

Siddhajyoti Interdisciplinary Journal (SIJ)

Vol. III, January, 2022

(A Peer Reviewed Open Access Research Journal)

ISSN: 2645-8381

Published by Research Management Cell, Siddhajyoti Education Campus Sindhuli

<https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/sij>

Classroom discourse in the English language class

Man Bahadur Jora

Article History: *Received:* 30 June 2021; *Reviewed:* 30 November 2021; *Accepted:* 10 December 2021

Abstract

This article discusses classroom discourse theoretically. English language class consists of talks which occur between teachers and students. It takes place in the area of classroom research to be studied. The language learning is the main concern of the interaction existing in the classroom setting including linguistic perspective. Additionally, issues of classroom talk in terms of teaching learning of English language formulate the interactive events in the class for meeting the educational goals. Similarly, the classroom activities become managed and balanced through the language practiced for communicative purposes. Language teaching is associated with the interaction that exists in language learning and communicative aspects. Students and teachers communicate in the respect of course contents. Such teaching learning is linked with language and culture. To the case of this article, theoretical aspect of discourse is focused. In line with the classroom discourse, different elements play role for cultivating the discourse. Language teaching reflects the conversation which takes place regarding the teachers' facilitation to the learning of language in learning of students. Linguistic perspective visualizes the language used in classroom situation.

Keywords: Classroom discourse, discourse, language teaching, English language class, social practice

Introduction

English language teaching is linked with classroom research, discourse, discourse analysis and history, classroom discourse, classroom interactional competence, culture in the classroom, opportunities in the classroom discourse, teachers' discourse, students' discourse, pedagogic discourse, mediated discourse in the class, and classroom discourse in the ELT class in Nepal. Classroom discourse has connection with discourse that matters the trend of classroom research appeared in the field of research. Particularly, I have presented classroom issues and their linking with different parts of discourse theoretically in this article.

Classroom Research

By nature, classroom research involves doing research in school settings and other issues about teaching and learning. The objective of classroom research is to enhance teaching learning environment, improve teacher's own teaching in the academia, and explore the student concerned issues. English language teaching is linked with classroom research, discourse,

Copyright 2022 © Author(s) This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons



Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

Siddhajyoti Interdisciplinary Journal (Peer reviewed), Volume 3, January, 2022

discourse analysis and history, classroom discourse, classroom interactional competence, culture in the classroom, opportunities in the classroom discourse, teachers' discourse, students' discourse, pedagogic discourse, mediated discourse in the class, and classroom discourse in the ELT class in Nepal. Classroom discourse has connection with discourse that matters the trend of classroom research appeared in the field of research. Particularly, I have presented classroom issues and their linking with different parts of discourse theoretically hereby.

Studies on classroom work dated from the 1940s (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Since the 1960s and early 1970s on, many areas of discourse, including classroom discourse has been undertaken in the English speaking world (Christie, 2002). In the Nepalese context, they can evacuate the essence of realities faced by teachers and students regarding teaching and learning process and innovative educational projects (Candela & Rockwell, 2004). We can study selective and subjective matters in it. The child study movement of the 1930s produced the pioneer work in observational methodology of research. During the 1940s provided the trends to objective methods of classroom observation. These led in the 1950s to teaching research like analyzing classroom behavior and recording observation (Medley & Mitzel, 1958) and were the most effective among the reported studies till the beginning of the 1960s.

Language pedagogy centered on the question of what is the best method or approach to be followed by the syllabus-designer, or the language teacher (Ellis, 1988). The shift of focus in ELT research took place from the effort to arrive at the best method or approach to the study of learning processes, learner variables and the learning. Classroom research emphasizes local classroom contexts in communicating about subject knowledge teacher-student and student-student interactions (Nystrand, 1997), and classroom issues with the vision of qualitative research design.

Discourse Analysis

Etymologically, the word "discourse" comes from the Latin "discursus" which means "to run to and fro" (Alzobidy & Khan, 2019, p. 269). Discourse is a way on which we look front and back of the social part cognitively. Similarly, it becomes critical classroom discourse analysis when classroom researchers take the effects of such variable contexts into consideration in their analysis (Rhymes, 2015). Discourse refers to talk and text which can be taken as a social practice behaved in the tandem of the interaction. Intentionally, discourse values the social applications of language producing speech acts. Communicative and genre-based approach prioritizes the development of students' communicative competence, by viewing language use as a social activity (e.g., Hyland, 2004). It is the use of language by social actors in specific settings concentrating on how stretches of language become meaningful and unified for their users embedding individuals in social, cultural and historical contexts as discourses socially constructed and socially constitutive.

Discourse analysis calls the quality of being meaningful and unified coherence. As Gee (1999) believes that we always actively use spoken and written language to create or build the world of activities around us through talking about and understanding the world, or an aspect of the world. In 1960s, two attempts took place to study supra-sentential structure: one by Harris (1952), and the other by Mitchell (1957). Harris published an article, i.e. 'Discourse Analysis' was not significant for the systematization to talk about supra-sentential structure, so he followed Bloomfieldian tradition for producing a formal method for the analysis of connected speech or writing. Discourse analysis was founded as a discipline in 1960

(Alzobidy & Khan, 2019) with the aim of context of its use, talk within the lesson, students' entire lifetime of socialization and the history of the institution (Rhymes, 2008). Then Chomsky's (1965) Generative grammar talked about formal analysis structure, but that sentence analysis is impossible (Coulthard, 1985). Later Mitchell's (1957) 'Buying and Selling in Cyrenaica' presents a motivated analysis working in categorizing it into market auctions, market transactions and shop transactions involving language form and language functions and includes the study of both spoken interaction and written text along with second language acquisition researchers and language educators. Discourse analysis studies talk and texts for fulfilling the requirements of participants in the classroom communication system (Cazden, 2001).

Discourses of Teachers in the English Language Class

Teachers are the initiators of the classroom discourse. The turn taking and replacements of the exponents categorize the classroom discourse. They are only the persons who terminate the discourse used in the classroom. The content and knowledge are integrated in the classroom language termed as classroom discourse. Mostly, teachers use the discourse as they prefer to produce for the class as authoritative fellows to authenticate in the classroom. Consequently, students are controlled to generate the language along with the language aspects in the class. Peer discourses and student teacher discourses can offer the learning. Teacher talk controls topics of discourse and provides the only live target input for students' reception.

Teacher discourse includes different activities of classroom purpose. Teacher question may serve various functions such as focusing attention, exerting disciplinary control, getting feedback and most important of all, encouraging students to participate. This is why different scholars (Brock, 1986; Gall, 1970) regard questioning as a worthwhile activity in teaching and consider it a popular method of involving students in a lesson and a tool for facilitating student participation. Teacher discourses may lead students towards their duties and responsibilities as the learner autonomy referring to classroom discourse as 'the oral interaction that occurs between teachers and students among students in classrooms in the form of communicative or interactive exercises (Johnson, 1995).

Classroom Discourse as a Social Practice

Discourse is the stretch of language used contextually in the classroom as miniature society. The interaction of the class goes on within the layers of discourse in the class. Classroom is the embodiment of diverse communities with their children creating a situation signifying their voices in the class. Course (2014) believes that classrooms are recognized as "social contexts, with often clearly defined role relationships in the learning space" (p. 331). We teachers have to include the social livings and strands of students in the English class due to which they may learn in the facilitated way. Irimiea (2017) states notions such as social practices and society have become highly debated issues associated with an increasing number of disciplines that study individuals and their activities. Social practice includes versions of kinesthetic and mental activities along with use and knowledge of comprehension revealing itself in our socialization, as we learn from our families, and eventually extends into our greater community, school, and the workplace (Merkel, 2015).

Classroom Interactional Competence

For classroom interaction, we need competence to run it cohesively. Classroom interactional competence is defined as 'teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a

tool for mediating and assisting learning' (Walsh, 2006, p. 132). Interactants display and orient to learning through interactions that are co-constructed, they also demonstrate differing abilities to jointly create discourse that is conducive to learning. Language users have underlying structure of their language due to which they are able to produce a language and they can speak a language grammatically correct. Undoubtedly, Chomsky (1966) labeled this set of rules linguistic competence, which "any speaker of a language knows implicitly" (p. 9). Communicative competence refers to "the individual capacity to acquire and use this social knowledge in different social situations" (Hymes, 1972, p. 282). Classroom interactional competence signifies ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting pedagogy.

Discussion

Classroom Discourse

Generally, classroom discourse is the language of teaching and learning. Clearly, classroom interaction research dates back to the late 1930s, but has expanded exponentially since the 1960s, when societal changes and growing student diversity in classrooms created a need for new ways of understanding teaching, learning, and classroom interaction as a language of the class. In the 1960s, the researchers primarily sought to develop observation instruments for measuring teacher behaviors yet each observational system focused on different phenomena (Simon & Boyer, 1970). Research on classrooms through the 1960s was mostly observational and quantitative, measuring how teacher variables affected particular student outcomes. Qualitative researchers entered classrooms in the 1960s, seeking to understand discrepancies in achievement of students from varied linguistic and ethnic backgrounds. In doing so, Green and Dixon (2008) traced the roots of this research in the U.K. and the U.S. noting that U.K. scholars tended to examine reasons for school failure, while U.S. scholars sought to explore linguistic differences of students, their influences and student opportunities for learning.

On the other hand, in the early 1970s, research on language in schools began to move from a focus on discrete chunks of language to a concern with "communication as a whole, both to understand what is being conveyed and to understand the specific place of language within the process" (Hymes, 1972, p. xxviii). Most of this early qualitative work was ethnographic, conducted by scholars grounded in anthropology, sociology, and sociolinguistics. In other words, the qualitative research was oriented to anthropology, sociology and sociolinguistics to elicit the ideas from them. Classroom discourse is a byproduct of social phenomena which are shown in institutional procedure of practice.

In an early study of language use in schools, Shuy and Griffin (1981) noted that whatever else goes on there, what teachers and students do in schools on any day is to talk. To a great extent, the fabric of schooling is woven of linguistic interaction. Since the late 1960s, discourse analysis has been used to examine the ways in which school discourse is unique and thus what children must be able to do linguistically in order to succeed. Conversation analysis (CA) has increasingly been applied to the analysis of language classroom discourse in pursuit of studies that may further our understanding of what language teachers and learners actually 'do' internationally (Huth, 2011, p. 297). Classroom discourse varies importantly from other forms of conversation is "one of the most important influences on students' experience of learning in schools" (Skidmore, 2006, p. 510) is natural. Early work on elicitation sequences, composed of teacher initiation, student response, and teacher evaluation (IRE),

provided principled descriptions of classroom talk as social interaction (Mehan, 1979). Teacher and students' interactive activities fall within the IRF sequence. Examining the third turn of this exchange sequence, others proposed the terms feedback and follow up in place of evaluation (thus IRE becomes IRF) because these more inclusive terms cover the range of speech acts that can occur there in addition to evaluation, such as requesting more information or asking for evidence and backing (Lee, 2008).

Mehan's (1979, p. 171) ethno-methodological work is general education convinced that whatever happened in the classroom was indeed a co-production. Kumaravadivelu (1999) posited a three-way analysis in his observational scheme: (a) turn taking analysis which relates to several aspects of turn-getting and turn-giving practices, (b) a topic analysis, which relates to the use of language as instances of linguistic samples mostly meant for student imitation and of communicative expressions about the target language itself, and (c) a task analysis, which relates to the managerial as well as the cognitive aspects of classroom tasks. Emphasis on ethnography finds a strong echo in the work of van Lier (1988), who very effectively uses ethnographic means to understand classroom aims and events.

Regulative discourse largely determines or frames how subject knowledge or competence is constructed or transmitted in the classroom. A pedagogic discourse is a discourse for the apprenticeship of subjects into socially valued practices, so that in schools the subjects are the students and they are socialized into the various areas of instruction or school disciplines. This discourse is the amalgamated form of regulative and instructional discourse. Classroom discourse is the language that teachers and students use to communicate with each other in the classroom in the process of teaching and learning. The classroom discourse engages pedagogues in the ELT classroom.

Teachers mould the classes as authenticating factors to interrogate the classroom behaviors. They ask questions to students, but not provide chances for real language use. The access of language use is not given students and they have to use language in accordance with students. Contrarily, teachers have to use language for the ease of learners. In classroom discourse, more than two people have (been) gathered for the specific purpose of learning (Strolberger, 2012). Classrooms can speculate the termination of tasks laddering the matching solutions in the classes. The activities that happen in the classroom have to be studied to elicit the realities remaining in the classroom. Bennet (1976) defines teaching styles as "the teacher's pervasive personal behavior and media used during interaction with learners" (p. 27). Heimlich and Norland (1994) connect teaching styles to language teachers' personal behavior in language instruction, while Grasha (2002) alludes not only to the behavior of language teachers in the classroom but also to their personal qualities and they have "an effect on students and their ability to learn" (p. 144). Nunan (1989) defines questioning lies in the characteristics of questions and of their objective in classroom language.

Features of Classroom Discourse

Classroom discourse studies seek to make visible how everyday life in classrooms is constituted in and through the linguistic and discourse choices of participants. Classroom discourse, rather than behavior, became a focus of research and theoretical re-examination within and across disciplines. It has several features that distinguish it from casual conversations in other interactive contexts. Many of these features relate to the teacher's role and power (Lin, 2007): (1) teachers control the children's participation in the discourse by

initiating most linguistic exchanges, assigning turns, and having the right to the third move; (2) teachers have didactic and pedagogical purposes that need to be pursued in the discourse; (3) teachers assume the role of primary knower and direct the discourse in a pre-determined direction. In light of the centrality of this role, the discussion which follows focuses principally on features of classroom discourse, such as control of patterns of communication; elicitation techniques; repair strategies; and modifying speech to learners. Simultaneously, Jora (2020) views that learners use strategies to learn a new language or to regulate their efforts to do so for developing the interaction.

Communication patterns found in language classrooms are special, different from those found in content-based subjects. Meaning and message are one and the same thing, 'the vehicle and object of instruction' (Long, 1983a, p. 9); language is both the focus of activity, the central objective of the lesson, as well as the instrument for achieving it. Halliday (1978) declares, "Its very existence implies that communication takes place within it; there will be sharing of experience, expression of social solidarity, decision making and planning, and, if it is a hierarchical institution, forms of verbal control, transmission of order, and the like" (pp. 230-231). Classroom discourse is the interaction between teacher and students, students and students and teacher student and teacher in terms of teaching learning process.

Culture in the Classroom Discourse

Classroom discourse is an entity of the educational enterprise that takes place in the classroom differing from place to place, culture to culture, community to community and country to country. Due to cultural phenomena, students use discourse in the classroom by connecting students in the classroom for performance. Culture overpowers the livings of people in the performance whatever they replicate. To quote Cheng (1993), regarding effective and ineffective organizational cultures, stronger culture has better motivated teachers. Culture is shared meaning in which people belong to the same community, group, tribe or nation that is applied to support them interpret and make sense of the world. We find discussion of discourse to learning and teaching owes a debt to the Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky (1896–1934) who emphasized social and cultural influences on child development, and especially recognized language enhances cognitive development.

Cultures represent students' social practices in the institutional surroundings. As Clifford (1973) has viewed culture represents a historically transmitted pattern of meaning which are expressed both explicitly through symbols and implicitly through beliefs. Culture covers deep patterns of values, beliefs and traditions which have been formed over the course of the school history. The belief of Bruner (1996) highlights that school culture lies in the commonly held beliefs of teachers, students and principals. The identity of people is reflected by the culture. Hall (1990) concedes that culture is a major means which constructs, sustains and transforms identities of people.

The influence of increasing cultural variations on students' classroom education has been a challenging concern for scholars at least for the last 30 years (Cazden, 2003). Schoolrooms are the places that increase intercultural contact among students particularly in younger grades. Classroom environment provides students with initial extensive experience with a different culture. The role of culture and education can be used to cultivate life style and specific skills and is the element of indeterminacy surrounds the transferability of off the job learning to on the job practice (Hamilton, 1990). Clark and Clark (2008) say that classroom

discourse involves techniques of meaning construction in the development of students' social identities. This role of teachers affects short and/or long-term learning of students. Classroom interaction refers to social process of meaning-making and interpreting, and the educational value of interaction grows out of developing and elaborating interaction as a social process" (Scarino & Liddicoat, 2009, p. 39). It is proven in literature that classroom interaction is fluid and dynamic (Seed house, 2011).

Most studies of discourse at school concern the language of teaching and learning, examining classroom interaction as social practice or cognitive work, or both. But there is also a site in which children's repertoires for strategic language use expand (Hoyle & Adger, 1998). Classrooms and other school settings present social tasks that differ from those of home and neighborhood; they inspire innovation in register repertoires, framing capacities, and assumptions about appropriateness. Eder's (1998) work on lunchtime interaction in a middle school shows that collaborative retelling of familiar stories functions to forge individual and group identities with culture.

The discourse used in the classroom is usually teacher initiated and students follow whatever is ordered by teachers. Teaching learning process occurs in transnational and global context (Strobelberger, 2012). As classrooms particularly large, formal gatherings present together for pedagogical instead of social causes, participants will glue to their own perpetuation of communication that are likely to vary from the norms of turn-taking communicative interaction in small, informal social gatherings. Classroom discourse germinates the development of communicative competence in the class. Interestingly with the respect of Walsh's (2006) reference to teachers' interactional awareness featured as the meta-language, critical self-evaluation and conscious decision making. Interaction, participation and negotiation create learning opportunities in the L2 classroom (van Lier, 1991). Classroom discourse analysis could be paraphrased as looking at language-in-use in a classroom context to understand how context and talk are influencing each other (Rhymes, 2015).

Opportunities of Classroom Discourse

Classroom discourse is the language that includes teacher talk and forwards motifs to the students from the side of effective teachers. The language we use in the class is the mainstream of educational transaction. They always involve coordinating language with ways of acting, interacting, valuing, believing, feeling, and with bodies, clothes, non-linguistic symbols, objects, tools, technologies, times, and places (Gee, 1999). The success of any event in classroom is highly dependent on construction of communication between and among teacher and student (Daniels, 2001). Discourse works as scaffold the learning to guide to the goal. What is more, Cazden (2001, p. 63) opines that the concept of a shifting zone of competence within which a learner, with help learners launch their contributions initiating to express ideas relevant to the topic or question in the class. Students can improve their performance level required for learning.

Functions of Classroom Discourse

Christie (2002) stated that systemic functional theory grew out of the model of Scale and Category grammar. Systemic functional linguistic theory (Halliday, 1994) is unique owing to its three realizations. They are functional organization, specific uses associated to the notion of system, and the relationship of language or text and context. The language functions according to Halliday (1994) are the ideational function, the interpersonal function

and the textual function. The ideational function signifies those aspects of the grammar that are directly involved in representation of the world and its experiences. Interpersonal refers to those dealings in which the relationship of interlocutors is perceived regarding mood, modality and person. The textual function consists of the aspects of the grammar that help in organizing language as a message, the resources of theme, information and cohesion.

Classroom Discourse and the English Language Instruction

Classroom discourse contains the language used by teacher in favor of students in the classroom. In the literature on classroom discourse, the three-move (or triadic) initiation response-feedback (IRF) pattern, originally described by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), is traditionally considered as the basic unit of analysis. This pattern is made up of three turns: the teacher initiates a linguistic interaction (generally directing a question to a selected child), the pupil provides a Response, and the teacher replies with a feedback. In general, research on classroom interaction shows that IRF is a pervasive and dominant pattern, and a fundamental feature of classroom talk (Liu, 2008; Lyle, 2008). Their interaction backups the feedback in constructing ways and students can add up the learning ideas and subtract the redundancies.

Moreover, since most transactions in school take place through linguistic interactions initiated by the teachers, it is regarded as the main indicator of the teacher–student interaction (Wells & Arauz, 2006), with the teachers regulating the students' participation in the class activities through the management and control of linguistic exchanges (Burns & Myhill, 2004). English language class construes the discourse used favoring students' achievements. Language teaching contains classroom discourse that includes students and teachers' activities in the class. Classroom discourse solves the classroom bizarre happening in the classroom sites. It is in the sense that different types of classroom activities and interactive activities take place in the combined form of teachers and students.

Students Talk in the Classroom and the Space of Learning

Students talk in a way that they understand each other for flexible matter. They behave linguistically digested exponents for mediating members in communication. The speakers share ideas with the support of language to exchange ideas. Student centered talks provide students chances in the class for their own performance. Huth (2011) regards that learning, including language learning, is seen as a matter of students' and teachers' gradual socialization into particular interactional practices over time. Group work, pair work and other types of activities may be practiced in the class. Classroom interaction (CI) is a part of classroom language which has impact on learning pace of learners. ELT Studies have revealed that in teacher-fronted classrooms student talk amounts to less than thirty percent, on an average (L, 2003). Marton, Runesson, and Tsui (2004) express that school is 'an institution with which all citizens in the industrial world have extensive familiarity and one that frequently attracts considerable public and political attention' (p. 3).

Pedagogic Discourse and Cultural Aspect in English Language Class

Pedagogic discourse is the use of language that is used within educational space to accomplish pedagogical objectives. Bernstein's theory of pedagogic discourse includes the whole field of pedagogic activity and its social relations, and to the field of classroom discourse analysis, that is an ongoing concern for educators and educational linguists. Patterns of discourse in pedagogic contexts serve to create, maintain and reproduce syndromes of social

relations, identities and order over time. Obviously, pedagogic discourse creates a moral regulation of the social relations of transmission/acquisition, that is, rules of order, relation, identity, and that such a moral order is prior to, and a condition for, the transmission of competences. Dhakal (2013) reports that instruction guides children's motivation towards their study for the pedagogic discourse. This type of discourse engages students for learning, and guides teachers for teaching effectively. Thus, pedagogic discourse employs the classroom language used for language learning.

Classroom discourse links cultural artifacts in the class. Cultural scenarios surround the learning paces of learners in language class. In doing so, Dhakal (2013) analyzed the Nepalese classroom discourse from cultural perspective aiming to explore to make meaning for the realities of classroom happening in the Nepalese schools. He found that the rationality of cooperation and collaboration in classroom discourse makes as a ground for teaching and learning activities as discussion, dialogue, interaction and interpretation. Linked to this, Gulzar (2009) says that "teachers' code switching is function oriented and it is associated with classroom discourse and socializing discourse in most of the cases and shows that there is a need to devise clear language policy about the clarity can bring a qualitative change in the infrastructure of Pakistani bilingual classroom discourse" (p. vi).

Classroom Discourse in the English Language

Classroom discourse is the actual use of language in the class coordinating the learning for students attracts to creativity if it is encouraging and motif based. Accordingly, Cazden recognizes the functions of classroom discourse as "the language of curriculum, the language of control, and the language of personal identity" or "the propositional, social, and expressive functions" (Cazden, 1988, p.3). In the language class, classroom language is an art that repairs the gap between and students' codes. With this wave, children's languages also are connected with classroom discourse. In this context, Jora (2019) writes that language teaching gets being affected from children's languages. Even more, in Talking Science, Lemke (1990) suggests that specialists—including teachers—use language in ways that are particularly well suited to their discipline, be it music or physics. In the English class of Nepal, classroom discourse is a transition that connects the teaching learning process. Learners' learning outcomes depend on teachers' effective discourse. Therefore, classroom discourse tries to deal with language in the use in English language classes.

Interactions are the foundations of classroom discourse in the learning space. Teachers and students can act linguistically in the sector of language learning. Reason showing deeds are the most in the classes of English language. And, this clarifies Vygotsky's claim that social interactions influence individual thinking (Farist, 2011). To the date, classroom discourse of English language classes at secondary level is a big deal of study in the English class of Nepal. Similarly, students are being motivated or not in the process is another significant aspect in the class. Hamilton (1990) argues that learning through play is rehearsal for the life to gain confidence and develop competence in different settings to deal with activities. In English language class, interaction takes place in different modes with the tools of classroom discourse.

Teachers need to learn about the learning pace of students. Small group teaching can recap the learning abilities of students. Culturally linked classes can push up the learning of students. Dominant cultural models derogate the learners' zeal for learning. Constructed

knowledge has to be linked to the shared and student favored knowledge in the space of learning. Respectively, students' language learning needs to be issue centered in the journey of learning and setting skills. Teacher talk has to be maintained in accordance with the cultural reciprocity of students in the class. Teachers have to become cultural models for the supportive engagement in the class. Classroom activities are presentations to classroom discourse in practice either to the side of students discourse or teachers' side to make enhanced learning for students and achieved goals teaching for teachers.

Conclusion

Regarding teaching and learning aspect, teachers and students are always in proximity of academic deeds in the classroom scenario. Teachers interact with students employing questions. They organize the educational planning for the benevolence of students. The educational issues related to students and teachers can operate as the mainstream of education through classroom research. The talk in the interaction deals with the wave of classroom language. Discourse analysis supports to study the classroom discourse entities for issuing the interests researchers and analysts. Teacher discourse emphasizes use of language for the language learning purpose of students. Students' discourse reveals the interaction behaviors in the class. Classroom discourse comprises of pedagogic and cultural matters in the class. Diverse functions appear in the class as ideational, interpersonal and textual for scaffolding classroom discourse.

References

- Alzobidy, S. A. M. & Khan, A. (2019). Classroom discourse of English language teachers at Secondary school level. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9 (1), 269-276. ISSN 1923-869X E-ISSN 1923-8703
- Bennet, N. (1976). *Teaching styles and pupil progress*. Cambridge, US: Harvard University Press.
- Brock, C. A. (1986). The effect of referential question on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, (1), 46-59.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Burns, C., & Myhill, D. (2004). Interactive or inactive? A consideration of the nature of interaction in whole class teaching. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 34(1), 35–49. Cambridge University Press.
- Candela, A, & Rockwell, E. (2004). *European Educational Research Journal*, 3 (3), 692-713.
- Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom Discourse: The Learning of Teaching and Learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cazden, C.B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cheng, Y. C. (1993). Profiles of organizational culture and effective schools. In school effectiveness and school improvement, 4(2). 85-110.
- Chomsky, N. (1966). *Topics in the theory of generative grammar*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom discourse analysis: A functional perspective*. London, New York: Continuum.

- Clark, C. & Clark, I. (2008). Exploring and exposing a gap in L2 research: How socio-linguistic roles and relationships facilitate or frustrate second language acquisition. *Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies*, 30(1), 101-113.
- Clifford, G. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. In Heckman, Paul, E. (Eds.) *school restructuring in practice: reckoning with the culture of school*. International Journal of Educational Reform (pp. 263-71). New York: Basic Books.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research method in education* (6th ed.). London: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Coulthard, M. (1985). *An introduction to discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Course, S. (2014). ELT students' use of teacher questions in peer teaching. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences, ELSEVIER*, 158, 331-336. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.096>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating qualitative research* (4th ed.). USA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Daniels, H. (2001). *Vygotsky and pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- Dhakal, H. R. (2013). *Classroom discourse in Nepalese schools*. An unpublished PhD dissertation. Kathmandu: Tribhuban University.
- Duff, P.A. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Eder, D. (1998). Developing adolescent peer culture through collaborative narration. In Susan Hoyle and Carolyn Temple Adger, eds., *Kids Talk: Strategic Language Use in Later Childhood*. New York: Oxford, pp. 82-94.
- Ellis, R. (1988). *Classroom second language development*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Farist, J. C. (2011). *An analysis of teachers' discourse and their perceptions concerning the use of questioning and feedback during reading instruction in third-grade classrooms*. An unpublished PhD thesis. Bagwell College of Education, Kennesaw State University Kennesaw, GA.
- Gall, M. D. (1970). The use of questions in teaching, *Review of Educational Research*, 40, 707-721.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gharbavi, A., & Iravani, H. (2014). Is teacher talk pernicious to students? A discourse analysis of teacher talk. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 98, 552-561.
- Grasha. A. F. (2002). The dynamics of one-on-one teaching. *College Teaching*, 50(4), 139-146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567550209595895>
- Green, J. L., & Dixon, C. N. (2008). Classroom interaction, situated learning. In M. Martin Jones, A. M. de Mejia & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd ed., Vol. 3: Discourse and Education, pp. 3-14). Birmingham, UK: Springer Science + Business Media LLC.
- Grix, J. (2004). *The Foundations of Research*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191–215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gulzar, M. A. (2009). *Classroom discourse in bilingual context: Effects of code switching on language in Pakistani TEFL classroom*. An unpublished PhD dissertation. Islamabad: National University of Modern Languages.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1961). Categories of the Theory of Grammar. *Word*, 17(3), 241–92.
- Hamilton, D. (1990). *Learning about education*. An unfinished curriculum. Milton Keynes/Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Hammadou, J., & Bernhardt, E. (1987). On being and becoming a foreign language teacher.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. London, UK: Longman.
- Harris, Z. S. (1952). Discourse analysis: A sample text. *Language*, 28(4), 474-494. <https://doi.org/10.2307/409987>
- Heimlich, J. E., & Norland, E. (1994). *Developing teaching style in adult education*. San Francisco, US: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Hoyle, S., & Adger, C. T. (1988). Introduction. In S. Hoyle and C. T. Adger (Eds.), *Kids talk: Strategic language use in later childhood* (pp. 3-22). New York: Oxford.
- Huth, T. (2011). Conversation analysis and language classroom discourse. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 5(5), 297-309. Doi 10.1111/j.1749-818x.2011.00277.x
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jora, M. B. (2020). Students' beliefs on learner autonomy in English language classroom. *Journal of NELTA Gandaki (JonG)*, III (1&2), 12-24. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jong.v3i1-2.33139>
- Jora, M. B. (2020). Ethnic group parents' beliefs toward English medium instruction in school: A case of Kailali district. *Siddhajyoti Interdisciplinary Journal*, 1, 74-83. <https://doi.org/10.3126/sij.v1i0.34922>
- Kukla, A. (2000). *Social constructivism and philosophy of science*. London: Routledge.
- Kumaravadavelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 453-484.
- L, D. P. (2003). *The dynamics of classroom interaction in the context of English language. Teaching/ Learning as a second language*. An unpublished thesis of PhD. Institute of English University of Kerala. Thiruv Ananthapuram.
- Lee, Y. (2008). Yes-no questions in the third-turn position: pedagogical discourse processes. *Discourse Processes*, 45(3), 237-62
- Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning, and values*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2007). What's the use of "triadic dialogue"? Activity theory, conversation *Siddhajyoti Interdisciplinary Journal (Peer reviewed)*, Volume 3, January, 2022

- analysis and analysis of pedagogical practices. *Pedagogies*, 2(2), 77–94.
- Liu, Y. (2008). Teacher-student talk in Singapore Chinese language classrooms: A case study of initiation/response/follow up (IRF). *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28-102.
- Long, M. H. (1983a). Narrative speaker/non-native speaker conversation and negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-41.
- Marton, F., Runesson, U., & Tsui, A. M. B. (2004). The space of learning. In Marton, F., Tsui, A. B. M., with Chik, P. M. P. et al. (2004), *Classroom discourse and the space of learning* (pp. 3-42). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc. Publishers.
- McCarthy, M. (2007). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Medley, D. M., & Mitzel, H. E. (1958). A technique for measuring classroom behavior. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 49(2), 86–92.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organizations in the classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Merkel, E.V. (2015). *High school classroom teacher talk: The belief-discourse*. An unpublished thesis of DE. Indiana University.
- Mitchell, T. L. (1957). The language of buying and selling in Cyrenaica, *Hesperis*, 44, 34-71.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for English teachers*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Understanding language classroom*. New York. Prentice Hall.
- Nystrand, M. (1997). *Opening dialogue: understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Rymes, B. (2015). *Classroom discourse analysis: A tool for critical reflection*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315775630>
- Irimiea, S. B. (2017). Professional discourse as social practice. *European Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(1), 108- 119.
- Scarino, A. & Liddicoat, A. J. (2009). *Teaching and learning languages: A Guide*. Melbourne: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
- Schostak, J.F. (2002). *Understanding, designing and conducting qualitative research in education: Framing the project*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (2011). Conversation analytic research into language teaching and learning. In E.Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 345 363). New York: Routledge.
- Shuy, R. W., & Griffin, P. (1981). What do they do any day: studying functional language. In W. P. Dickson (ed.), *Children's Oral Communication Skills* (pp. 271–86). New York: Academic Press
- Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. London: Sage Publications.
- Simon, A., & Boyer, E. G. (Eds.). (1970). *Mirrors for behavior: An anthology of observation instruments continued*. Philadelphia, PA: Research for better schools.

- Sinclair, J. McH. & Coulthard, R. M. (1975), *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Skidmore, D. (2006). Pedagogy and dialogue. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(4), 503-514. *Theory into Practice*, 26(4), 301-306.
- vanLier, L. 1988. *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*, London: Routledge.
- Wells, G. & Arauz, R. M. (2006). Dialogue in the classroom. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 15, 379–428.

Author

Man Bahadur Jora is an Assistant Professor of English Education at Kailali Multiple Campus Kailali, Nepal. He has completed Master's Degree in English Education and English in Arts from Tribhuvan University. He is currently a PhD scholar in English Education at TU. He is interested in classroom research, learner autonomy, classroom discourse, discourse analysis, and diversity in language education.