

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

((ن والقلم وما يسطرون))

صدق الله العظيم
سورة القلم (١)

In the name of Allah, the most Gracious, the most merciful ((Nun, and by what it represent and what it stands for as a natural symbol of adoration))

True are the words of Allah

Al-Qalam: (1)

Dedication

*very long
dedication*

I would like to dedicate this research to :
Our prophet **Mohammad** (Peace upon to him)

My Father;

There is no doubt in my mind that without his continued support and counsel could not have completed this research.

My Mother;

Without her patience, understanding, support, and most of all love, the completion of this work would not have been possible.

All our friends;

(Too many to list here, but you know who you are!) Who have inspired me and have been by my side during this process.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks are due to my supervisor Dr. GHAZWAN ADNAN for his assistance, guidance, insightful supervision and price fess instructions during the various stages of this work.

Many thanks are also due to the teaching staff at the department of English. College of Education for Human Sciences, and sincere appreciation to my family for their patience, encouragement and help.

The researcher

Abstract

Communication is called for when the language user recognizes a situation which requires the conveyance of information to establish a convergence of knowledge, so that this situation can be changed in some way. This transaction requires the negotiation of meaning through interaction. In fact, it refers to this negotiation as discourse (Widdowson, 1984: 100).

The use of language in any classroom is interesting from an educational point of view because education itself is conducted fundamentally through the medium of language. The term «the language classroom» is used here to refer to a classroom in which the primary concern is the development of a language that is not the first language of the learners.

Classroom discourse is often different in form and function from language used in other situations because of particular social roles which learners and teachers have in classrooms and the kind of activities they usually carry out there. Researchers and language teachers focus on classroom discourse in order to know what actually happens in the classroom that really matters, that makes a difference to the learners' progress in language acquisition.

Briefly speaking, the current research is divided into two sections, section one deals with the orientation of classroom discourse while section two deals with the language and learning of classroom discourse as well as to conclusions and bibliography.

Table of Contents

No.	Title	Page No.
	Dedication	III
	Acknowledgments	IV
	Abstract	V
	Section one The Orientation of Classroom Discourse	1
1.1	Introduction	2
1.2	Defining Classroom Discourse	2
1.3	Features of Classroom Discourse	4
1.3.1	Traditional Teachers	4
1.3.2	Peer Tutors	6
1.4	Structure Components of Classroom Discourse	8
1.5	Effective Questioning	9
1.5.1	Types of Questions	10
	Section Two Classroom Discourse: Language , Learning & Culture	13
2.1	Classroom Talk Issues	14
2.2	Classroom Discourse and Student's Learning	15
2.3	Varieties of Classroom Discourse	16
2.4	The Nature Classroom Discourse Varieties	18
2.5	The Role of Classroom Talk in Student's Learning	18
2.6	Classroom Discourse and Culture	20
2.7	Related Studies	21
	Conclusions	24
	Bibliography	26

Section One

**The Orientation
of
Classroom Discourse**

1.1 Introduction

The orientation of classroom discourse helps a person working with a realm of knowledge to develop an approach as to how it works. The classroom also helps in developing a frame work about the field in which the work and provides them the basis for analyzing synthesize data, organization of concepts. Suggestion and principles new and relations and speculating about the future.

The orientation gives a foundation for action classroom discourse treated classroom as a subject of philosophy. The orientation of classroom discourse them selves could not agree about what is a good classroom discourse? And they couldn't come out of a generalized definition for a classroom discourse.

It is obvious from history, origin of knowledge and discipline come in to existence. In classroom learning and teaching, a large proportion of time is spent in talking and learning. (Reference)

1.2 Defining Classroom Discourse

The concept of language classroom discourse has undergone various interpretations. Nunan (1993:33) views classroom discourse as «the distinctive type of discourse that occurs in classrooms».

While Nuthall (2016: 1) defines the term classroom discourse as it refers to the language that teachers and students use to communicate with each other in the classroom. Talking, or

conversation, is the medium through which most teaching takes place, so the study of classroom discourse is the study of the process of face-to-face classroom teaching.

Discourse in the language classroom is a matter of the oral use of language in the classrooms. At least 35 years ago, an important direction in applied linguistics and education research sought to understand the nature and implications of classroom interactions, or what is commonly referred to as «classroom discourse». One influential approach to the study of spoken discourse, as acknowledged by (McCarthy, 1991:32), was carried out by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975:21), they suggest a three tier approach, beginning-middle-end, to focus on the distinct «moves» " Classroom Discourse: Analyzing Teacher/Learner ... in discourse, which can be considered as question-answer-comment in the classroom environment, or command-acknowledgement-polite formality, as occurs in a shop between the client and the shopkeeper".

Broadly speaking, classroom studies can be viewed from three different perspectives (Johnson and Johnson, 1998:77):

1. From the perspective of interaction (between teacher/learners with each other)
2. From the perspective of the effects of instruction on language development.
3. From the perspective of whether different methods of instruction have different effects on language development.

1.3 Features of Classroom Discourse

Don't leave a space after this title -

1.3.1 Traditional Teachers

Teachers are the ones who control the classroom and students' behaviour in most cases. They affect the nature of learning significantly and this is why the teacher's speech needs to be paid attention to.

As Hadfield (1992:10) proposes, ^{that} teachers should create a joyful and productive learning situation where the students can participate and learn from also after the actual face to face teaching. In addition to this, listening to students and giving attention to them is important in order to maintain the interest in classroom discourses (Hadfield, 1992:158).

Students often expect some oral feedback or comment on their speech and thus it is important for the teacher to listen in order to maintain a diverse discourse. The students lose their interest quickly if the teacher uses monotonous voice or ignores students and their opinions completely. In addition to the overall importance of the teachers, one should pay attention to the different features that the teacher can exploit during the classroom discourses. One of these features is the style of speech as the teacher's style of oral communication can vary during the learning situation. However, it should be noted that the style of communication should be encouraging and positive, since "[N]egativity has a very powerful attraction" (et .al., 86).

Negative oral communication style can lead to a lack of self confidence and desire to participate in the classroom discourse and

the whole learning situation. In the same way Bushell (1973:31) says that a student's behaviour should be positively reinforced, since paying much attention to what the student says or does wrong does not encourage students to speak up and learn in the classroom. Axelrod (1983:9) also mentions that negative reinforcement does not bring anything useful to the classroom discourse, as it is used to remove an unwanted feature.

However, positive reinforcement often brings, for example, an urge to learn more and be better in the subject at hand. The topics used in classroom discourses are important in keeping the learning session interesting and encouraging the students' want to study.

Hadfield (1992:59) says that students should be invited "to draw on their own personal experience, talk about themselves and share feelings." This approach is said to promote "friendship, good feeling, and cooperation, while providing good language practice."

Ayers (1993:25) says in his book that teaching can be seen as an interactive practice that has to concentrate on seeing the student. It should be remembered that each student is an individual.

Walshaw and Anthony (2008:19) clarify that the teacher should pay attention to students and that effective "teaching involves observing students [and] listening carefully to their ideas and explanations". Thus the teacher cannot build classroom discourse based only on his or her opinion and want, as the teacher should

notice that teaching does not involve only the concept of one single class as it is about several individuals learning in different ways.

1.3.2 Peer Tutors

In addition to traditional professional teachers, students can act as teachers too. According to Goodlad and Hirst (1990:90), it is important to introduce the peer tutor to the students, since thus the students feel freer to communicate with each other and with the peer tutor in the classroom.

In the same way Hadfield (1992:59) claims that group cohesion is more productive if the students know “something about each other, and are willing to disclose information about themselves.” In the present study, students are familiar with the peer tutors as the students get to form the study groups by themselves and not with a help of a teacher.

In addition to the help of familiarity of the group, it is important to set the group activities on a suitable proficiency level for the students to succeed in their learning. One can notice that the face-to-face nature of communication in group activities can help speakers to set their speech to a suitable level for the particular listeners and to adjust it when listeners indicate a lack of understanding. (Nation and Newton 1997:244.)

This way the students get more from the discourse and can learn more than they do with the traditional teacher, since the peer

tutor's speech to fellow-students is often simpler and more informal compared to the speech used by the original teacher.

Nation and Newton (1997:244) mention that students can make errors and ask for repetition freely in a group-based peer interaction without exposing their weakness to the teacher.

Read (2008:90) discusses how by treating students like adults and giving them more power to affect the classroom discourses make the learning situation better than by having a biased teacher-led lesson. Unlike Goodlad and Hirst (1990), Read (2008:612) does not advise teachers to choose any certain student to act as a tutor. She prefers to give the students more agency without actually announcing it. However, Read (2008:612) believes that the students are aware of the continuation of the teacher's authority and continue to act within the classroom rules given by the teacher even though the teacher would not play a major role in the classroom discourse.

In this context , Axelrod (1983:63-64) mentions that there are a number of advantages in using peer tutoring. He says that in peer tutoring a student can begin instruction at her own level, can be paced according to her own learning rate, can be given immediate feedback, and can be taught according to methods most appropriate to her. This is not possible when a teacher instructs all students simultaneously.

1.4 Structural Components of Classroom Discourse

According to Chang (1999: 2-3), discourse in a classroom can be divided into four structures as follows: 1. *IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback)*, 2. *Instruction*, 3. *Probing Questions*, 4. *Argumentation*.

1- *IRF*: IRF may have a traditional pattern of discourse, when the teacher asks a question, the student answers and the teacher evaluates. The teacher continues to ask another question and so the sequence continues. «In this typical three-part structure, the teacher *initiates* a question in order to check a student's knowledge, a student's *responses*, and the student's response is evaluated with *feedback* from the teacher» (*Our focus*) (Richards *et al.*, 1992: 52). The students' answers are usually brief and students are concerned about giving correct answers that are expected by the teacher. The main role of the teacher is asking questions, but only a few students are actively involved.

2- *Instruction*: Another type of discourse is giving instructions. The teacher gives directive or informative statements. The students do not answer verbally; however, they understand the statements as instructions by following them physically.

3- *Probing Questions*: The probing question is another discourse structure. The teacher asks Referential questions or «thinking questions» (Brown, 2001: 171) and the students are encouraged to give longer answers through their thinking. Their answers may challenge the teacher's position. However, evaluation does not come immediately after the students' responses.

4- *Argumentation*: Argumentation can be regarded as probing questions where the teacher involves the students in a challenging

situation in order to make them to justify their reasons. The questions asked are commonly Referential questions, which try to elicit predictions, explanations and clarification from the students. The argumentation may be in question or statement forms.

Ellis (1990: 88) offers three structural components of a pedagogic discourse:

1. An *opening* phase where the participants inform each other that they are in fact going to conduct a lesson as opposed to some other activity.
2. An *instructional* phase where information is exchanged between teacher and students.
3. A *closing* phase where participants are reminded of what went on in the core of a lesson.

Also, Ellis (1994: 577) observes four types of language use in EFL classroom discourse , which are ;

1. *Mechanical* (i.e. no exchange of meaning is involved).
2. *Meaningful* (i.e. meaning is contextualized but there is still no new information to be conveyed).
3. *Pseudo-communication* (i.e. new information is conveyed but in a manner that would be unlikely to occur outside the Classroom).
4. *Real communication* (i.e. spontaneous speech resulting from the exchange of opinions, jokes, classroom Management, etc.).

1.5 Effective questioning

Questions and answers (Q and A) form a high percentage of classroom activities that are supposed to get the learners involved in

creation or recreation of meaning through language (Chastain, 1988: 142).

However not all questions and answer's are of communicative value. To be effective, questions and answers should be designed to ask for information. That means in every question and answer activity there must be a communicative purpose and an information gap to be filled.

Questions that do not serve that purpose will be little value in language teaching since in reality questions are not asked in vacuums. As language teachers, our motive in questioning is usually to get our students to engage with the language material activity through speech; so an effective questioning technique is one that elicits fairly prompt, motivated, relevant and full responses (Ur, 1996: 230).

1.5.1 Types of Questions

Suter (2001: 67) has proposed the following question types such as;

1- Socratic or Elicitation Question:

A methodological approach which can be found in classrooms is to structure a lesson by hopping from a question to the next one, using the learners' answers as point of departure for the next question. To follow his or her plan, the teacher cannot proceed with the lesson until the expected answer is given by a learner. This approach can be referred to as the «Socratic Method» (Chaudron, 1988:129), or «Elicitation Method» (Nunan, 1991:195).

Then, Chaudron offers a positive view of the teacher as a guide for «the learner toward particular bits of knowledge», this

methodological approach is more unacceptable. Nunan, for example, accuses it of wasting time in holding back information which could easily be given by the teacher.

2- Convergent Questions vs. Divergent Questions:

Suter (2001:80) propose to classify questions into either «Convergent» or Divergent ones. Richards *et al.*, state that Convergent is a question that encourages students' responses to focus on a central theme such as convergent questions require a single correct answer and elicit short responses from students (Richards *et al.*, 1992: 85). Convergent questions are useful when the teacher focuses on certain skills or information, such as when the teacher tries to find out whether learners can focus on specific information in a reading part.

Divergent questions allow the learners to establish real personal involvement in the course of the lesson. In other words, a divergent question is a question that elicits students' responses that vary or diverge. Divergent questions are used when the teacher wants to compare students' ideas about a specific topic. There are no wrong answers or right answers in this type of question such as: Tom, what is your idea?. This type of question can be expected to lead to more communicative use of language but makes lesson planning difficult because the learners' utterances cannot be predicted for a certain topic or goal.

3- Display Questions vs. Referential Questions:

Display refers to questions for which the teacher knows the answer and which demand a single or short response of the low-level thinking kind. Referential questions, by contrast, demand more thought and generate a longer response and for which the teacher does not know the answer in advance (Brown, 2001: 171).

Section Two
Classroom Discourse
Language, learning & Culture

2.1 Classroom Talking Issues

Intuitively , how teachers and pupils communicative must be important ; after all, talk is central to most of what happens in classroom. Through talk, for example, concepts are explained, tasks demonstrated, questions posed, and ideas discussed indeed, one is hard – pressed to think of any significant school activities that do not involve talk in some way. But talk's ubiquity in classrooms is a rather weak argument for its importance.

Perhaps children would be better served by lesson with less talk, there by allowing each to get on with their own work, individually, without the distractions of teacher guidance, pupil chatter and other noise. However, a strong argument ties talk and language to pupil thinking, learning and development.

In a famous passage, Vygotsky asserts the primary of social interaction in human development. Every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people (inter psychological) and then inside the child (inter psychological). All the higher mental functions originate as actual relations between people (vygotsky, 1987:57).

Vygotsky argues that thinking originates in social interaction. That discourse between people is internalized as individual cognition. There are at least three ways in which internalized talk can advance thinking. First, language is cognitive resource: by being exposed to and participating in certain ways of using language, one becomes a "fluent speaker" of that language, able to use and

understand its key concepts and expressions (CF.Lemke, 1990). Second, through talk participants are exposed to alternative voice and perspectives that challenge or elaborate their own world – view. Third, habitual interactional patterns – e.g. providing all participants opportunity to voice their views, demanding and providing justification for arguments, questioning assumptions, clarifying concepts, and so on are internalized as habitual ways of thinking. Sfard (2008: 89) argues that the similarities between interpersonal communication and individual cognition are such that they can usefully be thought of as different manifestations of same processes.

2.2 Classroom Discourse and Student's Learning

In classroom learning and teaching, a large proportion of time is spent in talking and listening. Being one basic medium of classroom interaction, talking should play a crucial part in the process of learner development. But how important is it? Does the quality of talk accord with the quality of classroom learning? On the basis of these questions, Alexander (2004:8-9) argues that classroom talk not only mediates teaching and learning but the wider culture. Also, he indicates that talk is necessary for ‘the building of the brain itself as a physical organism and thereby expanding its power’.

Moreover, the quality of classroom discourse is of great importance because it sets a suitable climate for learning and transmitting teachers’ expectations for their pupils’ thinking (Nystrand, 1997:28).

However, perhaps because talking is impermanent and evanescent compared with written words, many people tend to be less reflective about spoken discourse than written in classrooms; besides, this lower status of talking is constantly strengthened by teachers as well as parents

For instance, it is always written work that is regarded as ‘real school work and as the most reliable medium for measuring pupil’s learning’(Alexander, 2004:5-6).

Barnes (1992:124) also implies that learning is not simply adding bits of information to the previous knowledge. Rather, most important learning is a matter of ‘working on understanding’, which can be achieved through talk.

In an effort to reveal the importance of classroom talk in student learning and their interrelation, this paper aims to discuss whether student learning is closely linked to the quality of classroom talk. First, theories from Vygotsky and Halliday concerning the correlation between language and learning are elaborated. Secondly, varieties of classroom discourse are considered. Afterwards, nature of the discourse varieties is uncovered. Finally, the role of talk in classroom learning is discussed.

2.3 Varieties of Classroom Discourse

There are two different types of classroom discourse, traditional and non-traditional lessons. Cazden (2001:25) makes an explicit contrast between the two categories. On one hand, traditional lessons refer to the using of a three-part sequence: teacher

initiation, student response, and teacher evaluation or follow-up (IRE or IRF). Lemke describes this format as 'triadic dialogue' (Wells, 1999:167).

Non-traditional lessons, on the other hand, means the sequence of talk in classrooms does not fit an IRE structure on account of a changed educational goal (Cazden, 2001:31). These two prominent alternatives of classroom discourse have earlier been differentiated by Bakht in (Skidmore, 2000:284) as 'authoritative discourse' and 'internally persuasive discourse'.

To be more precise, the former means 'someone who knows and possesses the truth instructs someone who is ignorant of it and in error'; while the later refers to more students' responses, student self-selection and students' topic expansion (Skidmore, 2000:290). Thus, it is obvious that in traditional lessons teachers generally dominate the class talk; students have fewer opportunities to ask their own questions or generate subtopics (Gutierrez, 1994: 77).

However, according to Wells (1999:167), the IRE structure in teaching takes up about 70 percent of all the classroom discourses in many secondary schools as well as some primary ones. In a research conducted by Nystrand (1997: 90), it was also found that the dominated pattern of classroom interaction was monologically-organized instruction, i.e. traditional IRE sequences rather than dialogically-organized form which can promote 'retention and in-depth processing associated with the cognitive manipulation of information'.

This view is also supported by Wood (1992: 425) and Lemke (1990: 334), who advocate teachers to use a less controlling type of discourse to encourage student participation to the largest extent.

2.4 The Nature of Classroom Discourse Varieties

Subsequently, it brings us to consider what factors lead to the two different classroom discourses. According to Skidmore (2000:292), it is the inherent nature of the task for the students to complete that results in the differences.

That is, what types of questions given by the teachers engender the distinctions. Questions are applied to check learners' attention, evaluate rote learning, and even to stimulate their thinking and discussion. Wood (1992:205) claims that questions may 'motive, sustain and direct the thought processes of the pupil' and promote reflection as well as self-examination. Apparently, questions have significant effects on classroom activities.

But will all questions equally contribute to student learning? Skidmore (2003:50) analyzes three categories of questioning: questions with one right answer; with a finite set of right answers and with an indeterminate though bounded set of possible answers. The first type, namely, closed or two-choice questions are criticized for not only failing to promote pupils' deep thinking but also inhibiting their intellectual activity (Wood, 1992:205). As Nystrand and Gamoran (1997:73) state, only authentic discourse can engage students, and authentic questions must stimulate pupils to think and reflect on the consequences of their ideas, not just recall their past experiences.

2.5 The Role of Classroom Talk in Student's Learning

Talk is 'arguably the true foundation of learning' (Alexander, 2004:5). It is through talk that children actively engage and teachers constructively intervene. In Alexander's (2004) classroom research

conducted around the world, it is found that most teachers basically use three kinds of classroom talk: 'rote' means mechanically practicing facts, ideas and routines; 'recitation' refers to the accumulation of knowledge and understanding through questions to test the pupils' previous knowledge or to apply them clues in the question to work it out; 'instruction/exposition' concerns 'telling the pupil what to do, imparting information and explaining facts, principles or procedures'.

Still, some teachers apply two additional kinds of classroom talk which have greater cognitive potential: discussion and scaffold dialogue. The former, existing between teacher-class, teacher-group or pupil-pupil, means the exchange of ideas in sharing information and solving problems (Alexander, 2000:527).

While the latter refers to 'achieving common understanding through structured and cumulative questioning and discussion which guide and prompt, reduce choices, minimize risk and error, and expedite 'handover' of concepts and principles'. Perhaps because Scaffold dialogue is more complicated and requires more teacher skills, it remains less common in classroom teaching.

Therefore, ones can summarize that various kinds of talk are unlikely to contribute equally to student learning. Barnes (1992:126) distinguishes two functions of talk between presentational and exploratory talk. Presentational talk, on one hand, focuses more on the needs of the teacher than on the student's own ideas. It usually occurs when teacher is trying to seek answers from students to test their understanding of a topic already taught.

On the other hand, exploratory talk enables learners to 'try out ideas, to hear how they sound, to see what others make of them, to

arrange information and ideas into different patterns'. Because much of the talk elicited from pupils is essentially presentational, Barnes (1992:126) proposes that teachers consider when and where to employ presentational or exploratory talk and ensure a balance of them.

2.6 Classroom Discourse and Culture

Jelani (2014: 67) states that in the average classroom, as much as 70% of instructional time consists of these kinds of verbal exchanges between you and students or among students: teacher initiation, student response, teacher evaluation of the response/feedback. Classroom discussion, dialogue, and discourse are the principal means of exchanging ideas, evaluating mastery, developing thinking processes, and reflecting on content and shared thoughts.

Engaging students in effective classroom talk begins by creating a discourse-rich classroom culture. Begin the year by discussing what rich discourse is, the rationale for it, and answering the What's In It for the teacher's question by specifying ways students benefit.

Another key element of building a discourse-rich culture is embedding the spirit of collaboration versus competition. Classroom talk is not only a means of students supporting each other, but also of holding each other accountable by helping clarify, restate, and challenge ideas.

Students may not participate if their thoughts are ridiculed, devalued, or ignored. To that end, establishing norms of discourse

helps develop safe spaces, establishes boundaries, and moves the discussion forward.

In any classroom, the norms included specifics on how to engage in active listening, address ideas versus individuals, and respectfully disagree/question. Role-playing appropriate and inappropriate actions can give students a better understanding of their expected role during classroom talk.

A third central element of developing a culture that fosters rich discourse is helping students appreciate the processes to get there versus simply the production of right answers. Make it clear that one values students strategically thinking about, discussing, clarifying, and elaborating on ideas rather than having someone simply state the correct answer in order to save time.

2.7/Related Studies

In one study of classroom talk, all wright and Bailey (1991:121), they compared the teacher's and native speaker's use of display and referential questions, comprehension checks, clarification checks and confirmation checks. A number of striking difference emerged:-

- 1- ESL teachers used significantly more display than referential questions in the classroom so there was less real communication going on in classrooms.
- 2- The teacher used more imperatives, more statements and fewer questions.
- 3- The teacher's speech was significantly more oriented to the <<here and now>>.

Pica and Long carried out two studies (as reported by Nunan, 1989:25). For their first study, they collected ten minute recorded samples of speech from ten ESL teachers. The researchers found that ESL classroom conversations differed from conversations out of classroom in a number of ways.

There was much less negotiation in the classroom; it was due to the fact that teachers tended to ask display questions. In the second study, Pica and Long worked on the differences between the language of experienced and inexperienced teachers. According to their study, experienced teachers were to be more fluent, and used more question forms.

Suter (2001:8-7) observed three lessons by four teachers in the different class and counted the number of display and referential questions using a tally sheet. After collecting the data and transcribing them, Suter observed in class (a), the teacher asked 31 display questions and no referential questions.

In class(b) the teachers asked 19 display questions and 5 referential questions. In class(c), the teachers asked 67 display questions and 41 referential questions. Suter concluded that referential questions have been shown to be far more effective in initiating interaction.

The material analyzed in Suter's research was recorded in an evening class of adult learners in Switzerland. The class was working with head way- Pre intermediate. Two extracts from the lesson were chosen for transcription and analysis.

Effectuate a discourse analysis on the basis of the <<IRF>> model has shown to be personal and professional interest to the teacher from several points of view. It has provided some valuable

insights on characteristics of teacher – centered classroom working in general as well as on my own teaching; it made the teacher aware of what actually happens on the level of spoken discourse when the student teaches and, for example, what my preferred markers are (ok, right).

Another study which deserves mentioning here is the one which was carried out in Korea by Oberli (2003:10). The purpose of his study was to investigate how an experienced teacher in Seoul, Korea, chose to answer the <<weak>> / <> dichotomy with regard to questioning and feedback strategies in his interactive classroom during a 70 minute lesson observed. The question to which the answer would be sought was: what types of questions does he ask and how do these in form his strategies and their effectiveness? Oberli (2003:10) concluded:-

"The questions investigated have produced some unusual, seemingly conflicting findings.... We have, on the one hand, a teacher who mostly asks convergent questions, often just closed ones. These indicate that he is in control, manipulating, classroom interaction in a near mechanical way.

Conclusions

The orientations of classroom discourse are a way of describing the philosophy of certain approach to the development and enactment of classroom with in abroad field of classroom discourse. Concisely, it is concluded that, learning experience and study of education experience aim that all students must know what they need to achieve to succeed in life.

By definition, discourse refers to a verbal exchange or conversation, but classroom discourse goes way beyond just verbal communication. Classroom discourse can be affected by motion, body language, attitude, disposition, classroom configuration, and confidence. As a result, students are learning more and gaining confidence in their abilities.

Moreover, ones conclude that the quality of student learning is closely associated with the quality of classroom discourse. Thus, as teachers, they should :

- 1- Attach more importance to spoken discourse during classroom interaction;
- 2- Manage to act more often as consultants but not just mere transmitters of information;
- 3- Recognize various group-based discussions as real work;

4- Encourage students to generate their own questions and to explore alternative answers.

Furthermore, authentic questions should be structured to encourage thoughtful answers, and further student questions built on previous responses are promoted. In addition, oral tasks should be given greater prominence than it is in the traditional ratio of spoken and written tasks. In order to achieve this, teachers ought to improve self-teaching skills. If a teacher can improve the quality of classroom discourse, s/he can certainly raise the quality of student learning.

According to the classroom culture, teacher should create a classroom culture rife with intellectually safe spaces and emphasizes on processes of strategic thinking versus production of right answers, s/he invites instructional episodes of rich discourse. Student-led discourse is a powerful way to let students take ownership of their own learning.

Bibliography

- Alexander, R. J. (2000). **Culture and Pedagogy: International Comparisons in Primary Education**, Oxford: Blackwell.
- (2004). **Towards Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom talk**, Cambridge: Dialogos
- Allwright, D. and Bailey, K.M. (1991). **Focus on the language classroom**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Axelrod, S. (1983). **Behavior modification for the classroom teacher**. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Ayers, W. (1993). **To teach – the journey of a teacher**. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Barnes, D.(1992). **The role of talk learning** in Norwman, k. (1992). **The thinking voices: the work of the national oracy, project**, London: Hadder & Stoughton.
- Brown, H.D (2001). **Teaching by principles** (2nd Ed.). London: Longman.
- Bushell, D. Jr. (1973). **Classroom behaviour: A little book for teachers**. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs.
- Cazden, C.B. (2001). **Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning**, Portsmouth, (2nd ed.), NH: Heinemann.
- Chang, D. (1999). **Classroom as discourse communities**. Cambridge: Cambridge university press
- Chastain, K. (1988). **Developing second language skills: Theory and practice**. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Chaudron, D. (1988). **Second language classrooms**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1990). **Instructed second language acquisition**. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.
- (1994). **The study of second language acquisition**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Goodlad, S. and B. Hirst (1990) . **Explorations in Peer Tutoring**. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Gutierrez, K. D. (1994). How talk, context, and script shape contexts for learning: a cross-case comparison of journal sharing. **Linguistics and Education journal**.
- Hadfield, J. (1992). **Classroom dynamics**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jabari, Jelani . How Rich Is Your Classroom Discourse? **AMLE Magazine**, November 2014.
- Lemke, J. L. (1990). **Talking science: language, learning, and values**. Norwood, N.J: Ablex Pub. Corp.
- McCarthy, Michael (1991): **Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers**. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Nuthall , Graham (2016). **Classroom Discourse**. Education Encyclopedia – State University. <http://education.Stateuniversity.com/Discourse.html>.
- Nation, P. and J. Newton (1997). **Teaching vocabulary**. In J. Coady and T. Huckin (eds.), **Second language vocabulary acquisition**. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1989). **Understanding language classroom**. Cambridge: Prentice Hall.
- (1991). **Language teaching methodology**. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- (1993). **Introducing discourse analysis**. London: Penguin English.
- Nystrand, M. & Gamoran, A. (1997). **‘The Big Picture: Language and Learning in Hundreds of English Lessons’**. London: Academic Press.
- (1997). **Opening Dialogue: Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom**, New York: Teachers College Press.

- Oberli, C. (2003). **Questioning and feedback in the interactive classroom**. Cambridge: Cambridge university press
- Read, B. (2008). The world must stop when I'm talking: gender and power relations in primary teachers' classroom talk. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*.
- Richards, J.C., Platt, J., and Platt, H. (1992). **Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics**. London: Longman.
- Sfard, A. (2008). **Thinking as communicating: human development, the growth of discourses, and mathematizing**. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, J. M. & Coulthard, M, (1975). **Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils**. London: Oxford University Press.
- Skidmore, D. (2000). From pedagogical dialogue to dialogical pedagogy. **Language and Education Journal**.
- Skidmore, D., Perez-Parent, M., & Arnfield, S. (2003). **Teacher-pupil dialogue in the guided reading session**. Reading: Literacy and Language.
- Suter, C. (2001). **Exploring teachers' questions and feedback**. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- (2002). **Analyzing spoken discourse in the EFL classroom**. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Ur. P. (1996). **A course in language teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). **Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Walshaw, M. and G. Anthony. (2008). **The teacher's role in classroom**

discourse: A review of recent research into mathematics classrooms.

Wells, C. G. (1999). **Dialogic inquiry:** towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. (1984). **Explorations in applied linguistics 2.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wood, D. (1992). '**Teaching Talk: How Modes of Teacher Talk Affect Pupil Participation**' in Norman, K. (1992) **.Thinking Voices: the Work of the National Oracy Project**, London: Hodder & Stoughton.