

ELT written discourse vs. a teacher's speech: experience of Critical Discourse Analysis

ISSN 2657-9774; <https://doi.org/10.36534/erlj.2020.01.01>

Mykhail Suknov*, Nataliia Krynska**

*Kharkiv National University of Radio Electronics, Ukraine; mykhailo.suknov@nure.ua

**Kharkiv National University of Radio Electronics, Ukraine; nataliia.krynska@nure.ua

Abstract

This article aims to contrast examples of teachers' speech as spoken pedagogic discourse with the written discourse of a Teacher's book enclosed with an international English language teaching (ELT). During any EFL (English as a Foreign Language) lesson based on published ELT materials, a teacher uses printed texts of ELT materials, adjuncts and expands them in the learning process according to a particular educational setting and learning needs. The teacher sets tasks from a textbook but articulates them through his/her own interpretation related to local educational paradigm and social ideology. Being a mediator between the written discourse of ELT materials and the learners, the teacher produces his/her speech, which presents another example of pedagogic discourse. Applying methods of critical discourse analysis (CDA) we compare examples of the written discourse of the Teacher's book (TB) and the teacher's spoken discourse. We analysed how the latter was developed on the basis of a detailed lesson plan from the Teacher's book (TB). The comparative analysis reveals a difference between the spoken teacher's discourse derived from the discourse of ELT materials and the written discourse of the TB in that it shows the dominance of the teacher's discourse within the local educational paradigm over those who produce such ELT materials.

Keywords: *pedagogic discourse, classroom discourse, critical discourse analysis (CDA), written discourse of textbook, teacher's speech*

Introduction

Following Michel Foucault's statement that "pedagogic discourse is a means by which notions of class, race, and gender are structured and reproduced within society" (Foucault 1971), critical discourse analysts have turned their scientific attention to classrooms and textbooks, where the results of exercising discourse structuring can be easily observed and examined. To base the importance of CDA studies on ELT we will quote a statement of other CDA proponents, Marianne Celce-Murcia and Elite Olshtain, who have been researching ELT discourse for the last decades: "Many critical discourse analysts believe that education in general and foreign language education, in particular, are ideological and political, but that most language teachers are unaware of this." (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain 2000: 10). Whether we agree or disagree with the authors, the analysis of a teacher's speech within the theoretical framework of critical discourse analysis may give clues to a difference between the spoken teacher's discourse developed on the basis of a detailed lesson plan from the Teacher's book (TB) and the written discourse of the TB. In a natural sequence of the lesson flow, the teacher processes the written discourse of TB, reacts to it and structures his/her own discourse as an interpretation of ELT material discourse through interaction with the students. To observe the correlation between written textbook language and a teacher's spoken language both processes will be examined through CDA methodology.

Theoretical background

Pioneers of discourse analysis in educational contexts deeply and intensively studied the relations between language (its genres, registers and structures) and education as a social and political practice. Theory of pedagogic discourse introduced and developed by Basil Bernstein in "Class, Codes and

Control', followed those studies. This theory analysed how pedagogic discourse functions in society and maintains social order, and pedagogic discourse itself is defined as "a principle of appropriating other discourses and bringing them into special relation with each other for the purposes of their selective transmission and acquisition" (Bernstein 1990: 118). Ursula Clark develops speculation on the nature of Bernstein's definition of pedagogic discourse stating that this discourse must be considered as "totally dependent upon other discourses which are drawn from outside in order to form its own" (Clark 2005: 35). Compared to Foucault's understanding of pedagogic discourse, social nature of pedagogic discourses and their possible analysis is viewed differently by Bernstein. Bernstein offered to analyse pedagogic discourses "for their power to reproduce dominant/dominated relations external to the discourse" (Bernstein 1990: 65) and speaking about the voices of classes and genders he insisted: "What is absent from pedagogic discourse is its own voice" (Bernstein 1990: 65).

The prominent studies to argue against the concept of socially neutral pedagogic discourse became works of Alastair Pennycook (Pennycook 1998) who looking at ELT practices states that language is always located within larger discursive frameworks and always is a part of the cultural and political moments of the day. These new theories about ideology and discourse of education were developed applying critical discourse analysis to written discourse of ELT books (Pennycook 1998, Phillipson 1992).

Another approach to pedagogic discourse was applied in the cross-intersecting area of linguistics and pedagogy when a concept of classroom discourse as a way to use language in educational environment was introduced in pedagogic literature (Cazden, John & Hymes 1972, Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz 1982, Brophy & Good 1986). Over recent decades classroom discourse has been described through the analysis of spoken discourse, which focuses on how a teacher interacts with students in a classroom (Walsh 2012). In its turn, a teacher's speech has been analysed through teacher-student exchanges using different approaches: exchange structure theory (Berry 1981, Christie & Maton 2011, Rose 2014), IRF cycles (Initiation-Response-Feedback/Follow-up) (Alexander 2000, Sinclair & Coulthard 1975). Such studies of classroom discourse developed a pedagogic approach to classroom interactions and focused on improvement of teaching and learning through understanding "how interactants collectively co-construct meanings, how errors arise and are repaired, how turns begin, end and are passed or seized" (Walsh 2011: 25)

The popularity of studies devoted to critical discourse analysis (CDA) has increased greatly since the 2000's. CDA attempts to find out the relations between language and power, and many methods and methodologies have been elaborated based on the works of founders of CDA methodology (Fairclough 1992, Halliday 1994, Foucault 1971, Van Dijk 1997, Wodak & Chilton 2005). To answer the key question of how discursive power can be exercised in order to control the 'mind', researchers around the world incorporate CDA in their studies on ELT discourse.

The scope of spoken and written pedagogic discourse attracts researchers' attention by rich material for investigation: CDA is used as a tool for evaluation of EFL textbooks (Hamdan 2018, Mehran & Mohsen 2015; Kazerooni & Omid 2017), practitioners investigate educational contexts as social practice applying CDA for different kind of lessons: EFL lessons focused on reading skills and critical thinking development (Cots 2006, Rahimi & Sharififar 2015, Amari 2015), and to see how language in classroom illustrates power during lessons of mathematics (Walkerline 1988, Zevenbergen 2000).

Interestingly, the ways in which a teacher's spoken discourse is based on or related to the written discourse of ELT textbooks have not been widely examined. Despite a variety of studies and a substantial amount of research papers in the field of pedagogic discourse in general, this question still remains beyond systematic study and analysis.

Our research question, then, is about the interpretation of written discourse by a teacher and his/her production of spoken ELT discourse in the course of a lesson based on the written discourse. Are there any elements in a teacher's speech that may influence the delivery of the written TB discourse to learners? How can such an analysis of a teacher's speech contribute to ELT practice?

We agree that “the same tasks and the same teaching materials can result in very productive or very unproductive lessons depending on the way the teacher organizes classroom interaction” (Evnitskaya 2018: 16) and it is hoped that such an investigation will provide a better understanding of how such discourse analysis can improve the communicative and social practices of teaching English around the world.

This research aims to conduct critical discourse analysis of the written discourse intended for teachers (Teacher’s Book of ELT course) and samples of the teacher’s speech to reveal the correlation between reception, production, and delivery so that power relationships in the teacher’s discourse and written discourse of TB can be distinguished.

Methodology

CDA provides a toolkit for observing the use of language and to analyse the written and spoken discourse we will use Fairclough’s three-dimension model (Fairclough 1989, 1992, 2003). The model allows to conduct empirical research being focused on three aspects of communication: 1) textual analysis which implies the linguistic analysis of text; 2) analysis of discursive practice, where a researcher examines the process of producing and receiving the text; 3) analysis a broader practice which a particular communication belongs to. As it was designed by the author of the model, the analysis of linguistic elements of the text will inevitably be followed by the analysis of discursive practices and vice versa (Fairclough 1992: 73). Text analysis is to be focused on formal features (lexis, grammar, syntax) and gives understanding of how discourses are implemented linguistically. Analysis of discursive practice reveals how text producers are using existing discourses and creating new ones. We will approach the textbook written text and examples of teacher’s speech as two different text samples applying for both of them an analytical structure of Fairclough’s model.

Viewing ‘language as a form of social practice’ (Fairclough 1989: 20) we accept that pedagogic discourse is a form of social practice. Assuming that the context of language use is crucial to discourse we will analyse how pedagogic discourse unfolds within a classroom produced by the teacher and what are its connections with the written discourse of TB.

Materials and methods

To investigate the intentions, techniques, and discursive strategies of ELT written discourse and its interpretation in spoken teacher’s discourse we selected an international ELT course with a global focus that is designed to be used in diverse social contexts around the globe. Most well-known ELT publishers market their courses as a pack of ELT materials, which usually includes a textbook, a workbook, a teacher’s book, audio or/and videos, extra resources. Such courses tend to apply a holistic methodological approach, incorporating not the one (only communicative or only grammar) approach, but a combination of them and fit a framework of development principles derived from second language acquisition research and experience (Tomlinson 1998: 5-22). For our research, the five-level general adult ELT course Language Leader was selected as a course claiming “to provide a thought-provoking and purposeful approach to learning English” (Kempton & Lebeau 2008a: 4). Among all the variety of English courses, we selected the English-language course “Language Leader” because the participants of our experiment had not used it before and in this way we hoped to obtain fresh impressions of receiving the discourse and spontaneous ‘live’ reaction in its interpretation. The course contains a textbook, a workbook with an audio CD, a class audio CD, as well as a teacher’s book with a test master CD-ROM, for this study a pre-intermediate level course was selected. One limitation of this approach is that teachers who were offered to develop a lesson based on the lesson plan from the Teacher’s book were performing a mock lesson, not a real one which is a part of the curriculum. In this case, one has to acknowledge that students’ performance and responses may differ from normal conditions.

A fragment of the textbook “Language Leader Pre-intermediate” and the corresponding chapter with a detailed lesson plan from the teacher's book was given to the teacher-participants. According to the study focus, the fragment offered to participants was supposed to have clear and direct instructions together with recommendations on how to implement communicative techniques and discursive strategies. The set of materials for teachers consists of (1) a fragment of Chapter 1 from TB (Kempton & Lebeau 2008a: 8-12) containing a detailed plan on how to conduct activities using the textbook material and (2) a fragment of the textbook unit 1 (Kempton & Lebeau 2008b: 6-7).

The participants of the study are 12 EFL teachers of the Foreign Languages department from Kharkiv National University of Radio Electronics, Ukraine. They are non-native speakers; they have been teaching English to adults for more than 10 years and they are actively using in their teaching practices various international multi-levelled packs of ELT materials.

The participants were asked to prepare a detailed instruction or exact sentences to be used during the lesson based on the set of materials. The interaction between teachers and students lies beyond the scope of our research, for this reason only the examples of teacher’s speech were taken for the analysis. These with examples of the teacher's interpretations of TB discourse were considered as examples of the teacher’s spoken discourses and analysed via Fairclough’s model.

Results and discussion

Analysis 1. CDA of the chosen TB fragment

According to Fairclough’s model, the first step was to provide semantical, grammatical and syntactical analysis of the text of the chosen fragment. Regarding the lexis of the text, it is noticeable that most of vocabulary is closely connected with the educational setting (a picture, the exercise, students, activity, the questions, the coursebook), contains a lot of intertextualised extracts from the coursebook and employs verbs denoting actions needed to acquire knowledge. These verbs form two sets: 1) verbs with direct meaning of physical actions: *do activity as per coursebook, show the differing stress, ask students*, 2) indirect verbs to describe actions assigned to be performed by students: *have a class discussion, let students guess, elicit the meanings*. The language of the TB text mostly consists of simple syntactical structures with imperative forms prescribing a particular action during the lesson. There are some variations of indicative mood sentences (e.g. *Students look at the pictures and describe what they see*) aimed to explain/provide support to the reader. These variations present usage of modal verbs as well: *students will either have to know the words or to guess, you may like to show the differing stress, although they [students] could check answers in pairs*, etc. Nevertheless, the communicative purpose of such structures remains similar to the imperative forms: to provide clear instructions on how to use the material of the textbook and conduct the lesson in pursuit of lesson aim and objectives.

Moving through the second dimension of the model, we generated a table to represent a ‘text’ seen as “an actual instance of language use” (Fairclough 2003: 3). To take into account the relations between language and discursive practice we analysed the elements of the ‘text’, where linguistic structures become a part of the whole text production process, which involves a genre and style, a text mission, type of publishing, physical embodiment of the text.

Table 1: The second dimension of written discourse of TB fragment.

Elements of the text	Information	Message
A genre and style	Methodological guidance for teachers related to Common	Learning takes place as student-centred and outcome-oriented education focused on the development of independent learning, study habits and self-

	European Framework of Reference (CEFR)	assessment. A teacher performs roles of a moderator and facilitator of brain-storming activities, as well as a controller, manager, assessor, lecturer.
A mission	TB is to provide “all the support teachers need from detailed teaching notes to extra photocopiable activities”, “there are warning points to alert teachers about possible problem areas as well as teaching tips to help them” (Kempton & Lebeau 2008a: 5).	A teacher uses a textbook implementing the recommendations from the TB and making his/her own decision to achieve the aims and objectives defined by a syllabus.
A physical embodiment of the text	A hard-cover black and white book printed on white thick paper with a colourful cover, high-quality printing and binding technology.	Discourse producers (publishers and authors) have determined the type of paper (its size, colour, weight, etc.), technology to suit best and efficiently a particular publication and to facilitate and promote its use by teachers.
A type of publishing	Trade publishing (books for general readers market and wider consumption) provided by Pearson Education, Inc. – “the company offers its services to teachers and students worldwide.” (Pearson Education, Inc. at www.bloomerg.com)	Teacher’s book as a part of the pack of ELT materials in this series is an important element of the course, which is relevant, valid and reliable due to the reputation of its publisher.
‘Linguistic units’ of the TB text	Simple and precise language of instructions and recommendations, inserted extracts from the textbook, syntactical structures with a high level of directness for the stages of the lesson and medium directness for the possible problem areas.	TB authors manage what material is to be taught and how, prescribing the way of presenting a piece of learning material, its amount and sequence of its practice as well as allowing teachers to extend or adjust it.

The second dimension of ‘discursive practices’ reveals that the ‘text; (written discourse of methodological guidance for teachers) is produced in the context of a particular ELT publication related to the certain educational framework of Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR).

The third dimension of Fairclough's model will bring us back to general definition of pedagogic discourse, which at this stage of the analysis is considered as a social practice. Following Bernstein's understanding of pedagogic discourse (Bernstein 1990: 65), we look at the written discourse of methodological guidance for teachers as social relations of power between textbook producers and teachers. Discursive practice as a TB text, produced in the context of global EFL course, allows us to see

how a teacher is offered, assigned and expected to perform particular roles in educational setting. These roles are a manager in the classroom, moderator and facilitator of brain-storming activities.

Analysis 2. CDA of spoken discourse

Following the analysis of written discourse, we have analysed examples of spoken teacher's discourses that presented interpretations of the TB instructions. The same three-dimensional model of Norman Fairclough (1992: 73) has been used. At the first level of the model – the linguistic analysis of the text – we revealed particular features at lexical, grammatical and syntactical levels.

1. The vocabulary of teacher's spoken discourse didn't go beyond the scope of the lesson and educational setting. Compared to the written discourse of the TB, the examples of spoken discourse contained the same lexis from the textbook and teacher's book, whereas the number of words grew: every instruction received additional follow-up sentence: e.g. "Open your books at our first unit. Look at this big picture (letter A) and small ones (letters B, C, D). What can you see? Is it snow?" Similarly, new verbs in teacher's speech were used to serve in classroom management. They are (1) verbs to mark the transitional move between lesson stages: *go on, move on, let's start, let's begin* and (2) verbs to arrange pair and group work: *make the pairs, split into four groups, let's work in pairs*. Corpus of nouns was enriched by grammar nomenclature: teachers explained material actively using such words as a *noun, adjective, ending, derivation*. In contrast to the neutral style of the TB fragment the language of teachers also contained a lot of personal pronouns, e.g.: "Look at ex.1a. Read the task 1b. What are you going to do? Take your time to do it. Let's pronounce together these 4 words. Repeat after me, please. Do you have any of this weather in our country? Do hurricanes happen in our country?"

2. Syntax of teacher's spoken discourse in some way reflected the TB written discourse, but normally imperative forms were supported by general and/or special questions or follow-up sentences, e.g.: "Let's work in pairs to check your answers. What are the correct words for number 1? Do you agree?" To illustrate how the range of grammar grew while completing the task from the TB, the following comparison can be used:

TB written discourse directive: "*Do activity as per Coursebook: 1b. Read these Internet reports. 2. Choose the correct word*".

Teacher's speech examples: "Let's move on and you are to read the text on page 6. Look 'Online News Weather'. While reading, choose the correct word", "Have a look at ex.1b. You have to read three extracts describing extreme weather and correct words", "Let's go back to our coursebooks. Read the task 1b. What are you going to do? How many reports are there in the text?"

3. If syntactical range of structures used by teachers is obvious and we can state that there appeared numerous examples of special and general questions, grammatically the teacher's speeches did not vary so much compared to the TB discourse. There were still a lot of imperative and indicative mood sentences and teachers avoided to use complex tenses. A range of modality was restricted by request: "Can anybody tell what you can see", hypothesis: "How can we speak about a day with rain?", and permission: "In the same way you can form new words from the words like wind and snow. You can use these new words to answer my question".

The second dimension of Fairclough's model implies analysis of the discourse in its unity with extralinguistic conditions: when a researcher examines what has been used to create and produce the text and how it is related to other texts. At this point, we approach the teacher's speech – 'the text' – as a discursive practice which reveals how language is used within the broader social practice such as teaching English as a foreign language. The text encompasses linguistic units of teacher's speech and the entire visual discourse including images from the coursebook, teacher's clothes, teacher's voice,

teacher's non-verbal behaviour, classroom environment, furniture, equipment, the social roles being represented in teacher's speeches.

Table 2: The second dimension of teacher's speech as spoken discourse.

Elements of the text	Information	Message
Teacher's clothes	Semi-formal clothes	A teacher performs a dominant role of controller, classroom activities manager, lecturer and assessor
Teacher's voice	A loud and well-accented voice,	
Teacher's non-verbal behaviour	friendly gestures signalling about cooperative intentions, walking around the classroom, moving empty chairs, cleaning the blackboard, standing in front of the blackboard	
Classroom environment, furniture	Standard spacious classroom for 30 students, heavy metal-framed desks	Learning takes place within the local educational system
Learning materials	Black and white copies of images from the coursebook stapled with the handouts	A lesson does not belong to the academic curriculum of the local institute, cost and availability of ELT materials restricts usage of original coursebooks
'linguistic units' of teacher's speech	Imperatives, questions, explanations, requests, echoing, summarizing	A teacher performs a dominant role of controller, classroom activities manager, lecturer, and assessor.

Thus, during interaction with students in the classroom the teachers were producing *the text* in order to fulfil a teaching task taken from the written discourse of the TB in *the context* of a particular EFL classroom environment playing social roles of a teacher peculiar to the local educational setting.

The analysis of teacher's speech within the third dimension of Fairclough's model aims to reveal how "social agents make or '*texture*' texts by setting up relations between their elements" (Fairclough 2003: 8), so power based on ideology located both in the structure of discourse and in the discursive practice might be revealed.

Having analysed how teachers implemented a received discourse during observed EFL lessons we can point out the following:

1. Most teachers used the TB discourse to present instructions and conduct certain activities and, in most cases, they supported these 'intertextualised' patterns by follow-up questions, paraphrasing, explanations or requests:

Directive: "*Have a class discussion about which situation students think is the most serious*"

Teacher's Speech Examples:

T1: "Now let's discuss some facts from the text. What do you think about every situation? Which situation is the most serious? Why? "

T2: "No doubts all these situations are very serious, but which one do you think is the most dangerous?"

Directive: "*Ask students if they know any other words to describe extreme weather.*"

Teacher's Speech Example:

"I offer you to talk about extreme weather. Split into 2 groups. One group discusses extreme weather in our country, another one - extreme weather in different countries. Share your ideas. What is the most popular extreme weather? What are the most dangerous regions to live in? What countries did you discuss?"

2. Most teachers developed the activities using the TB discourse, but adjusted them taking a leading role in these activities without giving students a chance to perform the intended action:

Directive: *"Let students guess or elicit the meanings of words blizzard, storm, drought"* – [meanings are provided in the TB below the directive].

Teacher's Speech Examples:

T1: "Let's guess the words to describe these extremes. Blizzard. Storm. Drought. What do you think? Drought is a long period of dry weather when there is not enough water. What picture depicts it?"

T2: "Look at the words. Can you guess what they mean? The first word is blizzard. It is a storm with a lot of wind and snow. We usually have it in winter. What picture depicts it?"

T3: "The word blizzard – what picture does it match? A? C? Right, D! Can you describe the picture D? It is a storm with a lot of wind and snow."

3. The task "to elicit the rules" was completed by direct elicitation in 3 cases, whereas 9 teachers made it through explanation. Below there are examples of the teacher's speech:

Directive: *"Elicit that with types of weather we can put -y on the end to make adjectives"*

Teacher's Speech Examples:

T1: "Give me examples of extreme weather from the text. Which words are also types of weather? How to make a word to describe the weather with rain? With snow? Look at the words from the text. How can we speak about a day with rain? Winter with snow?"

T2: "In English there are words that derive from another. There is a sun in the sky. But you can also say: 'It is sunny today'. So, the word sunny derives from the sun. In the same way, you can form new words from words like wind and snow. You can use these new words to answer the question: What's the weather like today? It is windy."

4. During the lessons the teachers were not using a plan offered by the teacher's book strictly or literally: 9 of 12 changed the order of tasks and skipped some activities.

Through the third dimension of the model, we can see power of a teacher when he/she creates pedagogic discourse. The purpose of the message inside the teacher's spoken discourse is to explain, to show and to share knowledge. In contrast to the TB discourse, the directives of the TB fragment are to bring the process of teaching in alliance with the approach defined by the authors as 'a broadly communicative methodology' (Kempton & Lebeau 2008a: 4) and guided discovery of grammar when "learners are encouraged to work out the rules for themselves" (Kempton & Lebeau 2008a: 6). Promoting teachers to perform the actions listed in lesson plans the authors provide implementation of this pedagogic paradigm. Pointing out that the teachers took responsibility to create new activities other than implied by the directive "Elicit that with types of weather we can put -y on the end to make adjectives" we would consider it as a reflection of a pedagogic paradigm shared by the teachers not that one shared by the authors of the TB. The message of pedagogic discourse changed and the social roles of a teacher within and out of the TB discourse changed as well. As a result of discourse collision power within the teacher's discourse became dominant. Existing pedagogical skills obtained by teachers within the local education system prevailed over the directives of the TB written discourse.

The dimension of discursive practice as a communicative event allows us to see producing teacher's discourse within a social institution – in the given case it is a state university under the governance of ministry and departments of higher education. This reveals power behind the discourse, which is expressed by local educational standards, ethics and norms of teaching practices implemented and used in a particular educational setting.

Discussion and conclusion

The analysis of written discourse of the teacher's book as a part of the ELT pack of materials and spoken discourse of teacher's speech when delivering a lesson based on the EFL coursebook revealed some interesting features of delivering written pedagogic discourse by speakers who are supposed to produce generically the same discourse as agents of pedagogic discourse. The difference between the two discourses concerns extra-linguistic factors, which embody different messages. The teacher's speech analysis helped to see how the messages of the TB discourse are interpreted by teachers and whether they are taken into action. Interpretation of the discourse is a complex process: it implies understanding of words and sentences, but it is also "a matter of judgement and evaluation" (Fairclough 2003: 11). We found out that whereas the authors created the lesson plan in order to organize classroom work, most of teachers (who were receivers of this pedagogic discourse message) did not fully employ the recommended approach. Teachers created a new discourse based on the TB text and this new discourse reflected their judging whether it is important to conduct activity "elicit grammar rules" in the offered way. The observed lessons took place in the EFL classrooms of higher education institution and the teachers followed the standards of local educational system performing roles of a lecturer, controller and manager. During the lesson the teachers were not developing a repertoire of the roles intended to perform by ELT materials producers such as a moderator or facilitator of brainstorming activities. From this point of view, ELT materials producers – the authors of the written discourse – came into conflict with the local educational system, and as a result, social roles of teacher changed having created a new form of social practice in a realm of pedagogic discourse of ELT practice. It proves that social agents of the discourse can 'texture texts' and thus have some freedom when articulating discourse (Fairclough 2003: 22) and this study shows that teachers may implement the power of using discourse to suit their beliefs and settings when providing new semantic meaning to fulfil educational purposes. Further research should be addressed to the educational setting where teachers' beliefs and standards of the local educational system influencing teacher's educational roles and their language were developed.

References

- Alexander, R. J. (2000). *Culture and pedagogy: international comparisons in primary education*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Amari, Z. F. (2015). The Role of Critical Discourse Analysis in EFL Teaching/Learning. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 6, 87-93.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse: Class, codes & control*. Volume IV. London: Routledge.
- Berry, M. (1981). Systemic Linguistics and Discourse Analysis: A Multi-Layered Approach to Exchange Structure, in: M. Coulard and M. Montgomery, (Eds.), *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 120-145.
- Brophy, J. & Good, T. (1986). Teacher Behavior and Student Achievement. *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 3rd edition, in: M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), New York: Macmillan, 328-375.
- Cazden, C., John, V. & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. & Olshtain, E., (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christie, F. & Maton, K. (2011). *Disciplinary: functional linguistic and sociological perspectives*. London: Continuum.

- Clark, U. (2005). Bernstein's theory of pedagogic discourse: Linguistics, educational policy and practice in the UK English/literacy classroom. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 4 (3), 32-47. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ847260.pdf> (20 June, 2019).
- Cook-Gumperz, J. & Gumperz, J. (1982). Communicative competence in educational perspective, in: L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Communicating in the classroom*, New York, NY: Academic Press, 3-24.
- Cots, J. M. (2006). Teaching 'with an attitude': Critical Discourse Analysis in EFL teaching. *ELT Journal*, 60 (4), 336-345. Retrieved from doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl024 (20 June, 2019).
- Evnitskaya, N., (2018). Classroom Interaction and Language Learning in CLIL contexts. *CLIL Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education*, 1 (1), 7-17. Retrieved from doi.org/10.5565/rev/clil.3 (20 June, 2019).
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. Psychology Press.
- Foucault, M. (1971). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon.
- Halliday, M. (1994). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hamdan Alghamdi, A.K. (2018). The gulf between text and context: Critical discourse analysis of English textbooks used in Saudi Arabia's preparatory-year programs. *Curric Perspect*, 38, 27-39. Retrieved from doi.org/10.1007/s41297-018-0040-3 (20 June, 2019).
- Kazerooni, M. & Omid, T. (2017). Textbook Evaluation: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Talk Time Series. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4, 194-205.
- Kempton, G. & Lebeau, I. (2008a). *Language leader: pre-intermediate: teacher's book and Test Master CD-ROM*. Pearson Education.
- Kempton, G. & Lebeau, I. (2008b). *Language leader: pre-intermediate: level textbook*. Pearson Education.
- Mehran, S. & Mohsen, S. (2015). A Critical Discourse Analysis of ELT Materials in Gender Representation: A Comparison of Summit and Top Notch. *English Language Teaching*, 8 (1), 121-133.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: OUP.
- Rahimi, E. & Sharififar, M. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis and Its Implication in English Language Teaching: A Case Study of Political Text. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5 (3), 504-511. Retrieved from doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0503.08 (20 June, 2019).
- Rose, D. (2014). Analysing pedagogic discourse: an approach from genre and register. *Functional Linguistics*, 1 (11), 1-32. Retrieved from doi.org/10.1186/s40554-014-0011-4 (20 June, 2019).
- Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.) (1998). *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Vol. 2. London: Sage.
- Walkerdine, V. (1988). *The mastery of reason*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising Classroom Interactional Competence. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 6 (1), 1-14. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_6_1/Walsh.pdf (20 June, 2019).
- Wodak, R. & Chilton, P. (Eds.) (2005). *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Zevenbergen, R. (2000). Cracking the code of mathematics classrooms: School success as a function of linguistic, social, and cultural background, in: J. Boaler (Ed.), *Multiple perspectives on mathematics teaching and learning*. Westport, CT: Ablex, 201-224.