

МЕТОДИКА НАВЧАННЯ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ У ВИЩІЙ ШКОЛІ

UDC 378.147:811.111'243]:37.016:81'271

Tamara Kavytska (Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1528-9439

Oksana Oliinyk (Ukraine)

ORCID ID:0000-0002-5701-7132

AN INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK OF ORAL INTERACTION UNITS FOR PRE-SERVICE EFL TEACHER EDUCATION

This paper offers a theoretical and conceptual analysis of four core units of oral interaction – turns, adjacency pairs, speech acts, and talk moves – to integrate these constructs into a unified framework for EFL communicative professional competence, particularly in ESP classroom talk. Drawing on conversation analysis, speech act theory, pragmatics, and educational linguistics, the study examines how these units, typically treated in isolation across disciplinary traditions, operate as co-functioning layers within institutional spoken discourse. The analysis shows that turns provide the structural vehicle; adjacency pairs determine sequential coherence; speech acts specify the social action performed; and talk moves operationalize interactional strategies toward professional and pedagogical goals. The article suggests that fluency in this integrated interactional framework constitutes a distinct professional competence that current EFL teacher education programs inadequately address. Eight pedagogical implications are proposed for pre-service EFL teacher preparation, including adjacency-pair awareness, speech-act instruction, talk-move repertoire development, dialogic teaching design, learner interactional agency, cross-cultural interaction norms, and interaction-sensitive oral assessment criteria.

Keywords: *oral interaction, turn-taking, adjacency pairs, speech acts, talk moves, strategies of oral interaction, ESP talk, pre-service EFL teacher education.*

Background

Oral interaction is an integral part of language teaching. Unlike other professional domains where expertise can be demonstrated through written products or planned presentations, teaching is enacted primarily through spoken discourse in real time: teachers ask questions, provoke responses, give feedback, and manage the conversational moves that open or close space for learner participation. This is why Ellis and Shintani's (2014) claim that all teaching is interaction is not a metaphor but a description of professional reality. The CEFR Companion Volume (Council of Europe [CoE], 2020) reinforces this by positioning oral interpersonal interaction as "the origin of language" (p. 70), recognizing its "interpersonal, collaborative and transactional functions" (p. 70) as

foundational to communicative competence. For teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL), and especially for those working in ESP contexts, where professional goals are achieved almost exclusively through spoken discourse, the capacity to manage, model, and scaffold oral interaction is not a peripheral skill but the core of professional practice.

The theoretical tools that would allow teacher educators to teach and assess interactional competence systematically – turns, adjacency pairs, speech acts, and talk moves – have been developed within separate and largely non-communicating research traditions: conversation analysis, pragmatics, speech act theory, and educational linguistics, respectively. As a result, these constructs are well-theorized individually but have never been

approached collectively as components of an integrated interactional framework applicable to EFL professional competence.

Therefore, this study directly addresses that gap. First, it synthesizes the four core units of oral interaction into a coherent theoretical model that captures how they operate not as separate components but as co-functioning levels of a communicative event; and second, it derives from that model a set of concrete pedagogical implications for the development and assessment of interactional competence in pre-service EFL teacher education.

The conceptual analysis is guided by two *research questions*: (1) How are turns, adjacency pairs, speech acts, and talk moves interconnected both structurally and functionally in the EFL classroom and ESP professional discourse? (2) What does a cohesive understanding of these units imply for fostering interactional competence in pre-service EFL teacher preparation, particularly in terms of curriculum design and oral assessment?

The study has a specific focus and does not collect new data. Instead, it aims to build a framework that connects detailed analysis of classroom conversations with the overall communication challenges EFL teachers encounter. Understanding how these conversation elements interact is essential for developing suitable teaching methods and assessments that meet the needs of modern EFL teacher education (Dede, 2010; Hall, 2022; Gardner, 2019).

Literature review. Classroom interaction, especially in EFL contexts, has been widely researched across various areas of linguistics, contributing theoretical and analytical tools for understanding how oral discourse is structured and functions in teaching environments. This review focuses on four concepts essential to the analysis of teacher-student spoken interaction: turns, adjacency pairs, speech acts, and talk moves, which are predominantly examined in separate but complementary fields of research. The review first synthesizes general definitions and conceptualizations

of four core units of spoken interaction, and, in the discussion that follows, these will be examined in the specific context of EFL teachers' classroom talk.

The organization of naturally occurring talk was originally the focus of Conversation Analysis (CA), in which Sacks et al. (1974) explained that speakers alternate turns through turn-taking. A turn, defined by Sidnell (2010) as "a stretch of talk by one speaker, bounded by the talk of another" (p. 38), is currently considered the fundamental component of interaction. In everyday conversation, turn-taking is natural and cooperative: interlocutors follow socially shared norms to manage the flow of conversation.

According to Sacks et al. (1974), turn-taking is based on the concepts of turn-constructional units (TCUs) and transition relevance places (TRPs). A TCU is a stretch of talk that can contain a word, a phrase or a full utterance, and express a potentially complete unit, after which a speaker change may occur. Typically, the process of selecting the next speaker follows three patterns: (1) the current speaker may choose the next speaker (by using his/her name or asking a question), and that speaker is expected to take the turn; (2) when no speaker is selected, another interlocutor may self-select; and (3) if no one self-selects, the current speaker may produce another TCU (Sacks et al., 1974, pp. 703-704). From data in English-speaking settings, Sacks et al. (1974) observed that "transitions from one turn to the next with no gap and no overlap ... together with transitions characterized by a slight gap and a slight overlap make the vast majority of transitions" (p. 708). By following these rules, interlocutors can avoid both long silences (gaps) and overlapping talk, or "no gap, no overlap", a conversational preference in many Western, especially Anglo, oral interaction practices.

Subsequent cross-cultural CA studies emphasize that "no gap, no overlap" is not a culture-neutral rule. Stivers et al. (2009) compared 10 languages and found that

although turn-taking in casual conversation is universally structured to minimize gap and overlap, the definition of what counts as "minimal" timing between speakers varies, with average gaps ranging from near-zero in Japanese to nearly half a second in Danish (Stivers et al., 2009, p. 10588). Italian or New York Jewish English conversations show more tolerance for overlaps, which are seen as engagement rather than interruptions.

Talk-as-social interaction is orderly: it "proceeds over time, turn by turn with a sequential alternation of speakers/participants" (Atwood et al., 2010, p. 360). Two consecutive turns of two different speakers where the first utterance prompts or requires a particular kind of second part are termed adjacency pairs (Levinson, 1983; Sacks et al., 1974), e.g., question → answer, greeting → greeting, request → compliance or refusal, etc. The structure of adjacency pairs "provides a robust demonstration of how turns at talk are sequentially organized; the first pair part projects the corresponding second pair part to be conditionally relevant; as a result, the absence of the second pair part, or an unfitting responsive action, is recognized as interactionally noticeable" (Cheng, 2016, p. 29). Given that, the participants can monitor "whether they have reached mutual understanding within the given interaction (Cheng, 2016, p. 30), thus, "adjacency pairs constitute a powerful sense-making mechanism for participants" (Cheng, 2016, p. 30).

Speech act theory holds that every utterance performs some kind of action, which can be categorized by its communicative intent (e.g., requesting, promising, evaluating, etc.), thus from the intentional dimension, utterances are speech acts, they show what the speakers actually *do* with their utterances, but not just *say* (Austin, 1962, p. 5; Searle, 1969, pp. 22–23).

Central to educational linguistics and classroom discourse studies are talk moves defined as "roughly utterance-sized units of

talk, intended (as a 'move' in a game) to get the other player(s) to respond in some way, to bring something particular to the table" (O'Connor & Michaels, 2017, p. 9): they reflect how teacher talk fosters cognitive engagement, and participation, promoting dialogic teaching and scaffolding understanding (Alexander, 2008; Mercer, 2000).

The analysis of how turns, adjacency pairs, talk moves, and speech acts are conceptualized in existing research provides grounds for claiming that these units are interrelated yet operate at different levels of interaction. Turns are basic units of oral interaction organized turn by turn; they can consist of one or more speech acts that actualize speakers' communicative intentions. Adjacency pairs, as two turns by different speakers, show reciprocal relationships between turns; they are the smallest sequences that build interactional meaning. Speech acts are related to the social action being performed by the utterances, but not to a specific interactional sequence. Unlike turns or adjacency pairs, which describe the structure of interaction, talk moves concern the functions-in-interaction, as utterances that actualize the interactional functions of turns-at-talk.

Using the wall analogy, turns can be metaphorically represented as bricks, adjacency pairs as brick bonds, speech acts as brick labels (purpose), and talk moves as builders' tools and techniques (see Table 1).

Though these concepts stem from different linguistic traditions, they are interrelated in actual classroom discourse, yet there is a notable lack of research examining them collectively as components of a unified interactional framework applicable to EFL professional competence. Hence, the goal of this study is to address this gap by describing how these key units of classroom spoken interaction are structurally and functionally interrelated in EFL settings where language acquisition is supported by participation in meaningful, interactive discourse.

Table 1*Conversation Wall Analogy: Units of Interaction*

| Conversation Unit | What It Represents | Layer in the Analogy |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Turns | The basic chunks of talk – who speaks and when; they make up the structure of the conversation | Bricks |
| Adjacency pairs | Determine how turns are connected into predictable sequences (question – answer, offer – accept, greeting – greeting) | Brick Bonds |
| Speech acts | Express the communicative function of a turn (asserting, requesting, offering, promising, etc.) | Brick Purpose / Label |
| Talk moves | Actualize interactional functions of turns-at-talk, shaping interaction toward a goal (e.g., revoicing, probing, pressing for evidence) | Builder's Tools & Techniques |

Methodology

This study adopts a theoretical and conceptual analysis methodology, a research approach well established in applied linguistics and language pedagogy for reconsidering and critically synthesizing existing theoretical constructs rather than generating or analyzing primary empirical data (Varpio et al., 2017; MacMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Conceptual analysis is purposefully applied in this research since the units examined here have been extensively theorized within separate research traditions but have not yet been studied in relation to one another or within a unified pedagogical framework. Each body of work has generated substantial empirical support, but the four units have rarely been examined collectively as components of an integrated interactional repertoire relevant to EFL professional competence.

The analysis involved three stages. In the first one, foundational theoretical sources were identified and reviewed for each unit of interaction: seminal works in conversation analysis (Sacks et al., 1974; Levinson, 1983), speech act theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969), and educational linguistics (O'Connor & Michaels, 2017; Michaels & O'Connor, 2015; Alexander, 2008; Mercer, 2000). Cross-cultural perspectives on turn-taking were drawn from Stivers et al. (2009) and Tannen (1984). In the second stage, each unit was analyzed in the context of the EFL classroom and institutional discourse, drawing on scholarship in interactional competence (Young, 2013), academic

speaking (McCarthy & McCarten, 2019), and classroom interaction research (Walsh, 2014; Hall, 2022; Gardner, 2019; Balaobao et al., 2024). In the third stage, the four units were compared to identify their structural and functional relationships, which led to the proposal of an integrated model in the Discussion.

As stated in the Introduction, the conceptual analysis is guided by two research questions concerning (1) the structural and functional interrelationships among the four units in EFL and ESP professional discourse, and (2) the pedagogical implications of an integrated understanding of these units for pre-service EFL teacher preparation, including curriculum design and oral assessment. The scope is intentionally limited to theoretical synthesis: the study does not seek to produce a descriptive account of any specific corpus of ESP talk but to build a theoretically grounded integrative framework that can inform pedagogical practice and teacher education program design.

Results and discussion

Unlike naturally occurring conversation, in institutional settings such as classrooms and courtrooms, speaking rights (turns) are explicitly allocated, making the interaction structure of turn-taking asymmetrical. In EFL classrooms, teachers allocate turns, determining who speaks, when, and for how long (Walsh, 2014). Face-to-face interaction in an academic setting differs from other types of social conversation (McCarthy &

McCarten, 2019). These differences demand competence beyond knowledge of the language system, a competence which we refer to as interactional competence.

Young (2013) outlines key elements of interactional competence, which include: "knowledge of rhetorical scripts, a knowledge of register – that is certain lexis and syntactic patterns specific to the practice, a knowledge of how to take turns-at-talk, a knowledge of topical organization, a knowledge of the appropriate participation framework, and a knowledge of the means for signalling boundaries between practices and transitions within the practice itself." (p. 18). Participants co-construct a discursive practice through an architecture of interactional resources specific to that practice, encompassing rhetorical scripts, register, the turn-taking system, topical management, the participation framework, and boundary-marking conventions (Young, 2013, p. 15).

Young's (2013) framework reveals that interactional competence in EFL professional settings is not merely an extension of general communicative competence but a distinct, practice-embedded capacity. Crucially, EFL speakers – and pre-service teachers in particular – must develop awareness of the rhetorical scripts that govern the specific institutional contexts in which they operate. In ESP talk, this means recognizing that turns, adjacency pairs, speech acts, and talk moves are not interchangeable analytical tools but co-functioning layers of a single communicative event.

The structural asymmetry of EFL classroom turn-taking has important consequences for all four units under analysis. Because the teacher controls turn allocation, the typical three-part initiation–response–feedback (IRF) exchange – documented extensively in studies of classroom discourse (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Estaji & Mirzaei Shojakhanlou, 2022) – functions as the dominant adjacency sequence. Within IRF, the teacher's initiation move constitutes the

first pair part of an adjacency pair, projecting a response; the student's answer provides the second pair part; and the teacher's feedback completes the sequence. In other words, a single IRF exchange is at once a turn allocation, an adjacency pair, a speech act, and a talk move. All four units are operating together within one brief instructional moment.

In ESP contexts, the speech acts realized within these sequences carry professional significance. When a teacher produces a directive ("Summarize the key argument"), a commissive ("I will clarify the term"), or an assessment ("That is an accurate summary, but consider the register"), each utterance performs a pedagogically or professionally consequential act. Searle's (1969) taxonomy of illocutionary acts thus acquires practical urgency: the EFL professional must not only understand what a speech act means but must also be able to perform the appropriate act at the structurally relevant turn and within the appropriate adjacency sequence. A misplaced or inappropriate speech act (a refusal when acceptance is sequentially expected, or an assertion when a question is required) disrupts not only the local interaction but also the broader professional relationship.

Talk moves play a particularly important role in mediating between the structural and functional layers of ESP oral interaction. O'Connor and Michaels (2017) identify revoicing, pressing for evidence, wait time, and inviting elaboration among the main productive talk moves in educational settings. In EFL classroom talk, these moves serve a dual purpose: they scaffold learners' linguistic production and simultaneously model the pragmatic repertoire of academic and professional discourse. When a teacher revoices a student's contribution ("So, you're suggesting that error correction should prioritize fluency over accuracy at the early production stage?"), the move simultaneously occupies a turn, constitutes the second part of an initiation–response pair, performs the speech act of reformulation and assessment, and functions as a pedagogical scaffolding

tool. This makes talk moves the most complex of the four units, requiring the EFL speaker to be consciously aware of discourse.

A further finding of this analysis concerns the cross-cultural dimension of oral interaction units in ESP contexts. As Stivers et al. (2009) demonstrated, norms for gap and overlap in turn-taking vary significantly across languages and cultural communities. EFL speakers whose L1 interaction norms tolerate or even encourage overlap, such as in Ukrainian academic discourse, which shares characteristics of Eastern European communicative styles, may experience systematic mismatches when operating in English-medium professional environments that expect minimal gaps and no overlap. This misalignment can manifest not only as timing errors but also as pragmatic failures: a silence that, in one culture, signals thoughtful processing may, in another, be read as disengagement, while a legitimate turn completion may be interpreted as an interruption. Raising EFL learners' metalinguistic awareness of these cross-cultural variation patterns is therefore an integral component of developing interactional competence in ESP contexts (Young, 2013; McCarthy & McCarten, 2019).

Taken together, the analysis confirms that units of oral interaction are not merely descriptive categories but constitute an integrated interactional repertoire of professional spoken discourse. For EFL speakers in ESP talk, command of this repertoire entails knowing when and how to take a turn (structural competence), how to orient to and produce the sequentially relevant second pair part (sequential competence), what illocutionary act is appropriate in context (pragmatic competence), and which talk move will advance the professional or pedagogical goal of the interaction (strategic competence).

For pre-service EFL teachers, these findings have immediate implications for how they should be trained to perceive and manage spoken classroom interaction. Teacher education programs frequently address communication skills in terms of

fluency, accuracy, or general pragmatic awareness; yet the integrated framework proposed here suggests that what pre-service teachers most need is discursive self-awareness: the capacity to monitor and strategically manage all four interactional layers simultaneously during live classroom talk. A pre-service teacher who is aware only of turn-taking norms but cannot recognize the adjacency structure of an IRF exchange, identify the speech act they are performing, or deploy a revoicing move to scaffold a student's contribution is interactionally underequipped for the ESP classroom. This points to a significant gap between traditional EFL teacher education, which tends to foreground linguistic accuracy and lesson planning, and the interactional demands of real professional classroom discourse (Ellis & Shintani, 2014; Walsh, 2014). Pre-service teacher preparation should therefore include systematic exposure to discourse analysis of classroom talk, collaborative reflection on interaction patterns in microteaching sessions, and explicit instruction in the strategic use of talk moves as professional pedagogical tools.

Pedagogical implications. The pedagogical implications of this integrated framework are most urgent for pre-service EFL teacher education, where the development of interactional competence has been insufficiently theorized relative to linguistic and methodological preparation. First, methodology courses should move beyond teaching turn-taking as a procedural classroom management convention and toward explicit instruction in the sequential logic of adjacency pairs. This will help pre-service teachers understand how their own initiating moves provoke specific response types from learners and what the interactional consequences are when those responses are withheld, delayed, or misaligned. Second, speech act awareness should be developed through analysis of authentic classroom discourse data: pre-service teachers need to recognize the

illocutionary acts they regularly perform (questions, evaluations, directives, scaffolding moves) and to understand how the choice of speech act type shapes learner participation in the classroom. Third, talk moves should be introduced in pre-service programs as a deliberate, learnable professional repertoire rather than as intuitive behavior: drawing on frameworks such as those developed by O'Connor and Michaels (2017) and Myklebust and Guadie (2024), teacher educators can design microteaching and reflective practice tasks specifically targeting productive talk moves such as revoicing, pressing for evidence, and inviting elaboration. The goal here is to cultivate the capacity to monitor and intentionally manage one's own interactional behavior in real time as a core professional competence of the EFL teacher.

Cross-cultural awareness represents a fourth, often neglected pedagogical priority. Given that turn-timing norms, preferred adjacency responses, and appropriate speech act realization differ across languages and communicative cultures (Stivers et al., 2009; Tannen, 1984), EFL learners in ESP contexts require explicit exposure to the interactional conventions of English-medium professional communities. This is particularly relevant for learners whose L1 oral interaction practices diverge from the Anglo-normative pattern. Interaction-aware pedagogy should therefore include awareness-raising tasks, discourse analysis of authentic ESP talk, and structured practice in mastering the full repertoire of interactional units under realistic professional conditions.

A fifth pedagogical implication concerns the relationship between the four interactional units and dialogic teaching: an approach that foregrounds sustained, exploratory classroom talk as a tool for cognitive and linguistic development (Alexander, 2008; Mercer, 2000). Dialogic teaching goes beyond the IRF exchange by creating conditions in which students, not only teachers, practice adjacency

sequences, perform diverse speech acts, and use talk moves to build on each other's contributions. For pre-service EFL teachers, exposure to dialogic principles during teacher preparation is essential. They need to understand how the shift from a display-question IRF to an open, exploratory question sequence reorganizes the entire interactional architecture of the lesson, widening the participation framework, diversifying speech-act types, and multiplying the talk-move repertoire of both the teacher and students. Training pre-service teachers to design and manage dialogic interaction sequences, rather than merely to conduct IRF drills, is a practical implication of the integrated interactional framework proposed in this study.

A sixth implication pertains to learner interactional agency. This is the aspect that the present framework risks underemphasizing by centering the teacher as the primary interactional actor. Pre-service teachers of EFL need to be prepared not only to manage their own interactional behavior but to design learning environments in which students progressively develop their own interactional competence. This competence involves the ability to self-select turns appropriately, to produce sequentially relevant second pair parts, to use speech acts beyond the minimal response, and to use talk moves (such as challenging, elaborating, or building on a peer's turn) as instruments of collaborative meaning-making. This points to a task-design aspect of EFL pedagogy that scaffolds the gradual transfer of interactional control from the teacher to the learner (Hall, 2022). Helpful here might appear interaction-rich tasks such as collaborative problem-solving, peer discussion, and role-play in professional registers.

Finally, the framework has implications for the assessment of oral interaction in EFL pre-service teacher education. Current oral proficiency rubrics in many EFL programs assess speaking along the dimensions of fluency, accuracy, vocabulary range, and pronunciation, which are largely insufficient

to capture interactional competence as defined in this study. An interaction-sensitive assessment framework would need to include criteria for turn-taking appropriateness (responsiveness to TRPs, avoidance of disruptive overlap), sequential coherence (production of fitting second pair parts, repair initiation), speech act variety and appropriacy (range and context-sensitivity of illocutionary acts), and strategic talk-move usage (revoicing, pressing for elaboration, building on contributions). Developing such criteria for microteaching assessments, practicum evaluations, and professional portfolio tasks would enhance the theoretical framework proposed here and provide pre-service teachers with targets for developing their interactional professional competence.

Conclusion and limitations

This study has examined four core units of oral interaction to integrate this body of discourse knowledge into a coherent framework for EFL communicative professional competence. It addressed two research questions.

In response to research question 1, the analysis demonstrates that, while the four units emerge from distinct research traditions (conversation analysis, pragmatics, speech act theory, and educational linguistics), they operate collaboratively within institutional spoken discourse. In ESP talk, these units are not parallel descriptors but integrated layers: a turn is the material vehicle; adjacency pairs determine how turns combine into meaningful sequences; speech acts specify the social action each turn performs; and talk moves activate the interactional strategies by which professional and pedagogical goals are achieved. The integrated model proposed here responds directly to the recognized gap between discrete-unit analyses of classroom talk and the holistic interactional demands faced by EFL professional speakers, particularly pre-service teachers of English.

In response to research question 2, the integrated framework reveals that fluency in this interaction constitutes a distinct professional competence that current pre-service EFL teacher education programs inadequately address. Seven pedagogical implications, presented in the paper, follow from this finding.

This study is the first to synthesize these four units, drawn from conversation analysis, pragmatics, speech act theory, and educational linguistics, respectively, into a unified interactional framework explicitly oriented toward EFL professional competence and pre-service teacher education. In doing so, it fills a gap between discrete-unit analyses of classroom talk and the holistic interactional demands that EFL teachers face as professional speakers.

This study, however, is subject to certain limitations. As a theoretical and analytical synthesis, it does not draw on primary corpus data from EFL classrooms. Consequently, the claim that the four units function in an integrated manner in actual ESP talk remains to be empirically validated through conversation analysis or interactional sociolinguistic research. The discussion has focused primarily on teacher-oriented classroom interaction and the IRF exchange as the dominant sequence type. Future research should examine peer interaction, collaborative task talk, and digitally mediated professional discourse, in which turn-taking norms, adjacency structures, and talk move repertoires may differ substantially from the face-to-face institutional model. Additionally, the cross-cultural aspect of interactional norms warrants further investigation in specific EFL contexts, including Ukrainian-English professional discourse, where existing research remains scarce. Future studies combining discourse analysis of authentic ESP talk with learner perception and self-report data would offer a richer account of how EFL speakers develop and reflect on interactional competence in professional settings.

Author contributions: T. Kavytska – conceptualization of the research problem, literature review and analysis, conclusions and discussion of future research directions; O. Oliinyk – development of the integrated theoretical and methodological framework

References

- Alexander, R. J. (2008). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (4th ed.). Dialogos.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Clarendon Press; Harvard University Press.
- Atwood, S., Turnbull, W., & Cappendale, J. I. M. (2010). The construction of knowledge in classroom talk. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19*(3), 358–402. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2010.491856>.
- Balaobao, A., Calapaan, A. J., Cubero, S. A., & Syting, C. J. (2024). Analyzing teacher-student interaction in English-medium classrooms: Flanders' and initiation-response-feedback model in focus. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature, 4* (1), 132–154. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v4i1.318>.
- Cheng, W. (2016). Exploring the adjacency pair. In W. Cheng & K. C. C. Kong (Eds.), *Professional communication: Collaboration between academics and practitioners* (pp. 25–42). Hong Kong University Press.
- Dede, C. (2010). Comparing frameworks for 21st-century skills. In J. Bellanca & R. Brandt (Eds.), *21st century skills: Rethinking how students learn* (pp. 51–76). Solution Tree Press.
- Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Routledge.
- Estaji, M., & Mirzaei Shojakhanlou, M. (2022). Realization of initiation, response, and feedback in teacher-student interactions in EFL classrooms: Learning realities and opportunities. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 14*(30), 91–114. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ELT.2022.53522.2510>.
- Gardner, R. (2019). Classroom interaction research: The state of the art. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 52*(3), 212–226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2019.1631037>
- Hall, J. K. (2022). L2 classroom interaction and its links to L2 learners' developing L2 linguistic repertoires: A research agenda. *Language Teaching, 55*(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000397>.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- MacMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- McCarthy, M., & McCarten, J. (2019). Interaction management in academic speaking. *Linx, 79*. <https://doi.org/10.4000/linx.3611>.
- Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and minds: How we use language to think together*. Routledge.
- Michaels, S., & O'Connor, C. (2015). Conceptualizing talk moves as tools: Professional development approaches for academically productive discussions. In L. B. Resnick, C. Asterhan, & S. N. Clarke (Eds.), *Socializing intelligence through talk and dialogue* (pp. 333–347). American Educational Research Association. https://doi.org/10.3102/978-0-935302-43-1_27.
- Myklebust, H., & Guadie, M. A. (2024). Following up: Questions and talk moves in preservice teachers' mathematics classroom conversations. *European Journal of Educational Research, 13*(3), 1001–1018. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.13.3.1001>.
- O'Connor, C., & Michaels, S. (2017). Supporting teachers in taking up productive talk moves: The long road to professional learning at scale. *International Journal of Educational Research, 97*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.11.003>.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696–735. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412243>.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.
- Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., Hoymann, G., Rossano, F., de Ruiter, J. P., Yoon, K.-E., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 106*(26), 10587–10592. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0903616106>.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Ablex.
- Varpio, L., Paradis, E., Uijtdehaage, S., & Young, M. (2017). The distinctions between theory, theoretical framework, and conceptual framework. *Academic Medicine, 92*(7), 989–994. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002303>.
- Walsh, S. (2014). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.
- Young, R. F. (2013). Learning to talk the talk and walk the walk: Interactional competence in academic spoken English. *Ibérica, 25*, 15–38. <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=287026237002>

Отримано редакцією журналу / Received: 23.03.26
Прорецензовано / Reviewed: 21.04.26
Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 22.04.26

Тамара Кавицька (Україна)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1528-9439
Оксана Олійник (Україна)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5701-7132

ІНТЕГРОВАНА СИСТЕМА ОДИНИЦЬ УСНОЇ МОВЛЕННЕВОЇ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ У ПІДГОТОВЦІ ВЧИТЕЛІВ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ

Вступ. Усна взаємодія посідає центральне місце у викладанні іноземних мов, однак інтеракційний вимір професійної підготовки вчителів англійської мови як іноземної (AMI) залишається значно недо-розвиненим. Чотири ключові одиниці усної взаємодії – репліковий крок, суміжна пара, мовленнєвий акт та комунікативний хід – традиційно досліджувалися відокремлено в різних галузях лінгвістики і досі не розглядалися як єдина педагогічно орієнтована система.

Мета статті полягає в інтеграції чотирьох зазначених одиниць у цілісну систему опису комунікативної професійної компетентності вчителів AMI з акцентом на професійно орієнтоване мовлення.

Методологія дослідження ґрунтується на теоретичному і концептуальному аналізі як визнаному методологічному підході в прикладній лінгвістиці (Varpio et al., 2017). Для кожної з чотирьох одиниць було проведено трирівневий аналіз: огляд фундаментальних джерел в аналізі розмови, теорії мовленнєвих актів і освітньої лінгвістики; вивчення кожної одиниці в контексті викладання AMI та інституційного дискурсу; порівняльний аналіз взаємозв'язків між усіма одиницями для побудови інтегрованої моделі.

Результати й обговорення. Аналіз засвідчив, що чотири одиниці функціонують як ієрархічно організовані і взаємопов'язані рівні будь-якої конкретної ситуації інституційного усного спілкування: репліковий крок є структурним носієм взаємодії; суміжна пара визначає її послідовну когерентність; мовленнєвий акт визначає соціальну дію, яку виконує висловлення; а комунікативний хід операціоналізує інтеракційні стратегії для досягнення професійних та педагогічних цілей. Встановлено, що вільне та усвідомлене оперування цією інтегрованою системою є особливим видом професійної компетентності, на яку програми підготовки вчителів AMI досі недостатньо звертають увагу. Окрім того, виявлено міжкультурні відмінності норм усної взаємодії у контексті англійського професійно орієнтованого мовлення. У статті сформульовано вісім педагогічних імплікацій для системи фахової підготовки вчителів AMI, що охоплюють: розвиток усвідомлення суміжних пар і навчання мовленнєвим актам; формування репертуару комунікативних ходів і розроблення діалогічних навчальних завдань; розвиток інтеракційної суб'єктності учнів, ознайомлення з міжкультурними нормами усного спілкування, а також розроблення критеріїв оцінювання усної взаємодії, чутливих до інтеракційних аспектів мовлення.

Ключові слова: усна взаємодія, репліковий крок, суміжна пара, мовленнєвий акт, комунікативний хід, стратегії усної взаємодії, професійно орієнтоване мовлення.

BIOS

Tamara Kavyt'ska, PhD in Education, an Associate Professor in the Department for Methodology of Teaching Ukrainian and Foreign Languages and Literatures at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine. Her research interests focus on Translation Pedagogy, Cognitive and Rhetorical Grammar, and Language Testing and Assessment.

E-mail: kawicka_t@ukr.net

Oksana Oliinyk, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Translation, Applied and General Linguistics at Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State University, Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine. Her areas of interest include teaching Spoken and Written English, Country Studies, Language and Culture Studies to pre-service translators.

E-mail: o.s.oliinyk@cuspu.edu.ua

Автори заявляють про відсутність конфлікту інтересів. Спонсори не брали участі в дослідженні, в аналізі й інтерпретації даних, в описі результатів дослідження, у схваленні публікації до друку.

The authors had declared no conflicts of interest. Sponsors were not involved in the research, data analysis, interpretation, writing, or publication approval process.