

Strategic Organisation Of Classroom Interaction in English Teacher Education: A Linguodidactic Framework

Makhliyo Safarova

Lecturer, Department of English Language Theory and Teaching Methodology, Nizami National Pedagogical University of Uzbekistan

Received: 26 July 2026; **Accepted:** 23 August 2026; **Published:** 18 September 2026

Abstract: The preparation of English teachers increasingly requires an account of professional communication that connects language knowledge, pedagogical purpose, institutional roles, and digitally mediated participation. This conceptual article examines pedagogical discourse as the professional environment in which prospective English teachers learn to organise interaction, realise communicative intentions, and regulate learner participation. It distinguishes pedagogical discourse from the broader category of pedagogical communication and develops a strategic-linguodidactic perspective that brings together discourse, genre, pragmatics, and interactional competence. Hybrid learning is treated not as a technological supplement but as a mode of pedagogical organisation governed by flexibility, interactivity, accessibility, and feedback. The article compares differentiated, multi-track, and alternating A/B configurations and argues that an alternating design is especially suitable for teacher education when each online activity prepares for or extends a face-to-face discourse task. The proposed conceptual framework clarifies how communicative strategies are realised through verbal, nonverbal, and paralinguistic tactics across classroom and online settings. It offers a theoretical basis for designing professional-language preparation without reducing teacher discourse to decontextualised formulas or treating digital tools as ends in themselves.

Keywords: Pedagogical discourse, hybrid teacher education, linguodidactics, communicative strategy, interactional competence, pragmatic competence, English teacher education, media literacy.

Introduction: The professional preparation of English teachers is shaped by two simultaneous changes. The first is a movement from the transmission of subject knowledge towards competence-oriented teacher education, where graduates must interpret classroom situations, make communicative decisions, and justify pedagogical action. The second is the expansion of learning across physical and digital environments. Together, these changes require a theoretical model that explains not only what a future teacher knows but how that knowledge is enacted through discourse in different modes of participation.

Teacher talk is sometimes approached as a collection of useful classroom phrases. Such an approach may assist beginners, but it cannot account for the institutional, interpersonal, and sequential nature of teaching. The

meaning of an instruction, question, correction, or evaluation depends on its pedagogical purpose, its position in an exchange, the roles of participants, and the verbal and embodied resources through which it is delivered. A professionally appropriate utterance therefore cannot be selected solely by grammatical form.

Pedagogical discourse provides a more adequate unit of analysis. It connects language with educational activity, institutional norms, role relations, knowledge construction, value orientation, and interaction management. In English teacher education, it also links language proficiency to pragmatic and interactional competence. This article develops a conceptual account of that link and examines the linguodidactic potential of hybrid learning for teaching the interactional aspect of

pedagogical discourse.

The discussion is derived from the theoretical concerns of the first chapter of a wider study on preparing prospective English teachers for pedagogical interaction. Its purpose is analytical rather than experimental. It addresses four questions: how pedagogical discourse differs from pedagogical communication; which components constitute its interactional aspect; how a strategic approach integrates discourse, genre, and pragmatics; and which principles of hybrid learning are relevant to the professional preparation of English teachers.

PEDAGOGICAL DISCOURSE AS A PROFESSIONAL DOMAIN

Pedagogical communication is a broad category encompassing interpersonal contact, educational influence, cooperation, emotional support, organisational exchange, and the transmission of cultural values in educational settings. Pedagogical discourse is narrower and more structurally defined. It is an institutional, subject-oriented, and norm-governed form of language use through which educational meanings, roles, and activities are produced. The distinction matters because a general account of communication does not automatically explain how a classroom exchange is organised as a pedagogical event.

Bernstein's analysis of pedagogic discourse demonstrates that education does not simply transmit neutral knowledge; it selects, relocates, and frames knowledge through institutional principles (Bernstein, 1990). From a systemic-functional perspective,

language simultaneously represents experience, enacts social relations, and organises text (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). These functions are visible in classroom discourse, where an explanation constructs subject matter, an instruction configures roles, and the sequencing of questions organises participation.

Pedagogical discourse is therefore multifunctional. Its regulative component establishes norms, boundaries, and participation rights. Its educational and cognitive components mediate knowledge and reasoning. Its axiological component communicates what is considered worthwhile, responsible, or acceptable. Its interactional component organises turns, responses, feedback, and repair. Its semiotic component coordinates linguistic, visual, spatial, and embodied meaning. Its practical component connects discourse to the performance of learning tasks. These components are analytically distinguishable but operate together in actual teaching.

The genre dimension clarifies how recurring educational purposes produce relatively stable forms of discourse. A mini-lecture, task instruction, feedback conference, classroom discussion, and reflective debrief differ in participant expectations, stages, linguistic resources, and criteria of success. Genre-based traditions emphasise the relation between social purpose and staged text organisation (Martin & Rose, 2008). For teacher education, this means that professional discourse should not be taught as an undifferentiated register; students need to recognise how discourse changes across pedagogical events.

Table 1. Distinguishing pedagogical communication and pedagogical discourse

Analytical feature	Pedagogical communication	Pedagogical discourse
Scope	Broad educational interpersonal exchange	Institutionally organised language use within pedagogical activity
Primary focus	Relationship, influence, cooperation, emotional contact	Meaning, roles, genres, strategies, interactional sequence, and knowledge construction
Degree of regulation	May include informal and loosely structured contact	Norm-governed and shaped by pedagogical purpose
Unit of analysis	Communicative relationship or event	Discourse move, exchange, genre, strategy, and multimodal configuration
Teacher-education value	Develops general communicative sensitivity	Supports analysis and deliberate performance of professional interaction

THE INTERACTIONAL ASPECT OF PEDAGOGICAL DISCOURSE

Interaction is not an additional component placed beside instruction; it is the medium through which instruction becomes observable and negotiable. Classroom participants coordinate attention, establish understanding, request clarification, respond to difficulty, and display learning through sequential action. The familiar initiation-response-feedback pattern captures one recurrent organisation, but dialogic teaching depends on the teacher's capacity to modify that pattern by extending learner turns, withholding premature evaluation, prompting elaboration, and creating space for alternative viewpoints (Alexander, 2008).

Walsh (2011, 2012) conceptualises classroom interactional competence as the ability of teachers and learners to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning. This definition shifts attention from the formal accuracy of teacher utterances to their pedagogical consequences. A display question may be appropriate when checking recall but restrictive when the objective is inquiry. Direct correction may be efficient in one activity and face-threatening in another. Interactional competence is thus context-sensitive and tied to pedagogical purpose.

For prospective English teachers, the interactional aspect includes turn allocation, questioning, elicitation, scaffolding, repair, feedback, topic management, transition, and closure. It also includes the ability to interpret learner silence, hesitation, overlap, resistance, and partial understanding. These phenomena are not adequately represented by isolated sentence patterns because their meaning emerges from sequence. The same phrase may encourage, control, challenge, or dismiss depending on timing, prosody, gaze, and the learner contribution to which it responds.

Pragmatic competence complements this interactional view by explaining how communicative functions are realised appropriately. The CEFR Companion Volume associates pragmatic competence with discourse organisation, functional language use, and interactional schemata (Council of Europe, 2020). In professional teacher discourse, appropriateness includes sensitivity to authority, social distance, learner age, emotional

state, lesson purpose, and cultural expectation. A future teacher must be able to select not only a correct expression but a responsible and pedagogically useful one.

A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO PROFESSIONAL TEACHER DISCOURSE

A strategic approach offers a bridge between theoretical analysis and professional action. In this perspective, a communicative strategy is an organised orientation towards a pedagogical goal, grounded in the speaker's intention, interpretation of context, and anticipation of participant response. Tactics are the local verbal, nonverbal, and paralinguistic actions through which the strategy is realised. A strategy of supportive correction, for example, may employ delayed evaluation, a clarification request, softened modality, rising intonation, encouraging gaze, and an invitation to self-repair.

The distinction between strategy and tactic prevents the mechanistic teaching of formulas. 'Could you try again?' is not inherently supportive; it may function as encouragement, routine repair, or concealed criticism depending on tone, timing, and previous turns. Students must therefore learn to reconstruct the relationship between intention, form, sequence, and effect. This requires discourse analysis, comparison of alternatives, performance, and reflection rather than memorisation alone.

The strategic approach synthesises three complementary perspectives. Discourse analysis reveals how meaning develops across turns and how power and participation are organised. Genre analysis identifies recurrent pedagogical events and their staged purposes. Pragmatic analysis explains speech acts, implicature, politeness, contextual appropriateness, and interpersonal effect. Their integration supports a richer account of professional competence than any single perspective can provide.

Verbal resources include lexical choice, syntax, modality, address forms, discourse markers, questions, reformulations, and evaluative expressions. Paralinguistic resources include intonation, stress, rhythm, loudness, tempo, pause, and voice quality. Nonverbal resources include gaze, gesture, facial expression, posture, movement, and spatial

positioning. Professional interaction requires congruence among these channels. A verbally polite request delivered with abrupt prosody and dismissive

gaze may be interpreted as coercive; a concise instruction supported by calm tone and clear gesture may reduce unnecessary linguistic load.

Table 2. Strategic layers of pedagogical interaction

Layer	Guiding question	Illustrative resources
Pedagogical goal	What learning or participation outcome is intended?	Eliciting reasoning, sustaining attention, enabling repair, regulating activity
Communicative strategy	How will the goal be pursued through interaction?	Scaffolding, supportive correction, dialogic questioning, redirection
Discourse tactic	Which local action realises the strategy?	Prompt, reformulation, follow-up question, wait time, uptake
Multimodal realisation	How do verbal and embodied cues shape interpretation?	Modality, prosody, pause, gaze, gesture, posture, proximity
Reflective evaluation	What effect did the move have and what alternative is possible?	Learner uptake, participation pattern, self-analysis, peer interpretation

HYBRID LEARNING AS A LINGUODIDACTIC ENVIRONMENT

The term hybrid learning is frequently used alongside blended learning, and the boundaries between the labels remain unstable. Hrastinski (2019) notes that blended learning functions as an umbrella term for multiple combinations of media, methods, technologies, and modes. For the present framework, hybrid learning denotes the planned integration of face-to-face and online participation in a shared pedagogical sequence. The defining feature is functional interdependence: activity in one environment changes what participants are prepared to do in the other.

This definition is important for linguodidactics. Language and discourse are learned through exposure, attention, participation, feedback, and repeated use. Digital environments can support replay, annotation, asynchronous reflection, searchable records, and broader access to multimodal examples. Face-to-face environments support embodied co-presence, spontaneous turn-taking, immediate repair, and the perception of fine-grained social cues. The task of hybrid design is not to decide which environment is superior but to assign each activity to the environment that best supports its learning function.

Four principles are especially relevant. Flexibility allows students to revisit complex discourse and manage preparatory work at an appropriate pace. Interactivity

ensures that online work includes response, negotiation, and co-construction rather than passive content consumption. Accessibility concerns both technical access and the cognitive transparency of tasks and resources. Feedback connects observation with improvement through teacher, peer, automated, or self-generated evidence. These principles are mutually dependent: flexibility without feedback may become isolation, while interactivity without accessibility may intensify inequality.

Media literacy is part of professional language competence in this environment. Prospective teachers must evaluate the authenticity, cultural location, representational bias, and pedagogical relevance of digital texts. They also need to recognise how platforms shape turn-taking, visibility, response time, permanence, and participation rights. Digital communication does not merely carry pedagogical discourse; it modifies its temporal, spatial, and semiotic conditions.

CONFIGURATIONS OF HYBRID TEACHER EDUCATION

Hybrid courses may be organised through differentiated, multi-track, or alternating configurations. In a differentiated model, students complete different combinations of face-to-face and online activity according to need, readiness, or access. This supports personalisation but requires careful coordination to maintain common outcomes. A multi-track model offers parallel routes through the same

content, allowing students or groups to work through different modes. It increases choice, yet equivalent quality and workload can be difficult to ensure.

An alternating A/B configuration distributes interconnected activities across face-to-face and online phases. It is especially useful for professional discourse because observation and reflection can occur online, while contingent performance and embodied interaction can be practised face to face. The value of alternation does not lie in a fixed timetable. It lies in the pedagogical relation between phases: online noticing prepares live performance, and live performance generates evidence for subsequent reflection.

A theoretical sequence may begin with an online discourse sample and an observation protocol. Students identify the pedagogical goal, genre, strategy, tactics, participant roles, and multimodal cues. In the classroom they compare interpretations and reconstruct the interaction through role-play or microteaching. A recorded or written trace then returns to the online environment for peer analysis and reflective reformulation. The next face-to-face encounter tests whether reflection has changed performance. This sequence illustrates how hybrid design can turn conceptual knowledge into an interactional repertoire without predetermining a single correct script.

Table 3. Hybrid configurations for English teacher education

Configuration	Organising logic	Pedagogical advantage	Main design risk
Differentiated	Mode and task vary according to learner need	Personalisation and targeted support	Fragmented experience or unequal expectations
Multi-track	Parallel pathways lead towards common outcomes	Choice and accommodation of access conditions	Difficulty ensuring equivalence across routes
Alternating A/B	Interdependent online and face-to-face phases recur	Continuity between noticing, performance, feedback, and reflection	Mechanical alternation without functional connection

IMPLICATIONS FOR ENGLISH TEACHER EDUCATION

The framework has several implications for curriculum design. First, pedagogical discourse should be visible as an explicit object of study across language-practice and methodology courses. Students need a metalanguage for analysing pedagogical goals, genres, speech acts, interactional sequences, and multimodal resources. Without such concepts, reflection tends to remain impressionistic and feedback focuses on personality or general fluency.

Second, assessment should address situated performance. Grammatical accuracy and lexical range remain important, but they do not show whether a future teacher can create participation, respond to misunderstanding, mitigate evaluation, or adapt an instruction. Assessment criteria should connect language form with contextual appropriateness, learner uptake, interaction management, paralinguistic control, and reflective justification.

Third, technology integration should be evaluated by its pedagogical function. A platform is useful when it improves access to discourse evidence, supports

analysis, enables response, preserves traces for reflection, or facilitates timely feedback. The mere presence of a learning management system or video task does not constitute a hybrid pedagogy. Garrison and Kanuka (2004) locate the transformative potential of blended learning in thoughtful redesign, not in the combination of media as such.

Finally, teacher educators should treat cultural interpretation as part of discourse competence. Institutional authority, politeness, participation, praise, criticism, silence, and physical distance are culturally mediated. Authentic examples from films, recorded lessons, and online classrooms should therefore be compared rather than copied. Students need opportunities to ask which features are transferable, which require adaptation, and how alternative formulations may change the learner's experience.

CONCLUSION

Pedagogical discourse offers a coherent theoretical basis for connecting language, professional identity, institutional purpose, and interaction in English teacher education. It is more specific than pedagogical

communication because it directs attention to the rule-governed genres, strategies, exchanges, and multimodal resources through which teaching is accomplished. Its interactional aspect includes not only turn-taking and feedback but also the pragmatic and affective consequences of communicative choice.

A strategic-linguodidactic perspective makes these choices teachable. It relates pedagogical goals to communicative strategies, local tactics, multimodal realisation, and reflective evaluation. Hybrid learning can support this development when online and face-to-face activities are functionally integrated according to flexibility, interactivity, accessibility, and feedback. Among possible configurations, alternating A/B organisation is theoretically well suited to cycles of observation, performance, evidence-based reflection, and re-performance.

The conceptual framework does not prescribe a universal technological model. Its central claim is that professional teacher discourse develops through purposeful participation across contexts. Digital tools acquire educational value only when they make interaction more observable, analysable, responsive, and open to improvement. This principle provides a foundation for subsequent methodological modelling and empirical evaluation of pedagogical interaction in hybrid English teacher education.

REFERENCES

1. Alexander, R. (2008). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (4th ed.). Dialogos.
2. Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse: Class, codes and control* (Vol. 4). Routledge.
3. Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom discourse analysis: A functional perspective*. Continuum.
4. Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment - Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>
5. Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2), 95-105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.02.001>
6. Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines*. Jossey-Bass. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118269558>
7. Hall, J. K. (2018). *Essentials of SLA for L2 teachers: A transdisciplinary framework*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315452692>
8. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
9. Hrastinski, S. (2019). What do we mean by blended learning? *TechTrends*, 63, 564-569. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-019-00375-5>
10. Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Blackwell.
11. Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.
12. Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2008). *Genre relations: Mapping culture*. Equinox.
13. Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
14. Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Blackwell.
15. Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching*, 48(1), 1-50. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000263>
16. Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203827826>
17. Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 6(1), 1-14.
18. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.