

STRUCTURE OF CLASSROOM DISCOURSE PRODUCED BY ENGLISH TEACHERS OF DIFFERENT EXPERIENCE TO DIFFERENT LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY GROUP

Hamzah¹

¹ FBS Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ zzahham@gmail.com

Abstract

The study was aimed at exploring how the teaching experience in terms of length of service affects the capability of the English teachers in modifying the structure of classroom discourse at the exchange, transaction and interaction level. Data for this study comprise twenty recording transcripts generated from twenty English lessons produced by five novice and five experienced teachers teaching at Junior High School and five novice and five experienced teachers teaching at Senior High School. The data were analyzed by identifying the discourse segments from the lowest rank to the highest using Sinclair and Coulhard's classroom discourse structure model. The findings revealed that in the micro level the experienced teachers use IRF model then novice teachers. In addition, the teachers teaching Senior High School students produced more IRF model as compared to their counterparts in Junior High. In the macro level. The experienced teacher produced more complete segments for opening, body, and conclusion. In addition, the more experienced teacher produced more activities and exchanges. For overall performance, all teachers are weak in producing opening and closing segments, and also the producing the activities leading students to free communication.

Key Words: Classroom discourse, discourse structure

Introduction

Classroom discourse can be classified as an institutional discourse as a results of spoken interaction among participants in the classroom. This type of discourse is characterized by unequal power relationship, unique turn-taking mechanism and interaction (Nunan 1993). Its communicative function is to scaffold students in their learning process. This is the reason why the study of classroom discourse is related to the students learning - the language used and the structure of the interaction are supposed to contribute to the learning optimalization. In addition, Jaworsky and coupland (1999) claimed that discourse analysis can be an effective tool to evaluate approaches to language learning in the classroom.

Studies on classroom discourse can be categorised into teacher talk, classroom interaction, and classroom discourse structure. Studies on teacher talk and interaction in Iran revealed that the teacher dominated the talk in the EFL classroom and sometimes the talk initiation came from students and they also provided feedback to the question they asked (Rashidi and Rafieerad 2010). Nurmasitah (2010) investigated the teacher talk in geography class presented in English in Indonesia and found that the students were interactive and the class was characterized by content cross. Agung (2014) explored the pattern of the classroom interaction developed by student-teachers in Bandung. The findings of his study revealed that the interaction varied in accordance with the teacher's belief toward the classroom itself.

Study on classroom discourse structure firstly introduced by Sinclair and Couthard (1975) by developing a model of discourse involving five level in hierarchical order - from the lowest to the highest are act, move, exchange, transaction and interaction unit where the higher unit contains the lower ones. By using this model, they found that exchange units was the building blocks of the discourse, and it is made up from three lower level elements called initiation-response and Follow up (I R F). This framework was generated from the data obtained from the classes with high degree of formality and the teachers exert high control over the discourse in the sense the teacher chose the topic and regulate the turns. Since then, there have been many studies conducted on Classroom discourse structure. Yu (2009) studied the classroom discourse of English for non English major at university level and found out that IRF dominated the exchange (35%) and several deviated patterns were also found as the result from the attempts made by the teacher to motivate the students to participate. Kim and Grant (2009) studied sixth grade mathematics classroom discourse and the finding showed that the discourse structure can be changed by changing the classroom atmosphere by encouraging

more students to participate. Xin, Luzheng and Biru (2011) studied the vocational collage classroom discourse in china and found the exchanges were dominated by IRF patterns with a proportion of 64%. Jiang (2012) studied collage English classroom discourse and the result showed that that there were nine exchange patterns with four dominant ones- IRF, IR, IRIR and I. 98% exchanges were initiated by the teacher. Nathan,. Xu (N.A) found that the exchange patterns can be shifted from IRF patterns to multiple blended learning pattern in the bended learning. Liu and Le (2012) studied University Classroom discourse in china and found that the exchanges are dominated by IRF patterns (70%), and ratio of teacher talk time was 78:22. Haradasht and Aidinlou (2016) studied the EFL classroom discourse at university level in Iran and their findings showed that the teacher talk outnumbered student talk and the use of IRF exchange were prevalent (more than seventy percent). Those previous studies did not analyse the discourse structure as a whole, instead they focused only on pattern of the exchange unit.

Classroom discourse structure may change when the context of situation is modified. For example, in student centered classroom and discovery learning, students are more often to initiate the interaction and when they provide response their responses normally consist of more elaboration. Engle and Conan (2002) found that in contemporary education students are more common to initiate the exchange and also become the agent for doing evaluation and follow-up. Nathan, Kim and Grand (2009) study the effect of using hibrid learning mathematics on discourse structure and they found that traditional IRF pattern shifted toward IDF pattern where I and F were acted by students and D (description) by the teacher.

The previous studies only concentrated their analysis on the exchange unit which is only one rank out of five. It is true that this exchange is the building block of the discourse, but the information presented was partial. So as an attempt to understand the classroom discourse structure and its relationship to the genre of classroom discourse, the present study will explore the classroom discourse by applying the whole hierarchical model in the sense that the unit pattern of each level will be studied. Beside the patterns, this study also will compare the classroom discourse structure produced by novice and experienced English teachers.

Methodology

The objects of this study were 20 transcripts of classroom discourse generated from twenty English lessons produced by five novice and five junior high School English teachers and five junior and five Senior High School English Teachers. The data were analyzed by identifying the discourse segments from the lowest rank to the highest using Sinclair and Coulthard’s classroom discourse structure model. The presence of elements in each unit starting from exchange to lessons will be identified and tabulated. The frequency distribution of the element in each category was compared descriptively between novice and experienced English teachers oth inJHS and SHS.

Findings and Discussion

Variation in Micro-structure modification

After identifying the data, the researcher described the frequency and percentage of the types of exchange by the novice and experience teachers in English classroom. In this report the modification of exchanges are presented as two separated tables – table showing the traditional exchanges and then followed by table showing elaborated exchanges. The frequency and percentage of the types of traditional exchanges used by the teachers in English classroom was presented in the table below:

Table 1 The Types of the Exchange Units produced by Novice and Experienced Teachers

No	Types of the Exchange	NT SMP 297	ET SMP 606	NT SMA 303	ET SMA 423
1	I	1.01	0.49	2	1.9
2	IR	48.82	41.25	36.6	26.2
3	IRF	25.58	40.26	39.6	52.2
4	Extended Form	24.69	18	21.8	19.3

Table 1 shows that the types of exchange used by these teachers are varied on the basis of teacher experience and level of the students. The contribution of each type exchange by the novice teachers and experience teachers at SMP and SMA were clearly on unequal portion. The frequency indicates that experience teachers of SMP have the highest percentage rather than other teachers. It was 606 times of exchange. It can be seen from the total obtaining of each exchange used by the teachers. It consists 0.49% of initiation (I), 41.25% of initiative-response (IR), 40.26% of initiation-response-feedback (IRF), and 18% of extended form.

The total exchange by the novice teachers at SMP was 297 times. Novice English teachers at JHS produce the least interaction exchanges among the groups. The types of exchanges they produced consist 1.01% of initiation (I) only without proceeded by R and F, 48.82% of initiation-response (IR), 25.58% of initiation-response-feedback (IRF), and 24.69% of extended form. Furthermore, novice teachers at SMA produced the interaction exchanges about 303 units. They consists 2% of initiation (I), 36.6% of initiation-response (IR), 39.6% of initiation-response-feedback (IRF), and 21.8% of extended form. Moreover, the high total exchange was also contributed by experience teachers at SMA. It was 423 times. It obtains 1.9% of initiation (I), 26.2% of initiation-response (IR), 52.2% of initiation-response-feedback (IRF), and 19.3% of extended form.

The high proportion of IRF structure normally shows traditional classes in which the teacher exerts the maximum amount of power over the classroom discourse. Data in table above show that experienced teachers either in SMP or SMA exert more power over the classroom discourse as compared to novice teachers. The experience teachers contributed 40.28% and 52.2% of IRF exchange structure meanwhile the novice teachers at SMP or SMA were 25.58% and 39.6%. In contrast, the present of F in the exchange contains the pedagogical significance in which the learners are able to know immediately whether the response they provided are appropriate by looking if the teacher give positive or negative feedback.

Furthermore, the presence of extended variants also reduces the IRF proportion. Based on the data analysis, there are several variants of exchange model as a result of the more creative modification by the teachers. Table above shows that the novice teachers produced more expanded variants of the exchange structure as compared to their counterparts in Senior High Schools with the ration 25:18 in JHS and 22:19 in SHS. However, the production of expanded variants may be regarded as the attempts to make the exchanges become more effective to scaffold the learners in their learning process.

The IRF is traditionally used for questioning exchanges. The data shows that the structure correlates perfectly with the types of the exchanges. Directing exchanges normally produce IR structure. Further, the functions of the exchanges in pedagogical discourse can be identified as questioning, informing and directing. The proportion of the exchange functions may lead the interpretation to whether the teacher has moved from traditional classrooms into the more interactive classrooms by involving more students' active participation in the interaction. The use of exchange functions are shown in the table below.

Table 2 The Functions of exchanges produced by Novice and Experienced Teachers

Functions of the Teacher Exchange	NT SMP 293	ET SMP 606	NT SMA 292	ET SMA 425
Questioning	38.22	49.17	54.5	76.5
Directing	57.33	49.17	39.0	18.6
Informing	4.43	1.65	6.5	4.9

Table 2 shows the proportion of exchange function produced by the English teachers in JHS and SHS based on their teaching experiences. Each teacher used various functions of exchange. The teachers have their own tendency to practice the interaction or function of exchange. There are three categories of function of exchange. They are questioning, directing, and informing. Novice teachers have more significant role in producing the variety of exchange function than experienced teachers. Based on the table 2 experienced teachers at SHS was the highest percentage of questioning. It was about 76.5%. Meanwhile directing was mostly used by novice teacher at JHS. It was 57.33%. Moreover, about 6.5% of informing function was mostly applied by novice teachers at SHS.

Experienced teachers produced more questioning exchange as compared to novice teachers. Experienced teacher at SHS markedly produced the questioning function of 78.5 % which is more than double than those of JHS novice teachers. This phenomenon indicates that the experienced English teacher at SHS develop the interaction with the emphasis on cognitive aspect of the interaction. In contrast, the novice teachers produced directing and informing frequently rather than experienced teachers. The teachers at JHS produced more directing than the teachers at SHS. It is clearly shown by the ratio of calculated percentage among them. The novice English teachers at JHS produced markedly directing functions of 57,3%. It reveals that the novice teachers at JHS directed the students active participation for psychomotoric aspect of the interaction

Structure of pedagogical discourse of English Lessons

Generally, classroom discourse is composed by several parts of interactions in teaching- learning process. They are opening stage, body stage, and closing stage. Ideally, the opening stage contains motivating, reviewing, and bridging. Then, body stage is categorized into presenting (contextual and non-contextual),

practical (mechanical and meaningful), and producing (pseudo communication and free communication). Last, closing stage includes the concluding, evaluating, giving homework and previewing.

Each of these stages consists some units of interaction that is recognized through exchanges. Based on the data analysis, the novice and experience teachers at JHS and SHS were absently done several components of effective interaction in English classroom. The details are stated on the following table:

Table 3 The Transaction and Interaction Units Produced by Novice and Experienced English Teachers

STAGES		NT SMP				ET SMP				N T SMA				ET SMA				
		P	M		T	P	M		T	P	M		T	P	M		T	
			A ct	E x			A ct	E x			A ct	E x			A ct	E x		
Opening	Motivating	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	
	Reviewing	-	1	6	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	2	7	1	
	Bridging	-	1	1	1	-	2	4	-	-	2	7	-	2	3	19	-	
Body	Presenting	Contextual	1	1	2	-	2	2	5	-	1	5	16	-	1	2	8	-
		Non contextual	1	1	1	-	4	8	21	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	19	-
	Practice	Mechanical	-	5	81	-	2	1	25	2	4	1	15	-	4	4	74	1
		Meaningful	5	1	17	1	4	1	14	4	3	4	36	-	5	1	26	1
	Producing	Pseudo communication	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	17	2
		Free communication	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
Closing	Concluding	-	-	-	-	-	3	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Evaluating	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Giving homework	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	4	-	
	Previewing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	

Based on the table 3 the opening stage consisting of the activities such as motivating, reviewing, and bridging were variously done by the teachers. Motivating only occurred in novice teachers' English classroom at SHS. It was 1 activity and 2 exchanges and they occurred at medial exchange. Then, reviewing was possessed the highest frequency doing interaction in reviewing the material with the students. It was 1 exchange at preliminary, 2 activities consisted 7 exchanges at medial, and 1 at terminal. Last, bridging was done by all of the teachers at JHS and SHS. However, similar to reviewing, the experienced teachers at SHS was the most frequently do interaction with the students when bridging the material. It was about 1 exchange at preliminary, 3 activities with 19 exchanges at medial, and 1 exchange at terminal.

Furthermore, the body stage contains presenting, practical and producing. The presenting was derived into contextual and non-contextual. Contextual was most actively produced exchanges by novice teachers at SHS. They composed about 1 exchange at preliminary, 5 activities and 16 exchanges at medial. Move to the non-contextual, it was mostly done by the experience e teachers at JHS. It contains 4 exchanges at preliminary, 8 activities and 21 exchanges at medial. Further, the second section of body stage is practical. It includes the mechanical and meaningful. The highest numbers of exchanges on mechanical was possessed by experienced teachers at JHS. There were 2 exchanges at preliminary, 17 activities with 252 exchanges at medial, and 2 exchanges at terminal. Then, it was followed by the novice teachers at SHS. There were 4 exchanges at preliminary, 11 activities by 153 exchanges at medial. The meaningful was done by all of the teachers. The experience teachers at SHS produced the highest number of exchange for meaningful session. There were 5 exchanges at preliminary, 17 activities by 267 exchanges at medial, 1 exchange at terminal. The lowest numbers of exchange at meaningful session was less actively done by novice teachers at SHS with 3 exchanges at preliminary, 4 activities by 36 exchanges at medial. In addition, the third section of body stage is producing, it consists pseudo communication and free communication. Pseudo communication was mostly done by experience teachers at JHS with 1 exchange at preliminary, 2 activities with 17 exchanges at medial, and 2 exchanges at terminal. The lowest was taken by the experience teachers at SHS with 1 exchange at preliminary, 1 activity and 3 exchanges. For free communication, the experience teachers at SHS were the only teachers who paid attention to do interaction in even with the low numbers of exchange. There were 1 activity and 1 exchange at medial, and also 1 exchange at terminal.

Moreover, the closing stage includes the concluding, evaluating, giving homework, and previewing. The concluding section was only executed by the experience teachers at JHS. There were 3 activity and 12 exchanges at medial. Next, the evaluating section was done by no teachers. Then, the giving homework section was only undone by the novice teachers at JHS. Last, previewing section was only done by novice teachers at SHS. It was 1 activity and 4 exchanges at medial.

Structure of Transaction Unit

Transaction units in classroom discourse are derived into several parts of exchanges. They are preliminary exchanges, medial exchanges, and terminal exchanges. Preliminary exchanges function as signposts that provide students the signal that one activity starts or the medial exchanges are going to be composed. The medial exchanges are determined by the number of activities. The exchanges that are executed while the activities running is known as medial exchanges. Last, the terminal exchanges that has the function as the sign-posts showing that one activity ends.

In general, the four groups of teachers produced smaller amount of Preliminary and Terminal exchanges as compared to the amount activities. The terminal exchanges were even less. It indicates that the teachers were rarely providing the summary before they continued to the next activities. In details, it can be seen on the table below:

Table 4 The Summary of Transaction Units

No	Types of exchanges	NT SMP	ET SMP	NT SMA	ET SMA
1	Preliminary exchanges	7	23	9	15
2	Activities	24	44	26	34
3	Medial exchanges	268	425	215	424
4	Terminal exchanges	2	6	0	6

Table 4 shows the production of the exchange on the basis of their types as the parts of transaction unit in the English classroom discourse. The experience teachers at JHS and SHS produced exchanges almost double as compared to their novice counterparts.

The experienced teachers as JHS frequently gave signals to the students that activity was started. It was about 23 times for 44 activities. It means that preliminary exchanges were mostly used by the experience teachers at JHS than the other teachers. Then, the numbers of activities were also mostly done by the experience teachers at JHS. There were 44 activities had been applied by the experience teachers at JHS. Meanwhile, the novice teachers at JHS possessed the lowest numbers of activities. They were only 24 activities. The numbers of these activities determine the number of involved exchanges. Thus, the highest numbers of exchanges were also executed by the experience teachers at JHS. It was about 425 exchanges. It means that the medial exchanges were mostly produced by the experienced teachers at JHS. Moreover, the terminal exchanges were frequently done by experience teachers at JHS and SHS. They possessed the similar numbers of exchange at terminal. They were 6 exchanges each of them.

The discrepancies between the amount of activities and the preliminary and terminal exchanges revealed that the teachers' presentation is not well structured. The well-structured presentation will provide the clear sign-postings. The most prominent signposts in the transaction level are the use of preliminary and terminal exchanges. The preliminary exchanges signpost that the teacher will move from one activity to other activities, and the terminal exchange signpost that teacher have finished discussing that activity. In the more student oriented classroom, the preliminary exchange show the starting point of one activity and terminal exchange show the end of one activities.

The structure of the interaction / Lesson

The teachers' understanding in applying the effective English learning is reflected through the structure of interaction. The structure of interaction between the teachers and the students is one of the main aspects that exposed the teachers' performing in the classroom. This section provides information about the tendency of the teachers performing the moves in every stage of the classroom discourse.

Table 5 The Tendency of English teachers performing the moves of stages Classroom discourse

STAGES		Teacher Performing
Opening 15'	Motivating	5
	Reviewing	20
	Bridging	35

Body 65'	Presenting	Contextual	60
		Non-contextual	50
	Practicing	Mechanical	75
		Meaningful	100
	Producing	Pseudo Communication	10
Free Communication		5	
Closing 10'	Concluding		5
	Evaluating		0
	Giving Homework		15
	Previewing		5

The table 5 shows that how rigid are the teachers follow and perform the stages of the classroom discourse. The table reveals that the teachers focused their activities in presenting and practicing, only some teacher continue to practicing stage.

In the opening stage, the teachers did not perform well in the set induction. It shown by the facts that only five percent teachers motivated their students at the beginning of the lesson. Those activities plays an important role to attract their attention and to show the importance of the current lesson to their immediate needs. Reviewing moves that can be regarded as a means to activate the students' prior knowledge were neglected by most of the teachers. The data showed that only twenty percent teachers performed those activities. Bridging that may consist of describing the purpose and providing the outline of the materials to study at that allotted time were not performed well by the teachers. the table shows that only thirty five percent teachers did those activities. The transcripts of the interaction reveal that the teachers spent the allotted time for opening stage for checking students' attendance by calling names one by one, asking the reasons of those who were absent and several other activities like straightening students' chairs and disciplining the class. The activity which was common to all teachers is asking or telling the topic to study that day.

The second element is the body consisting of presenting, practicing and producing. Presenting stage can be categorized into contextual and non-contextual presentation. The findings revealed that the teacher may use meaningful, non meaningful, and combination of the two. There was a tendency that many teachers (40%) did not use contextual presentation as suggested by the current curriculum. Moreover, 50% English teachers still used non contextual presentation in the forms of presenting rules or using out of context language forms.

The third element is practicing and that will lead to production stage. The activities should be arranged gradually as an attempt to scaffold the learners from comprehension to production in the form of free communication. The findings of the study revealed that the teachers concentrated their activities in the practicing stage- mechanical exercise are deployed by 75% of English teachers and meaningful exercises are used by all teachers (100%).

In the contrary, the activities fell down sharply in the production section. Only few teachers continued the class activities to the higher levels. Pseudo communication activities were only performed by ten percent of the teachers. Moreover, only five per cent of the class got free communication activities. It implies that the teaching activities did not bring the students to the highest level of competence where they can use the language for communication. This is probably resulted from the facts that some teachers cannot distinguish between communicating, which is one and final stage in the current curriculum, and free communication as the final target of learning a foreign language. The teachers' ability to use meaningful exercises are due to the facts that the current curriculum has provide the guidance for core classroom activities leading to meaningful exercises. Since the core activities suggested in that curriculum are generic which is applicable for all subjects, the specific target of language teaching for free communication is not covered. For successful learning a foreign language, the teacher should be sure that the classroom activities they provided lead to free communication.

The last stage is closing consisting of concluding, evaluating, giving homework and previewing. The findings of the study revealed that the activities within the range of closing can be regarded as the most neglected part in the teaching and learning processes. That phenomenon can be seen from the facts that only five percent teachers conclude their lessons. As far as the data concerned, there were no teachers gave the product or result evaluation at the end of the session. They probably think that the students' performance or presentation in front of the class as communicating the results of group-work or pair-work has been sufficient as evaluation tools. In fact, the evaluation element at the closing section is regarded as an attempt to evaluate the final result of the teaching and learning process for the given time. Homework as an integral part of the lessons was not emphasized by the English teachers. the data showed that only 15% teachers gave home-

works for their students. Although, there is a controversial issues on giving home-works to students, the current curriculum still advice the teachers to provide home-works in the forms of structured and independent home-works. The last elements is previewing – the activities where the teachers briefly introduce the topic for the next meeting and assign the students to read or do the survey on the net about the topic. The activities relating to previewing were rarely used by the English teachers. There was only five per cent teachers did those kinds of activities. The absence of many activities relating to closing section was due to the weak time management in the part of the teachers. Most teachers closed the teaching session abruptly because the time had been called before they sometimes finished the previous section.

Conclusion

On the basis of the information presented in the findings, some conclusion can be drawn. Firstly, The experience of the English teachers contribute the ability in modifying the internal structure of the exchanges. The experience English teachers produces more IRF pattern than novice teachers for both senior High School and Junior High School. In terms of the exchange functions, the novice teachers at JHS produces dominantly directing, while experienced English teachers produces questioning and directing evenly. However, SHS English Teachers produces dominantly questioning both in JHS and SHS. In the Transaction level, all groups produce small amount of preliminary exchanges and terminal exchanges for activities from opening to closing. In the interaction or lesson level, the teachers from four categories elaborate more on presentation and practice. Several stages are skipped by the teacher. The most common missing elements are motivating in the opening stage, free-communication in the body, and concluding and previewing in the closing stage.

References

- Agung, Tri. 2014. *Classroom interaction patterns, team teaching model in an EFL Classroom*. Retrieved from http://repository.upi.edu/8550/3/t_ing_0602381_chapter1.pdf on January 10, 2016
- Cheng-Hua (2005)
- Engle, R.A. and F.R. Conan. (2002) *Guiding Principles for Fostering Productive Disciplinary Engagement: Explainingan emergent Arguments in a Community of Learners Classroom*. *Cognition and Instruction*. Vol 20/4.
- Haradasht, Mehdi Azimi and Nader Assadi Aidinlou. (2016). A Case Study on EFL Classroom Discourse. *InternationalJournal of Humanities and Cultural studies*. VOI 2 April 2016
- Jaworsky, A. and N. Coupland. (1999). *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Kim and Grant (2009)
- Nathan, M. J., S. Kim and T. S. Grant (2009). *Isntituting Change in Classroom Discourse Structure: Human and Computer-Based Motif Analysis*. Wisconsin: Wisconsin Center for Education Research. WORKING Papers no 2009-1
- Nunan, D.. (1993). *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. London: Penguin English.
- Nurmasitah, Sita. 2010. *A Study of Classroom Interaction Characteristics in a Geography Class Conducted in English: The Case at Year X of an Immersion Class in SMAN.2 Semarang*. Published Thesis. Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Central Java. Retrieved from <Http://www.core.ac.uk/download/pdf/11722762.pdf> on October 10, 2015
- Rashidi and Rafieerad. 2010. Analyzing Patterns of Classroom Interaction in EFL Classrooms in Iran. *The Journal of Asia TEFL Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 93-120, Autumn 2010*. Retrieved from http://www.asiatefl.org/main/download_pdf.php?i=161&c=1419304107 on May 14, 2015
- Sinclair, J. M. And R. M. Couthard. (1975). *Toward an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by the Teacher and Pupils*. Lonndon: Oxford University Press.
- Tao, J and Thao Le. (2012). A Case study on College English Classroom Discourse. *International Journal of Innovative Interdisciplinary research*. Vol 2 2012
- Xin, Liu, Lou Luzheng and Shi Biru. (2011). EFL (English as a Foreign Language) Classroom Discourse Analysis of a Vocational College and Some Reflections. *US-China Education Review B* 6 (2011) 752-755
- Xu, zhichang. (N.A). Discourse analysis of blended teaching and learning and its implications for the teachers and students in Hong Kong. *Research, Reflections and Innovations in Integrating ICT in Education*. Hong Kong: HongKong Instituteof Education.
- Yu, Weihua. (2009). An Analysis of College English Classroom Discourse. *Asia social Science*. Vol 5/7. July 2009.