), classroom interactional structure in ELTE, and English language teacher identities. In each interface, related theory is discussed to elucidate the missing foundations in relation to teacher educator interactional identities in ELTE. As a result of this elucidation, the chapter presents a researchable problem based on three lacks: how English language teachers' established roles operate or are established throughout classroom interaction in ELTE; how the linguistic, social, and interactional components and factors of classroom interaction in ELTE are the result of English language teachers' realization of their roles as teacher educators; and how teacher educators' identities are constituted during classroom interaction in ELTE.

**Keywords:** Teacher Educator, Classroom Interaction, Interactional Identities, Language Education.

## Introduction

---

This chapter problematizes classroom interaction and teacher educator interactional identities. It explores how classroom interaction may constitute teacher educator interactional identities in English language teaching education (ELTE). The study is justified in the fact that classroom interaction is the scenario in which teachers and learners share their knowledge, experiences, and use of the target language for language teaching and learning (Johnson, 1994; Cazden, 2001; Rymes, 2009; Walsh, 2011, Lucero, 2015), while they permanently unveil and constitute their identities throughout classroom interaction (Morgan 2004, Clarke, 2008; Norton, 2013). Classroom interaction shapes teachers and learners' identities. These identities can be seen from different perspectives and levels, namely, gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, social status, subject, and performance (Prosser & Trigwell, 1999; Moore, 2004; Clarke, 2008; Mitchel, 2016). The research problem proposed in this chapter emerges from the scarce research on the relationship between

classroom interaction and teacher educator interactional identities in contexts where English is not only a subject matter but also the language through which pedagogical and disciplinary content about language education is shared. The characteristics that these contexts entail may make teacher educator interactional identities be constituted in distinctive manners. Studying this issue must be of major importance in the inquiries about classroom interaction since it is in ELT programs where future language teachers are educated and initially considered as interactants<sup>2</sup> in the language classroom.

Interactional identities have been defined by Professors K. Tracy and J. S. Robles (2013) as the “specific roles that people take on in a communicative context with regard to other specific people” (p. 22)<sup>3</sup>. This understanding is the result of their extensive ethnographic study of how communication works in everyday talk in varied social contexts. Although I do not see the interactional identities of teacher educators as roles but as their selves, the *who* a teacher educator is in interaction instead of a *role* while interacting (I will progressively elaborate on this idea in each of the interfaces below), the purpose of adopting this definition in here is to transport it into the classroom interaction that occurs in ELT programs. As I have thus far exposed, both teacher and learners take on specific roles (the *selves* each one enacts in interaction) accordingly and throughout classroom interaction. This social context has not yet been explored with the magnifying glass of interactional identities. I have come to this endeavor by doing research on how classroom interaction occurs in English as a foreign language (EFL) learning programs.

The study of teacher educator interactional identities is directly interconnected with three fields of inquiry: ELT education, classroom interactional structure, and teacher identities. In the subsequent sections, I will talk about the interface between interactional identities and each of these three fields.

---

2 This concept of *interactant* has been coined from the use that a number of authors have given to it: *an individual who interacts in conversational exchanges* (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998, p. 2; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 587; Hua, Seedhouse, Wei, & Cook, 2007, p. 11; Tracy & Robles, 2013, p. 42). According to Cashman (2005), being an interactant implies being competent to interact with the others in a determined context.

3 Zimmerman (1998) calls this level of identity as *Discourse Identity*. He defines it as “what they [speakers] are doing interactionally in a particular space of talk... orienting participants to the type of activity underway and their respective roles within it” (p. 92).

English language teachers' roles have been a major concern in ELTE. Well-known authors (see below) have written about what roles English language teachers must comply with in the English language classroom. In my point of view, these teacher roles have been seen from three different perspectives but always in line with their characteristics and duties for English language teaching and learning. Oxford et al (1998), Brown (2007), and Richards and Rodgers (2014) have elaborated detailed characteristics of English language teacher roles. Cohen (1985), Ur (1996), Olshtain and Kupfergerg (1998), Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000), and Benson (2013) have explained English language teacher roles from a more discursive and reflective angle, being these teachers the actors in the classroom from the analysis they have made of the pedagogical discourse and context. Johnson and Johnson (2008), Hertz-Lazarowitz (2008), Pritchard (2009), Smily and Antón (2012), Carbone (2012), and Yoon and Kyeong-Kim (2012), have seen English language teacher roles from a more socio-constructivist angle towards language learning and teaching practices in context.

Perceiving English language teacher roles with detailed characteristics and functions comes from the idea that language teaching methods and approaches define those roles (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Eventually, classroom interaction is configured by the set of actions indicated for each teacher role in each language teaching method or approach, as specified by Brown (2007), and Richards and Rodgers (2014). Described in the form of metaphors, most of those roles point to the design and orchestration of lessons, meaning, organization, assistance, and monitoring of language learning (Oxford *et al.*, 1998). There are then teacher roles for before (designer), during (monitoring), and after (rethinking) language lessons. By doing the actions established for each role, teachers can create the type of classroom and interaction that each method or approach pursues. According to Brown (2007), there is no escape from these roles, language teachers need to "accept the fact that you [they] are called upon to be many things to many different people" (p. 251). Those different people are the learners, and the many things are the roles demanded for the correct application of a language teaching method or approach. In Richards and Rodgers' (2014) words, each approach or method gives language teachers the central role for encouraging learners to interact and use the target language. By carrying out their functions and roles, language teachers are essential to the access of the method. Therefore, the established roles in each language teaching method or approach provide language teachers with the frames to construct their conversational agendas.

This situation aligns language teachers to interact only in the indicated manners that each role signals.

A second perspective of English language teacher roles sees them from a more discursive and reflective standpoint. For example, Olshtain and Kupferger (1998), and Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000) state that language teachers need to be more aware of how their discourses are structured because they are the reflection of the roles that they have assumed in their teaching practices. Thus, language teacher roles are crucial to effective language presentation and practice activities. Furthermore, Cohen (1985), Ur (1996), and Benson (2013) assert that language teacher roles refer to their responsibilities to engage learners into language learning. Language teachers must not only limit their functions to follow steps of language teaching methods, but also create proper conditions for learners' language learning so that they can take responsibility for their own motivation, performance, and learning. Specifically, Ur (1996) and Benson (2013) provide a set of tasks for language teachers (as a self-directed instructor, advisor, and developer) to foster learners' motivation, autonomy, and performance. From a discursive and reflective perspective, these roles equally provide language teachers with responsibilities, functions, and tasks for their teaching practices. These responsibilities, functions, and tasks later on mediate interaction in the language classroom. Little is known about how these roles really operate in classroom interaction in context.

The third perspective that I distinguish about English language teacher roles has a more socio-constructivist angle. Its authors give more emphasis on interaction between language teachers and learners for language learning purposes within their social contexts. Pritchard (2009), for instance, gives language teachers the role of the more knowledgeable in formal learning situations, thus, they must "stimulate dialogue and maintain its momentum" (p. 24). As learning is situated in social and cultural settings (the classroom is considered one of them), language teachers are material providers, task designers, and leaners/learning supporters. Complementarily, Hertz-Lazarowitz (2008) assigns language teachers the role of peer learners in which they have to facilitate "intellectual and social development of the students" (p. 39). Investigation and interaction are key factors for this purpose. Although not much is said about how all of this may happen in classroom interaction, both language teachers and learners have to practice effective interaction with each other and the social context in order to orient language learning towards common purposes (this is understood as investigation for this author). Similar to this, Johnson and Johnson (2008) suggest that language teachers need to be cooperative, knowledge supporters, and interaction promoters for group processing. The accomplishment of these roles impact the learners' actions and language learning goals.

On the other side, Smily and Antón (2012) offer an alternative position by stating that language teachers need to reflect on “how to plan discourse in the classroom in order to express their roles” (p. 246). In their study, these authors claim that language teachers use a variety of discursive strategies that turn them into learning mediators and interaction promoters, all in line with the type of learners that they have. This premise implies that these roles are “semiotically conveyed by discourse strategies” (p. 247); this means that language teacher roles are portrayed by the language they use. Although Yoon and Kyeong-Kim (2012) agree with this premise, they state that language teachers must also “adjust their instructional approaches based on the students’ different level and status” (Yoon & Kyeong-Kim, 2012, p. xvii). Carbone (2012) attains to similar understandings; nonetheless, for her, language teacher roles mostly emerge when they value learners’ funds of knowledge and understand their cultural backgrounds. In sum, this socio-constructivist perspective assigns roles to language teachers based on how their interactions with learners happen. The context, learning objectives, classroom tasks, teaching materials, and planned discourse affect the manner in which classroom interaction occurs. Again, we scarcely know about how these roles really operate in classroom interaction. The understanding gained is that language teachers seem to align to interact only in the indicated manners that each role scripts.

The matter under discussion in this section is to see how English language teacher roles are perceived from their functions and according to language teaching methods and expected classroom interaction. These three perspectives regulate and organize the specific roles that language teachers must take on in classroom interaction (see Table 1 below). ELTE has adopted these perspectives for its teacher educators, who teach new English language teachers. My discernment is that the three perspectives establish roles as a set of rules or ideals that language teachers must carry out. These three perspectives consider English language teacher roles as the set of actions that they have to do and the type of person they have to be only under the umbrella of language teaching methods and approaches.

Detailed Characteristics and Functions	Discursive and Reflective Standpoint	A Socio-constructivist Angle
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In line with teaching methods and approaches</li> <li>- Design and orchestration of lessons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How their discourses are structured</li> <li>- Create conditions for language learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emphasis on T-S interaction with the social contexts for learning purposes</li> </ul>

<p>Teacher as a/an:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Controller</li> <li>- Director</li> <li>- Manager</li> <li>- Facilitator</li> <li>- Resource</li> <li>- Designer</li> <li>- Monitor</li> <li>- Lesson thinker</li> <li>- Learning motivator</li> </ul>	<p>Teacher as a/an:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discourse analyst</li> <li>- Learning motivator</li> <li>- Instructor</li> <li>- Advisor</li> <li>- Developer</li> <li>- Communicator</li> <li>- Language user</li> </ul>	<p>Teacher as a/an:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interactant</li> <li>- Material provider</li> <li>- Task designer</li> <li>- Learning stimulator</li> <li>- Learning supporter</li> <li>- Learning facilitator</li> <li>- Peer-researcher</li> <li>- Discourse planner</li> </ul>
---	--	--

Source: Own.

Although these English language teacher roles pinpoint necessary responsibilities in ELTE, they are not supported from the types of interaction and factors that can emerge in the huge variety of language teaching contexts. My claim is that English language teacher roles must also be seen from the “who” they enact as interactants within and throughout classroom interaction in varied contexts. This claim demands seeing these roles mostly from a bottom-up perspective (roles that emerge from the way in which classroom interaction happens in context), and not just from a top-down viewpoint (a set of duties and actions that English language teachers must carry out in line with teaching methods and approaches). Classroom interaction seems to have been configured by considering the dictated roles, as if they were prescriptions for how to interact with learners. This tradition has omitted what English language teachers can be and do as a result of how classroom interaction really happens in different contexts. When acting those listed roles, English language teachers may feel that those are like imposed characters that they have to act for the sake of language teaching and learning. As if the roles were scripts of what to be and do while teaching and interacting. Those roles may go from directive to nondirective positions, projecting a different English language teacher figure, and making pressure for being someone of many facets with which English language teachers may not feel identified. Being and doing the suggested roles, I may indicate, normalize English language classroom interaction, by making it fit into standard patterns.

Bearing in mind my studies in English language classroom interaction, this is what I usually perceive: teachers struggling to be what language teaching methods or approaches tell them to be and what they possibly are not. The purpose of doing research on the relationship between classroom interaction and teacher educator interactional identities in ELTE is to reveal how teacher educators’ roles (their interactional identities) are more related to what happens in the moment-to-moment of the amount of interactions with their pre-service teachers. Not with the idea of providing a new taxonomy of English language

teacher roles but of revealing the interface between interactional identities and classroom interaction in ELTE. The reason of this is that the established “what to be and do” of English language teacher roles can be unaligned with the real selves that these teacher educators enact as interactants in classroom interaction. Research should then focus on how English language teacher educators see themselves as interactants during classroom interaction: what they really are, do, and become while interacting with their pre-service teachers, say, their interactional identities not their interactional attributes. Under this understanding, teacher educators’ interactional identities may have multiple realizations (the teacher educator’s selves) depending on how classroom interaction flows in a determined context. Research on teacher educator’s interactional identities must perceive that these realizations seem to occur more in actual interactional practices and situations in classroom activities. Interactants’ variables (such as age, language proficiency level, affective factors, and attitudes) and classroom characteristics (setting, contents, and environment) are important aspects in those studies.

In this section, I have presented three perspectives of seeing English language teacher roles. Although they characterize varied roles, each perspective still maintains a normative and mechanistic vision of them: English language teachers need be this and do that according to language teaching methods and approaches. In my point of view, this is what English language teacher educators have taught preservice teachers to do: to exercise certain roles as English language teachers, the roles that have been indicated in language teaching methods and approaches, and stated by well-known scholars (e.g. Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000; Brown, 2007; Pritchard, 2009; Benson, 2013; and Richards & Rodgers, 2014). I then propose a shift to study how teacher educators in ELTE display their interactional identities while interacting with their pre-service teachers. A study that can be able to unveil their own selves as interactants in the English language classroom, what they are as a persona, the way they behave, feel, and see themselves while interacting in the classroom. A study that can redefine the view of English language teacher roles from an interactional perspective in context. This endeavor requires not only the study of teacher educators’ interactional identities in ELTE, but also the study of those identities in the interactional structure of the language classroom. This latter requirement is the focus of the following section.

### Classroom Interactional Structure and Teacher educator Interactional Identities

---

If the interface between teacher educators’ interactional identities and ELTE must be a major concern in discovering what they really are and do as interactants in

classroom interaction, thus, this study needs a connection with the classroom interactional structure occurring in this field. When I talk about classroom interactional structure, I refer to the different linguistic, social, and interactional components and factors that help build interactions between English language teachers or educators and students. Unarguably, ELTE goes into realization throughout classroom interaction. The way in which the classroom participants in this field use language while co-constructing their interactions shapes their identities within the interaction (Rymes, 2009). Therefore, as Walsh (2011) states, classroom “interaction reveals what is really happening in a classroom” (p. 25); for the problematic in this chapter, how ELTE occurs and how teacher educators and preservice teachers’ interactional identities are shaped in it.

In the study of interaction in the English language classroom, the interactional components are for instance exchanges (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), turns (Schegloff, 1988), and interaction patterns (Cazden, 2001); social components are events (Searle, Kiefer & Bierwisch, 1980), and membership categorization (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007). These authors affirm that, in the construction of classroom interaction in the English language classroom, each participant puts together their utterances turn-by-turn, exchanges turns at speaking, signals the beginning and end of exchanges, and goes through different periods of time in their exchanges. All of this by categorizing speakers from the properties, actions, and responsibilities engendered during interaction. Furthermore, Seedhouse (2004), Cazden (2001), Rymes (2009), and Walsh (2011) present a series of social factors that lead to the emergence of distinctive interaction patterns in the English language classroom; for example, the context of the conversation, classroom activities, learner’s age and English proficiency. These socio-interactional factors seem to be the result of English language teacher and learner’s conversational agenda, which is composed of a pedagogical focus and an interactional focus (Seedhouse, 2004; Gardner, 2013). These two authors state that those agendas seem to be subconsciously memorized and scripted in terms of language and discourse and in relation to classroom activities. This situation prompts for the creation of repetitive interaction patterns with language learners in classroom activities (Lucero, 2015), which point to linguistic components, such as adjacency pairs (Schegloff, 1997), repairs (Schegloff, 1997; 2000), recasts (Markee & Philp, 1998), and initiation-response-evaluation sequence (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Although Ellis (1997) classifies these linguistic, social, and interactional factors into external (e.g. the social milieu and input) and internal (e.g. learner’s cognitive mechanisms, mother tongue, language aptitude, and knowledge about the world), he also affirms that all these factors together seem to help assist language acquisition since they play a major part “in creating the conditions in which language acquisition can take place” (Ellis, 1999, p. 30).



Despite these findings, not much is said with respect to how those linguistic, social, and interactional components and factors in the English language classroom are the result of teachers' realization of their roles as language educators. Conforming to Walsh (2011), the English language classroom has traditionally been thought about as conventional: "Classroom discourse is dominated by question and answer routines, with teachers asking most of the questions, while learners ask correspondingly few questions" (p. 11). Likewise, Castañeda-Peña (2015) discerns that, "The teacher structures the exchanges and socializes students through the use of language" (p. 28), albeit it is context-shaped and "embedded in the expression and construction of social meaning" (p. 29)<sup>4</sup>. If teacher roles, or their interactional identities, are enacted throughout these linguistic, social, and interactional components and factors of classroom interaction, research on how this happens becomes necessary.

At the beginning, in my research studies about classroom interaction in EFL learning programs (Lucero, 2011; 2012; 2015), I found that "language classroom interaction is composed of varied interaction patterns that teachers and learners create, co-construct, and then maintain, all in line with the particular interactional context and the established conventions of the class" (Lucero, 2015, p. 105). The varied interaction patterns in the English language learning classrooms studied are adjacency pairs, repairs, recasts, initiation-response-evaluation/feedback sequence, request-provision-acknowledgement sequence (Lucero, 2011), and asking about content and adding content patterns (Lucero, 2012). All of these are created and co-constructed throughout interactions between English language teachers and learners in either speak-out or linguistic exercises (the interactional contexts), and then maintained as the established conventions of interaction with each other in these types of exercises.

By having this in mind, I then wondered whether these interaction patterns were also present in ELTE, mainly at an undergraduate level. After analyzing the transcripts of 34 content-based sessions of nine teacher educators belonging to three undergraduate ELT programs from different universities in Bogotá, Colombia (Lucero & Rouse, 2017), the results revealed three major issues about how classroom interaction occurs in these contexts. The first indicates that these class sessions are divided into transactional episodes (presentation, production, practice, and check/evaluation) that are composed of exchanges containing the same interaction patterns that I had found in my

---

4 This discernment was initially postulated by Halliday (1978). He explains that discourse is linguistic signaling in action, in which language users simultaneously encode multiple meanings. Similar to the discussion that I point in this section, Halliday's postulate remains abstract in the manner in which encoding of multiple meanings occurs in interaction.

studies on EFL classes (adjacency pairs, repairs, recasts, initiation-response-evaluation/feedback sequence, request-provision-acknowledgement sequence, asking about content, and adding content). However, in comparison to the EFL learning programs I had studied before, these patterns in ELT programs present an extended pedagogical purpose: “to open spaces for learning and practicing how to teach and correct this language” (Lucero & Rouse, 2017). We also found that these interaction patterns are not only the result of the interactional contexts and the conventions of the class but also the realization of both teacher educators and preservice teachers’ pre-planned conversational agendas, which both contain pedagogical and interactional purposes (e.g. when teacher educators go around the classroom asking pre-service teachers for class work, they hold the pedagogical purpose of checking their advances in the class work for any help, and the interactional purpose of knowing how they are doing it). A final result reveals a certain level of incoherence in the way in which these purposes by both parties are acted out in speech. We call these disparities as instructional paradoxes which are “mixed messages that instructors send to preservice teachers about how to interact throughout the duration of the class”. For instance, when teacher educators direct to complete a particular task in a certain way in line with the pedagogical and interactional purposes of their conversational agendas (e.g. using only English to understand the contents and practice the language), yet within classroom interaction, end up doing something outside of these set parameters (using Spanish to understand the contents) (Lucero & Rouse, 2017).

From the findings in the abovementioned studies, I learned that classroom interaction in EFL and ELT programs is composed of distinctive interaction patterns, which both teachers and students create, co-construct, and maintain according to their conversational agendas, the class activities, materials used, and contents. I also learned that classroom interaction not only depends on the situational components of the conversational contexts (e.g. materials used, classroom arrangement, and topics) and the established interactional conventions of the class (how to interact with each other according to the type of language exercise), but also on social factors of the classroom such as the interactional context, classroom activities, teachers and students’ interaction management. In my previous research studies on interaction patterns in EFL and ELT programs, I was unaware of the interactional identities that English language teachers or educators assumed or were assigned in the interactions with their students. This fact makes me think about a likely constant movement of teacher educators’ interactional identities in consonance with the manner in which classroom interaction is co-constructed and maintained turn by turn with the pre-service teachers. By taking into account Young’s (2008) principle in which individuals’ interactional identities are likely to differ from the way in which they talk, negotiate meaning, sequence their speech acts, and

take turns, teacher educators' interactional identities may as well differ from these considerations within the classroom. In ELTE, teacher educators may likewise talk about varied topics, sequence interaction, and seem to constantly align their interactional identities to the ones assumed by their pre-service teachers. Therefore, the way in which classroom interaction occurs in ELTE does not only seem to depend on its participants' conversational agendas, the class activities, materials used, contents, and interaction patterns but also on the constant and reciprocal movement of these interactants' interactional identities according to the way in which their interactions are co-constructed and maintained. Little is known about how teacher educators' interactional identities are constituted within the classroom interactional structure in ELTE.

Here is an example between a teacher educator and five pre-service teachers in a content-based class of an ELT program. The excerpt illustrates this intricate network of classroom interaction. Pay close attention to the way in which these interactants depict their roles throughout the exchange. The teacher educator wants the pre-service teachers to understand and use conditionals in the present by exposing situations in which moral issues are involved.

### ***Excerpt 01***

[[The teacher educator (TE) is explaining the activity]]

01 TE: ... situation number three... ok situation number three, pay attention if your book is not very clear, so you go to the restaurant, you are going to pay your bill... the food in real life costs eh for example sixty thousand pesos [[TE writes 60,000 on the board]] this is the original price, the real one, sixty thousand pesos but when you got the bill, guess what? Forty thousand pesos... [[TE goes to the board and points out 60,000]] so you know that your food is sixty thousand but the bill when the waiter goes to the table [[TE acts out as if being a waiter]] and says ok here you have your bill, you just take it, look at it and say oh! Forty thousand pesos, what do you do if you receive [[TE writes 40,000 on the board]] the wrong bill?

02 Marisol: I receive the bill...

03 TE: =aha you...

04 Marisol: =and talk to the manager

05 TE: So you would talk to the manager, ok so... talk to the manager you talk to the manager, raise your hand if you talked to the manager [[some SS raise their hands]]

- 06 Gabriel: claro que depende en cuanto se descacha  
(Well, it depends on how much the difference is)
- 07 TE: [[laughs]] [[some SS laugh]] ok so depends on what...?
- 08 Gabriel: Depends porque eh... only twenty  
(Because)
- 09 TE: Ok. Who doesn't say anything and pay forty thousand pesos?  
Who doesn't say anything and pay forty thousand pesos? [[TE raises the hand]] (4 sec.) [[Student3 raises the hand]] aha Mary [[some SS laugh]]
- 10 Martha: Pero depende el servicio  
(But it depends on the service received)
- 11 TE: Aha. How do you say that in English?
- 12 Martha: Depends the service
- 13 TE: Mary, you would pay forty thousand?
- 14 Martha: [[nods]]
- 15 Laura: You teacher?
- 16 TE: Me eh... what do you think I would do?
- 17 David: Pay forty
- 18 TE: Yes, but it depends on the restaurant to talk to the manager, I would say this is or not correct, you know why? Because maybe the problem is for the waiter or the waitress and that is not fair, it's not good, so I talk to the manager and say this is not correct, I think it's more than forty thousand pesos, situation number 4... forget about that [[TE puts away the book]] now this is what we are going to do [[TE picks up some slides of paper off the desk]] you are going to receive different situations ok? On all these papers each one of you is...

In this example, we can identify different features of the structure of classroom interaction. The teacher educator mostly dominates the interaction by stating the conversation topic (turns 01 and 18) and asking the questions (turns 01, 07,

09, and 13). By the same token, this teacher educator structures the interaction by requesting for pre-service teachers' participation (turns 01, 05, and 09), commanding the use of English (turn 11), and assigning turns to speak (turns 03, 09, and 13). Throughout the excerpt, different interaction patterns are created: adjacency pairs (turns 01-02, 07-08, and 13-14), confirmation checks (turns 02-04-05), adding content (turns 05-06, and 09-10), and a regulatory sequence (turns 10-11-12). Turns 06 and 10 are initiated by the pre-service teachers to add content to the topic indicated by the teacher educator. Turns 15-18 refer to asking about content, what the teacher educator would do in the stated situation. It is a pre-service teacher's request that was not much expected by the teacher educator (see how she replies "me eh..." in turn 16, followed by a question to the pre-service teacher who asked her). All this classroom structure is context-shaped (what the participants would do in the indicated situation) and embedded in the expression and construction of social meaning (see particularly how the pre-service teachers reply in turns 06 and 10, which mirrors not only socio-linguistic uses of Spanish but also the considerations to take into account in the indicated situation).

Equally, the excerpt shows how the teacher educator's roles are shaped by the way in which the interaction is co-constructed with the pre-service teachers. The teacher educator enacts different roles as an interactant: presenter of the situation and requester for pre-service teachers' participation (turns 01, 05, 07 and 09), acknowledger of their contributions (turn 03, 05, 09, and 11), controller of the established conventions of the exercise (only English) (turn 11), clarification/confirmation requester (turns 13), respondent (turn 16 and 18), and conversation-participant all down the whole exchange. Correspondingly, the pre-service teachers take on the roles of respondents (turns 02, 04, 08, 12, and 14), contributors (turns 06), analysers of the conversation topic (turn 10), askers (turns 15 and 17), and participants all through the exchange as well.

In sum, Excerpt 01 illustrates that classroom interaction does not only depend on teacher educator's pre-planned conversational agendas (to make the pre-service teachers understand and use conditionals in the present by participation), the class activities (speak-out exercise), materials used (situations taken from the textbook), contents (conditionals and moral issues), and interaction patterns (adjacency pairs, confirmation checks, adding content, a regulatory sequence, and asking about content). Classroom interaction also seems to be the result of all the constant movement in the interactional roles that each participant takes on throughout their exchanges<sup>5</sup>. See for instance how, as the teacher educator presents the situation, the pre-service teachers

---

5 This constant movement in the roles that individuals take on in interaction has initially been studied in other social contexts, such as social conversations (Young, 2008), emergency phone calls (Zimmerman, 1998), and phone calls between two friends (Raymond & Heritage, 2006).

immediately think of how to reply, which displays them as respondents; from their replies, the teacher educator orients her role as an acknowledger, confirmation checker, or controller; from pre-service teachers' questions, which displays them as requesters too, the teacher educator becomes a respondent. This is the way in which both interactants constantly align their current roles to the ones that the other party assumes, displays, claims, or is assigned throughout the interaction. Classroom interaction in ELT programs may then be full of exchanges in which both teacher educators and pre-service teachers also align their interactional roles with the way in which their interactions occur. However, this issue has not yet had enough attention in research studies on classroom interaction in EFL learning contexts, still less in ELT programs.

In conclusion, EFL-learning and ELTE classrooms are composed of different interactional components and factors, as well as interaction patterns. All of these help build interactions between teacher educators and pre-service teachers. Several researchers (as the cited in this section) have found that these components, factors, and patterns are the result of the participants' conversational agendas, established interactional conventions of the class, and the way in which classroom interaction occurs around activities, materials used, and contents. Symmetrically to the previous section about the interface between English language teacher education and teacher educator's interactional identities, in which not much account is seen for how English language teacher roles are enacted in the application of teaching methods, I observe in the interface between classroom interactional structure and teacher educator's interactional identities that hardly any has been said in regards to how the interactional components, factors, and patterns constitute teacher educator's interactional identities in the classroom. More awareness must be raised of the manner in which the constant movement of the interactional identities that teacher educators assumed, displayed, claimed, or were assigned occurs in classroom interaction in ELTE. A study of this kind may then inform how teacher educators enact their interactional identities in settings where future English language teachers are educated. Nevertheless, apart from how teacher educator's interactional identities are constituted from the application of teaching methods and within classroom interactional structure, this endeavor also requires knowledge about teacher identities in the language classroom. This issue is the last interface in this chapter.

In this section, I initially elaborate on the notion of identities from socio-linguistic and interaction analysis scholarly works since they offer the foundations to understand first teacher identities and subsequently teacher interactional identities. I then elucidate this last interface by transferring the understandings of identities and teacher identities into the field of classroom interaction in ELTE. My elaboration does not exactly provide a chronological or epistemological review of the notions of identities, teacher identities, and teacher interactional identities, which is out of the scope of this chapter. Sustained theoretical foundation of these matters is an issue of a future work. As a reminder, this chapter particularly seeks to problematize how classroom interaction may constitute teacher educators' interactional identities in ELTE. Nonetheless, for the comprehension of this proposed study, in this section, I indicate the core ideas that help elaborate on the interface between teacher identities and teacher educator interactional identities.

Looking at identities from the socio-linguistic work is seeing this notion as constructed from the use of language in context. Language helps us learn the world and communicate it through interaction with others in situated contexts (Jackendoff, 1994, 2002). Those situated contexts are the “conversational machinery” and the “social activities” accomplished through the “sequences of interaction” (see Schegloff, 1991, p. 59, Zimmerman, 1998, p. 78; and Seedhouse, 2004, p. 43). Identities are linked to those specific social actions that individuals do in contextual interaction. Therefore, as Spolsky (1999) asserts, “language is a central feature of human identity” (p. 181). Here, interaction analysis takes its part to understand the construct of identities. The linkage among language, identity, and context embodies individuals to assume, validate, or be assigned their identities in interaction (Schegloff, 1991; Spolsky, 1999). During interactions, individuals can do various kind of identities. Those identities can have different levels: age, gender, sex; familial status, locality, nationality, ideology, class; race, ethnicity<sup>6</sup>; person's character, personality, attitudes; and roles in specific situations (see Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Raymond & Heritage, 2006; Tracy & Robles, 2012). Yet, these levels are neither static nor single. Identities might also be prior to any specific situation (this is debatable!), or be enacted, challenged, multiple, movable, overlapping, multi-scale, multidimensional, multifaceted, and context-sensitive (see Zimmerman, 1998; Wenger, 1998; Thornborrow, 1999; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Appiah, 2007, Tracy & Robles, 2012). Thus, all the identities that an

---

6 Arias-Cepeda (this volume) proposes a research study on the ethnic level of identity. His proposal embraces what concerns the construction of linguistic identities for English language teachers that are part of indigenous communities.

individual can have are constructed by the self and the others in interactions in varied contexts over time.

Under this perspective, identities reflect the settings in which individuals live and their experiences in it. The lifeworld<sup>7</sup> is then the resource for constituting identities. As Wenger (2010) affirms, identities reflect the complex “relationship between the person and the world” (p. 179), “the social and the personal” (p. 180). “Identities exceed the individual self” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 605). Although they may be perceived as just personal, they cannot be created and reflected without the other and a context (see Young, 2008; Tracy & Robles, 2012). Therefore, interactional experiences in all the social contexts shape identities: as individuals are positioned in contextual interaction, they assume or are assigned identities. Hence, identities are *constituted* in contextual and social interactions. The aspects of human experience (body, heart, brain, relationships, aspirations, etc.) and the different kinds of positions of self and the other occur simultaneously in the moment to moment of interaction (see Norton, 1997; Wenger, 1998; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). All these aspects and positions are of interactional value, each individual in the interaction is autonomous, and perhaps sometimes self-aware, of choosing which aspects of their identity are of interactional value and which positions they assume and are assigned by the other as the interaction flows turn by turn.

By taking all these aforementioned premises into account, the understanding of teacher identities finds its foundations. In line with Cummins (as cited in Norton, 2014), teacher identities are any role that teachers can assume discursively in class. Those roles can frequently be “re-scripted” as they circulate in class in response to instruction and students’ comments and queries. Complementarily, Rymes (2009), Clarke (2008), and Clake, Hyde & Drennan (2013) attest that teacher identities are constructed and shaped in the classroom, understanding this setting as an interactional discursive context that is social and cultural in nature<sup>8</sup>. Morgan (2014) and Hall et al (2010) also state that teacher identities are shaped in the classroom, but by the engagement processes of instruction and interaction that evolve within specific teaching contexts. Thus, the foundations of teacher identities align teacher roles into the coming and going of interactional exchanges that happen during instruction and conversation with students in the classroom.

7 The construct of lifeworld is understood as Husserl (1970) defines it: “the world of straightforward intersubjective experiences” (p. 109).

8 Posada-Ortiz (this volume) argues that English language pre-service teachers develop an imagined identity during their studies and practices while in their undergraduate ELTE program. Equally, Samacá-Bohorquez (this volume) talks about how English language pre-service teachers may also construct their identities as teachers in their pedagogical practicum. These two discussions may give evidence that teacher identities do not only reside on their practices when they get the status of in-service teachers, but their identity construction starts in unison with their undergraduate studies about being an English language teacher.



Despite these bases, the way in which teacher identities are constituted during classroom interaction has been slightly explored<sup>9</sup>. For example, by tracing the social functions of language in classroom literacy activities, Hall *et al.* (2010) found that teachers are active and productive creators of their own identities by using social and interactional resources available to them through classroom interaction. Although the authors present different identities that teachers can take on as a result of positioning moves in the interaction (e.g. as an entertainer and authority), they do not give an account of how interaction plays a central role in making teachers the types of people they are. Pavlenko and Norton (2007) and Norton (2013) defend that not all teachers have to interact in the same way, neither must they have the same roles in the classroom. Teacher identities can be “fashioned out” of how every teacher “imagines him or herself differently in different contexts” (Pavlenko & Norton, 2007, p. 591), or how they construct themselves within institutional, cultural, and discursive contexts. In my viewpoint, under these premises, what teachers are and do all through the moment to moment of their interactional practices with their students in classroom may aid constituting their identities as language teachers. It is from these interactions, and from what they are and do as individuals and teachers, that they take on their interactional identities. Not much about this has been examined in language classroom interaction in regards to ELTE.

In Excerpt 02 below, from a language-based class with pre-service teachers of an ELT program, I present an exchange in which a teacher educator enacts different interactional identities turn-by-turn while talking with them about their weekly news. Pay close attention to how the teacher educator (TE) keeps the interaction flowing as she assumes and is assigned different interactional identities.

---

9 Dávila-Rubio (this volume) presents a discussion on how English language teacher educators constitute themselves their identities as subjects from an epistemological viewpoint.

## Excerpt 02

[[Talking about news from the preservice teachers (SS), two of them have just told their news]]

- 01 TE: I don't know, who's next, who's next? Eh Maria?
- 02 Maria: [reading from her notebook] I split up with my boyfriend.
- 03 TE: Oh my god, "I split up with my boyfriend".
- 04 SS: ohhhh
- 05 Maria: Yes, teacher, I know. [SS laugh softly]
- 06 TE: But you don't usually say that to everybody.
- 07 SS: Noooo
- 08 TE: No, you don't say that.
- 09 Erika: No, but it depends...
- 10 TE: Ah, it depends, in which circumstances could you say, "good for me"?
- 11 Erika: If the kid is a bad boy.
- 12 TE: Yes, if you know he is a bad boy, but if it was a good relationship you say, "I'm sorry", right?
- 13 Maria: He was not a good boy.
- 14 TE: Well. Now we are going to listen to more news. For example, me, oh my God, I put over five kilos, look at me.
- 15 Pedro: Congratulations. [Students laugh]
- 16 TE: Oh c'mon, bad news or good news?
- 17 Sandra: Bad news.
- 18 TE: Bad news. How do you respond to that?
- 19 Sandra: That is no good.
- 20 TE: "That's not good, you should go to the doctor" or "that's not good, you should workout." Ok, clear? Who wants to give more news? [Silence] (0.4 sec.) This was mine. Next? Who wants? [Leidy raises her hand] Ok! Leidy come!

21 Leidy: I won some money in the “chance”<sup>10</sup>.

22 TE: I won some money in the lottery (?). Congratulations! What we should say? [To the whole class]

23 Students: Congratulations!

24 TE: What are you going to do with the money?

23 Leidy: Hm!

In this Excerpt 02, we can see how the teacher educator’s interactional identities are linked to the interactional machinery of the classroom activity and the situations that emerge in it. As the one in charge of leading the conversation, she is asking about the pre-service teachers’ weekly news. Maria’s news of breaking up with her boyfriend (turn 02) challenges the teacher educator’s role of just asking for the pre-service teachers’ reporting of their weekly news. The teacher educator has to move his or her initial role aside and take on a more empathetic role (turns 03, 06, and 08). Erika’s revelation of Maria’s ex-boyfriend being not a “good” boy (turns 11 and 13) demands a closer affiliation to Maria’s situation. The teacher educator corresponds in turn 12, but in turn 14, she decides the issue needs no more discussion and puts herself on the spot by telling the class that she has gained some weight. Pedro’s kidding in turn 15 makes her demand the class for a more sensible reply (turns 16, 18, and 20). The last situation in this excerpt about Leidy having won some money makes the teacher educator reify her role throughout the interaction again: from an empathetic and on-the-spot to a responsive and interested. It is evident in the exclamation and question made in turns 22 and 24.

Later, in an interview with this teacher educator about the way she handles her interactions with the pre-service teachers, she says that “*despite I want my students to focus on the topic, so they do not think of other things, I follow the conversation being aware of the students’ reactions and language... I react accordingly to make them feel comfortable when participating*”<sup>11</sup>. This answer seems to unveil the enactment of more roles than the ones inferred from the interaction in Excerpt 02. As a teacher educator in a language-based class, she wants her pre-service teachers to focus on the pedagogical purposes of the classroom activity and not to get distracted with other things

10 “Chance” is a gambling game in Colombia in which you bet some money to a sequence of three or more numbers of the top prize of a lottery. If the person’s sequence of numbers perfectly match the numbers of the lottery top prize, she or he wins money multiplied by the number of times of the bet.

11 This teacher educator’s answer was taken from the set of interviews Lucero and Rouse (forthcoming) did with the teacher-participants in their study about interaction patterns in ELTE undergraduate programs.

(parallel interactions with their peers or the use of their electronic devices, she says after). She also seems to also be permanently aware of the way in which they react to her activities and the progress of the interactions without distancing from how they use the target language. Besides, she is attentive to the preservice teachers' affiliation to her as a teacher educator, to the spaces to participate, and to her class.

In this analysis, we can see the linkage between teacher educator's interactional identities and classroom interaction situations in ELTE. The moment to moment of the interaction and the answers in the interview display that this teacher educator's interactional identities are multiple, movable, over-lapping, multi-scale and context-sensitive. In further observations with this teacher educator in different classes, I could observe that her identities in interaction might also be multidimensional (may change over time, space, and hierarchy) and at different levels (e.g. age, gender, ideology, and ethnicity). This situation of enacting and challenging teacher educator interactional identities can equally happen to other, if not all, teacher educators during classroom interaction. Despite these possible facts, how the teacher educator's interactional identities are *constituted* in ELTE needs deep exploration (for example, which aspects of the teacher educator's selves are of value throughout the moment to moment of interaction and what positioning is generated from them?). The study of the specific roles that teacher educators take on in classroom interaction with regard to their pre-service teachers (meaning their interactional identities) can help elucidate this gap. This endeavor demands doing research on the not-yet of teacher educator interactional identities, the final section in this article.

### Towards Doing Research on the Not-Yet<sup>12</sup> of Teacher educator's Interactional Identities

---

All through this chapter I have talked about the interface between teacher educator's interactional identities and three fields: English language teacher education, classroom interactional structure, and teacher educator identities in ELTE. In each interface, I have evidenced a gap in respect to teacher educator's interactional identities in ELTE. In the first interface, much has been written about what roles English language teachers must comply with in the English language classroom. Those established roles have been elaborated from

---

12 This construct of the "not-yet" has been coined from Ernst Bloch (as cited in Hudson, 1982, p. 19-30), in his principle of hope. For this current chapter, the "not-yet" refers to the study that still has not been done, but is conceived and proposed here, in relation to teacher educator's interactional identities in interface with English language teaching education, classroom interactional structure, and teacher identities (the three previous sections in this chapter).

instructional, interactional, or socio-constructivist angles. The roles indicated appear to regulate and organize the specific characteristics and functions that English language teachers must take on in classroom interaction; the regulation happens by aligning English language teachers to interact only in the indicated manners, as scripts of what to be and do while teaching. As I said above, we scarcely know about how these roles operate or are established conversationally in ELTE. In the field of classroom interactional structure, the second interface, I have shown how the study about classroom interaction has demonstrated that it is composed of linguistic, social, and interactional components and factors, as well as a constant movement of English language teacher roles throughout interactional exchanges. Nonetheless, we know little about how these components and factors are the result of teachers' realization of their roles as language educators. In the last interface, theory about teacher identities has been transferred into the field of teacher educator interactional identities. These foundations maintain that English language teacher educators can have various kinds of interactional identities through language and during conversations in classroom activities. Those identities can have different levels, dimensions, and facets. However, there is not much exploration in the way in which teacher educators' interactional identities are constituted during classroom interaction in ELTE.

The *not-yet* is then equal to the gaps shown in this chapter regarding teacher educator interactional identities in ELTE. Although there are theories about teacher identities and English language education, there are still not enough research studies on the interfaces between teacher educator interactional identities and ELTE, classroom interaction, and teacher educator roles. The *not-yet* of teacher educator interactional identities thus points out to study in which way the established roles of teacher educators may be supported from the interactional machinery that emerges in the context of ELTE; also, to know how teacher educators align their roles with the way in which classroom interaction occurs; or to identify what interactional identities teacher educators take on from what they are and do in classroom interaction with pre-service teachers in this educational context.

What is still to happen in doing research on teacher educator interactional identities in ELTE requires seeing teacher educators' roles from the "*who*" they are and "*what*" they do throughout the moment to moment of classroom interactional exchanges in these settings. As I have explained thus far, it is in this moment-to-moment of classroom interaction that teacher educators could unveil the aspects of importance and levels of their identities. Depending on how classroom interaction flows in this context, each interactional identity of a teacher educator may have multiple realizations. These realizations can be closely related to the teacher educator's *selves* that are not only enacted during classroom interaction but also in constant movement according to

the way classroom interaction is co-constructed and maintained turn by turn with the pre-service teachers.

Some cautions must be mentioned in here. Teacher educator interactional identities must not be a frame to label teacher educators in different types. Teacher educator interactional identities are more realizations of their selves that navigate into identity levels and facets, plus the dimensions of time and space in order to create, construct, and share different knowledges (pedagogical, disciplinary, socio-cultural, experiential, etc.)<sup>13</sup>. Under this premise, there seems not to be only one teacher educator interactional identity at play in the moment to moment of a conversational exchange, but most likely, multiple realizations and constitutions of interactional identities at different levels (interactional, social, cultural, professional, personal, etc.) and facets (the teacher as an evaluator, guide, facilitator, etc.). Equally, each interactional exchange between a teacher educator and their pre-service teachers may involve new interactional identities. Consequently, teacher educator interactional identities should not only be seen as interactional performances or their attributes as an educator, but also as expressions of their selves, the different forms of identifying as an interactant in the classroom.

As a final remark, the *not-yet* also contains the reasons for doing research in teacher educator interactional identities in ELTE. Complementarily, I can say that teacher educators need to be aware of how the realization of their interactional identities position themselves as a kind of teacher educator in the classroom and as a kind of English speaker in this context and other social ones. This situation may reveal the interactional environment in ELTE in the Colombian context. In the same order of ideas, a research study on teacher educator interactional identities may help understand that teacher education approaches need to see classroom interaction and teacher educator interactional identities not only from their components but also from their realizations and practices which are usually packed in the frame of the classroom practices attained to specific cultures through time.

---

13 Castañeda-Londoño (this volume) offers an ampler discussion on this issue. She argues that English language in-service teachers' knowledges are constituted not only of experiences, theories, beliefs, actions, and skills but also of the realm of their silenced, invisibilized, or unknown knowledges.

## References

---

- Antaki, C., Widdicombe, S. (Eds.) (1998). *Identities in Talk*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Appiah, K. A. (2007). *The Ethics of Identity*. UK: Princeton University Press.
- Benson, P. (2013). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. NY, US: Routledge.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles, an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)*. NY, US: Pearson Longman.
- Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic Approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614.
- Carbone, P. M. (2012). Teachers' Roles in Facilitating Novice Writers from Generation 1.5. In B. Yoon, & H. Kyeong-Kim (Eds.), *Teachers' Roles in Second Language Learning: Classroom Applications of Sociocultural Theory (135-154)*. Charlotte, NC, US: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Cashman, H. R. (2005). Identities at Play: Language Preference and Group Membership in Bilingual Talk in Interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 301-315.
- Castañeda-Peña, H. A. (2015). Classroom Discourse Analysis: Outlining the Field. In E. Wilder & H. Castañeda-Peña (Eds.), *Studies in Discourse Analysis in the Colombian Context (21-46)*. Bogotá, Colombia: Editorial El Bosque.
- Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.
- Celce-Murcia, M. & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching: A Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, M. (2008). *Language Teacher Identities: Co-constructing Discourse and Community*. NY, US: Multilingual Matters.
- Clarke, M., Hyde, A. & Drennan, J. (2013). Professional Identity in Higher Education. In B. M. Kehm & U. Teichler (Eds.), *The Academic Profession in Europe: New Tasks and new Challenges (7-21)*. London: Springer.
- Cohen, A. D. (1985). Reformulation: Another Way to Get Feedback. *The Writing Lab Newsletter*, 10(2), 6-10.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1999). *Learning a Second Language Through Interaction*. Philadelphia, US: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Gardner, R. (2013). Conversation Analysis in the Classroom. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (593-611). UK: Blackwell Publishing, Inc.
- Hall, L. A. et al. (2010). Teacher Identity in the Context of Literacy teaching: Three Explorations of Classroom Positioning and Interaction in Secondary Schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 234-243.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as a Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Open University Set Book.
- Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2008). Beyond the Classroom and into the Community: the role of the Teacher in Expanding the Pedagogy of Cooperation. In R. M. Gillies, A. F. Ashman, & J. Terwel (Eds.), *The Teachers' Role in Implementing Cooperative Learning in the Classroom* (pp. 38-55). NY, US: Springer.
- 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.
- Husserl, E. (1970). *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy* (D. Carr, Trans.). Evanston: IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1994). *Patterns in the Mind, Language and Human Nature*. US: Basic Books.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (2002). *Foundations of Language. Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (2008). Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning: The Teacher's Role. In R. M. Gillies, A. F. Ashman, & J. Terwel (Eds.), *The Teachers' Role in Implementing Cooperative Learning in the Classroom* (9-37). NY, US: Springer.
- Johnson, K. (1995). *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lucero, E. (2011). Code Switching to Know a TL Equivalent of an L1 Word: Request-Provision-Acknowledgement (RPA) Sequence. *How Journal*, 18, 58-72.
- Lucero, E. (2012). Asking About Content and Adding Content: Two Patterns of Classroom Interaction. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 14(1), 28-44.



- Lucero, E. (2015). Doing Research on Classroom Interaction: Approaches, Studies, and Reasons. In E. Wilder & H. Castañeda-Peña (Eds.), *Studies in Discourse Analysis in the Colombian Context* (91-122). Bogotá, Colombia: Editorial El Bosque.
- Lucero, E. & Rouse, M. (2017). Classroom interaction in ELTE undergraduate programs: Characteristics and pedagogical implications. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 19(2), 193-208.
- Mackey, A. & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational Interaction and Second Language Development: Recasts, Responses and Red Herrings? *Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 338-356.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation Analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Mitchel, D. (2016). *Diversities in Education: Effective Ways to Reach all Learners*. NY, US: Routledge.
- Moore, A. (2004). *The Good Teacher. Dominant Discourses in Teaching and Teacher Education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Morgan, B. (2004). Teacher Identity as Pedagogy: Towards a Field-Internal Conceptualization in Bilingual and Second Language Education. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(2&3), 172-186.
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409-429.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and Language Learning: Extending the conversation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). NY, US: Multilingual Matters.
- Olshtain, E. & Kupferberg, I. (1998). Teachers' Professional Knowledge as Reflected in Their Domain-Specific Discourse. *Language Teaching Research*, 2(3), 185-202.
- Oxford, R. et al. (1998). Clashing Metaphors About Classroom Teachers: Toward a Systematic Typology for Language Teaching Field. *System*, 26, 3-50.
- Pritchard, A. (2009). *Ways of Learning: Learning Theories and Learning Styles in the Classroom* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). NY: US: Routledge.
- Prosser, M. & Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding Learning and Teaching: The Experience in Higher Education*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Raymond, G. & Heritage, J. (2006). The Epistemics of Social Relations: Owning Grandchildren. *Language and Society*, 35, 677-705.

- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rymes, B. (2009). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Tool for Critical Reflection*. NJ, US: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation* (2 Vols). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Presequences and Indirection: Applying Speech acts Theory to Ordinary Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, 55-62.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on Talk and Social Structure. In D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (ed.), *Talk and Social Structure*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 44-70.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). "Whose Text? Whose Context?" *Discourse & Society*, 8:165-187.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). "Third Turn Repair." In Guy, R.G., Feagin, D., Schiffrin, D., and Baugh, J. (eds.), *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, (Volume 2), John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). "When Others Initiate Repair" *Applied Linguistics* 21/2: 205-243.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Categories in Action: Person-Reference and Membership-Categorization. *Discourse Studies*, 9(4), 433-461.
- Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F. & Bierwisch, M. (Eds.) (1980). *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Madison, USA: Language Learning Monograph Series.
- Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, R.M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smiley, J. R. & Antón, M. (2012). Teachers' Roles and Mediating Strategies of Learners' Engagement in the L2 Classroom. In B. Yoon, & H. Kyeong-Kim (Eds.), *Teachers' Roles in Second Language Learning: Classroom applications of Sociocultural Theory* (231-248). Charlotte, NC, US: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Spolsky, B. (1999). Second-Language Learning. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity* (181-195). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tracy, K. & Robles, J. S. (2013). *Everyday Talk: Building and Reflecting Identities*. NY, US: The Guilford Press.

- Thornborrow, J. (1999). Language and Identity. In L. Thomas & S. Wareing (Eds.), *Language, Society and Power* (77-103). London: Routledge.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. NY: Routledge.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (2010). Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems: the Career of a Concept. In C. Blackmore (Ed.), *Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice* (179-198). UK: Springer.
- Yoon, B. & Kyeong-Kim, H. (2012). Introduction: Sociocultural Theory as a Theoretical Framework for Understanding Teachers' Roles in Second Language Learning. In B. Yoon, & H. Kyeong-Kim (Eds.), *Teachers' Roles in Second Language Learning: Classroom Applications of Sociocultural Theory* (xiii-xxix). Charlotte, NC, US: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Young, R. F. (2008). *Language and Interaction: An Advanced Resource Book*. WY: Routledge.
- Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Identity, Context and Interaction. In C. Antaki, & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in Talk* (77-106). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.