Available online at http://www.bretj.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT LIFE SCIENCES

RESEARCH ARTICLE

International Journal of Current Life Sciences - Vol.3, Issue, 11, pp.199-219, November, 2013

AN INVESTIGATION OF EFL TEACHERS' ORAL DISCOURSE IN TERMS OF "SYNTACTIC FORMS", "QUALITY", "CONTENT", "RECIPIENT", " CLASSROOM ACTS" AND "SPEECH ACTS"

Monireh TaghiPour Masoumei*, N. Ghafouri, B. Behnam

Department of EFL, Faculty of Literature and Foreign Languages Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

A R T I C L E I N F O

Article History:

Received 12th, October, 2013
Received in revised form 28th, October, 2013
Accepted 14th, November, 2013
Published online 28th, November, 2013

Key words:

A B S T R A C T

Because most transactions in the school take place through linguistic interaction, it seems clear that it is with the quality of classroom discourse that we need to start. The perceived role of the EFL teacher is to prepare learners to use English outside the classroom. This study examined the features of the classroom discourse in eight English classes from Pardisan Language Center. In this respect, the study mainly aimed to analyze teachers' *oral instructions* which constitute the core aspect of teacher talk. In order to describe and define teachers' *instructions* fully, the whole data were analyzed in terms of six categories. At first *instructions* were analyzed regarding 'syntax', 'quality', 'content' and 'recipient' features based on Atwater and Morris's (1988) study. Next, in order to reveal the types of classroom acts, these *instructions* were searched relying on Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) taxonomy of classroom acts. As the last step, teachers' *instructions* were analyzed in order to bring out the types of speech acts they may convey relying on Searle's speech act categories (1975). Data analysis indicates that the most frequent syntactic form usage is 'direct imperatives' (42%). Positive instructions are determined to account for 94% of the total teachers' oral instructions. Also the results indicate that 97% of instructions are task-related. Regarding the addressee(s) of the teachers' oral instructions, the most frequent one is the whole class instructions. Through instructions, the most frequently used classroom act type is 'directives' with the percentage of 84%. As for the speech acts, commanding (52%), constitutes the most repetitive speech act type in this study. The results of the study may be shared with the novice teachers and may shed light on their choice of using some structures in their talk while addressing to their learners. In addition all the assessments compiled for this study and the similar studies, may be given in in-service trainings.

© Copy Right, IJCLS, 2013, Academic Journals. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

One of the principal means through which patterns of interaction are constructed is language. To interpret the patterns of life, members need to process linguistic and non-verbal aspects of the social interactions of others. Language, in relationship to the social construction of life in classrooms, refers to the oral and written discourse norms, expectations, and strategies that members establish through their daily interactions. Defined in this way, the language-of-the-classroom is a group of constructing phenomena, a negotiated system of meaning, and a set of conventions for interacting, participating and communicating information and knowledge within a particular classroom (Behnam & PourIran, 2008).

The use of language in any classroom is interesting from an educational point of view because education itself is conducted fundamentally through the medium of language. The term "the language classroom" is used here to refer to classrooms in which the primary concern is the development of a language that is not the first language of the learners (Behnam & PourIran, 2008).

The term *classroom discourse* refers to the language that teachers and students use to communicate with each other in the classroom. Talking, or conversation, is the medium through which most teaching takes place, so the study of classroom discourse is the study of the process of face-to-face classroom teaching (Nuthall, 1965).

According to Richards, Platt, and Platt (1992), Classroom Discourse refers to the type of language used in classroom situations. It is often different in form and function from language used in other situations because of the particular social roles students and teachers have in classrooms where they carry out different kinds of activities. In this respect, classroom-based research has produced a variety of models over the last forty years, operating from classroom discourse for describing and analyzing interaction in the classrooms for

Corresponding author:* **Monireh TaghiPour Masoumei , **Email:** monirtm@yahoo.com
Department of EFL, Faculty of Literature and Foreign Languages Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

a better understanding of the classroom conversational patterns employed by teachers and students and the functions they servefor(Behnam&PourIran,2008).Therefore, Classroom Discourse includes classroom environments in which teachers and students may be seen as members of a sociolinguistic context in which spoken language has social and pedagogical functions (Consolo, 2000). Cazden (2001) states that the functions of classroom language are produced under typical discourse patterns of classroom communication systems in which the role of language extend beyond the communicating of propositional information to the establishment and the maintenance of relationships in the classroom. In addition, the generation of language input by means of classroom interaction is believed to favor language acquisition (Ellis, 1984; Krashen, 1982). For instance, Bygate (1987, p. 7) States that, the language spoken in the classroom are not only linked to social and pedagogical aims; it is also "a medium through which much language is learnt, and which for many is conducive for learning". For teachers, as the dominating figures of the classrooms, are responsible for their students' learning, they may put different strategies into action by their talk, namely 'teacher talk'.

Within sociocultural theory, oral interaction among participants is a fundamental component of language learning. From this perspective, interaction is not just the facilitator of learning but more fundamental is the source of both what students learn and how they learn. In other words, oral interaction is both the means and the end (Swain, 1997) in that the language used during an interaction in a foreign language context is simultaneously both the tool for learning and the object of what is to be learned (Swain & Lapkin, 1998, 2002) (Thoms, 2011).

Spoken language is the medium by which much teaching takes place and in which students demonstrate to teachers much of what they have learned (Cazden, 1986). As the main medium of instruction, the language of the classroom has long been considered a fine lens through which to view the teaching and learning that occurs in schools. To date, most studies of classroom language have focused on how classroom talk differs structurally from everyday conversations, with little attention to the substance of the talk and therefore to the substance of teaching and learning. These studies have shown that classroom conversations led by the teacher and involving the whole class typically have large structural junctures that delimit lessons and tasks, and phases within them (e.g., Bellack, Kliebard. Hyman, & Smith, 1966; Erickson, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) (As cited in Greenleaf, 1993, p. 465).

Along with providing the propositional content of the course, an effective use of Teacher Talk in ELT context involves using various strategies such as simplifying their speech, adapting the foreigner talk and using other simplified styles of speech addressing to language learners (Richards, et. al., 1992). Through different ways, teachers observe their students if they are following what they are saying and try to monitor, edit and correct the language the students use. Apart from these aims, teachers are also in the effort of attracting students' attention, controlling the amount of speech, checking students' understanding and specifying topics (Thomas, 1987). Shortly, while teachers lead the students in the courses' form, content and atmosphere, they feed their students by their talk. A very basic linguistic tool that the teachers employ to accomplish the mentioned tasks is ***'instruction'***. Atwater and Morris (1988) define *instruction* as "form of communicating information that is both command and explanation for how an action, behavior, method or task is to be begun, completed or executed" (p. 159).

Despite general consensus among scholars and educators regarding the importance of instructions in classroom discourse, there has only been a small amount of research on teachers' oral instructions in related literature. One of these studies which has been carried out by Atwater and Morris (1988) includes an analysis of pre-school teachers' instructions. Using the definition of Atwater and Morris (1988, p. 2),"*instruction*" is "a verbal statement in which teacher informed a child or group of children of an observable behavior to be performed". They classified every instruction under four main headings: *syntax*, *quality*, *content* and *recipient*.

This study also chooses to focus on the types and functions of oral *instructions* which teachers use during the courses in ELT context. The study is based on the examination of natural data obtained from eight classes relying on Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) categories of classroom acts by adding some subtitles within the scope of Discourse Analysis. In addition, Searle's (1975) speech act categories have also been adopted and expanded as guided by the data of this study. In brief, the study involves an investigation of teachers' oral instructions under six broad categories, regarding *syntactic forms*, *teachers' attitudes*, *teachers' purpose*, *the recipient* as well as the pedagogic and social functions (i.e. Teachers' instructions as *classroom acts* and as *speech acts).*

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants in a classroom discourse are usually a teacher and the students. In this research, the eight instructors who participated in the study were all native speakers of Turkish and Persian (of both sexes) and their ages varied between 22 – 36. They were at an intermediate level of the Pardisan Language Center (in Tabriz, Iran). The teachers had adequate experience of teaching English as a foreign language in Iran. Detailed information about the participant teachers can be seen in Table 3 below. Except the teachers, the number of students who also observed in this study constitute 56-200 since the number of students in each class varied between 7 and 30.

As the nature of the study involves seeking out English teachers and the classes which have provided gathering fruitful data, this study's sampling is 'Convenience Sampling'. In this type of sampling, the researcher chooses the population and the situation which suggests rich data at random (Stubbs, 1983).

Instruments

The techniques for data collection included: recording, note-taking and observation. First of all, the data were collected by a tape-recorder. While recording the data, the researcher also took field notes involving teachers' and students' behaviors to be used as contextual information in order to be used later in identifying the functional values of the utterances. After observing and recording the classes, the recorded data were transcribed according to Jefferson's (2004) transcription conventions (See Appendix 4).

Table 1 Participants

Participants	Age	Gender	Graduate of	Years of Experience
T1	24	Female	State University	5 Months
T2	29	Female	Azad University	7 Years
T3	29	Female	Azad University	6 Years
T4	25	Female	State University	1 Year
T5	23	Male	Azad University	4 Years
T6	32	Male	Azad University	3 Years
T7	23	Female	State University	3 Years
T8	27	Female	Azad University	6 Years

According to Seedhouse (2004, p. 87) about deciding on the quantity and composition of the data, "classroom research has considered between five and ten lessons at reasonable database". In addition to the size of the database, its composition has to be given due consideration, the extent to which it is heterogeneous or homogeneous (Walsh, 2006, p. 63).

Procedure

The following steps were followed to accomplish the purpose of the study during the research process: First, the researcher chose several classes and the recordings were conducted in those classrooms. For the authenticity of the data, just the teachers were informed about the recording of their classes and not the students. After recording, the researcher lets them know and asked permission for working on their audio-recorded classes.

Table 2 Representation of the Data Analysis of the Study

Methodological Basis	Categories	Foci
Atwater & Morris (1988)	Syntax	Form
	Quality	Pedagogical Function
	Content	Pedagogical Function
	Recipient	Pedagogical Function
Sinclair & Coulthard (1975)	Classroom Acts	Discourse Function
Searle (1975)	Speech Acts	Discourse Function

There was no information for the teachers on what these recordings would be used by the researcher in order to obtain authentic data records. Then, the audio-recorded data listened to by the researcher several times. Next, the data were transcribed. The final stage was analyzing the data in order to find a reasonable answer to the research questions. By following a four-part process of Record-View-Transcribe-Analyze (R-V-T-A), foreign language teachers can use discourse analytic techniques to investigate the interaction patterns in their classrooms and to see how these patterns promote or hinder opportunities for learners to practice the target language. This process allowed language teachers to study their own teaching behavior, the instructions, syntactic forms, the content and other techniques they use in their classrooms and their effects on the learners' responses.

Data Analysis

To answer the research questions, the researcher implemented the (R-V-T-A) method in order to observe the frequent use of two types of questions. As it was referred to in the preceding chapter, eight classes at intermediate level were selected. Then the whole session of mentioned classes was audio-recorded. Totally twelve hours were recorded. The book which was used in the classes was "Interchange book".

After collecting the data, transcribing technique was employed. Transcribing is a tool commonly used by researchers, both those concerned with the study of language and those concerned with exploring other dimensions of everyday life through language. We should consider that the transcript is a text that 're-represents an event'; it is not the event itself. After data collection, the observed patterns were analyzed with reference to *form*, *pedagogical functions* and *discourse functions.*

In regard to meaning, there are two different types of analyses in which discourse analysts can engage. One type of analysis is the study of rather general *correlations* between form (structure) and function (meaning) in language. Let's call this *form-function analysis.* The other type of analysis is the study of much more specific interactions between language and context. Let's call this *language-context analysis.* The two types of analyses are related. Linguists use the word "form" to designate structural aspects of language, things like the parts of speech (e.g., nouns and verbs), types of phrases (e.g., noun phrases and verb phrases), or type of clauses (e.g., independent and dependent clauses). They use the word "function" for the sorts of meanings a given form can communicate or the sorts of the instructional work (purposes) a given form can accomplish. Language is a tool used for a number of different purposes (not just one). We can make a distinction between form and function for any tool, not just language. A hammer has a given form – its shape and material it is made out of – and that form fits it to carry out certain functions (purposes) rather well (e.g., raking ground or opening cans). Specific structures or forms in a language are used as tools to carry out certain functions (that is, to express certain meanings or accomplish certain purposes) (Gee, 1999, p. 54).

Teachers' instructions in this study have been analyzed under six categories regarding the 'syntactic forms', 'quality', 'content', 'recipient' as well as the classroom acts and speech act values of teachers' instructions. The examination of the first four categories is based on Atwater and Morris (1988). In the next two steps, the taxonomies of Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) classroom acts and Searle (1975) speech act categories were followed. While the first analysis mainly focused on the forms of instructions, the next two analyses examined the functions of teachers' oral instructions.

The first category mainly focuses on the syntactic features of the instructions; the second category 'quality' reflects teachers' positive or negative attitudes towards the students while issuing instructions. The third level of analysis is related to identifying the general pedagogic purpose in the teachers' instructions, as to whether she/he is trying to guide the students towards a teaching activity or towards setting up the classroom order. The fourth category detects the recipients to whom instructions are addressed; namely, whether they are individual students, groups, pairs or the whole class. Categories 'syntax', 'quality', 'content' and 'recipient' have their sub-categories to describe teachers' instructions in detail. The last two categories of analysis are concerned with discovering the specific functions involved in teachers' instructions: the types of the verbal acts so called 'classroom acts', realizing the pedagogical objectives; the types of verbal acts 'the speech acts' conveying the social meaning in a larger frame.

Table 3 Sinclair and Coulthard's (1992) Speech Act Categories

ACTS	FORMAL FEATURES AND FUNCTIONAL DEFINITIONS
Marker	Realized by a closed class of items – 'well', 'OK', 'now', 'good', 'right', 'alright'. When a marker is acting as the head of a framing move, it has a falling intonation, [1] or [1+], as well as a silent stress. Its function is to mark boundaries in the discourse.
Starter	Realized by a statement, question or command. Its function is to provide information about or direct attention to or thought towards an area in order to make a correct response to the initiation more likely.
Elicitation	Realized by a question. Its function is to request a linguistic response.
Check	Realized by a closed class of polar questions concerned with being 'finished' or 'ready', having 'problems' or 'difficulties', being able to 'see' or 'hear'. They are 'real' questions, in that for once the teacher doesn't know the answer. If he does know the answer to, for example, 'have you finished', it is a directive, not a check. The function of checks is to enable the teacher to ascertain whether there are any problems preventing the successful progress of the lesson.
Directive	Realized by a command. Its function is to request a non-linguistic response.
Informative	Realized by a statement. It differs from other uses of statement in that its sole function is to provide information. The only response is an acknowledgement of attention or understanding.
Prompt	Realized by a closed class of items – 'go on', 'come on', 'hurry up', 'quickly', and 'have a guess'. Its function therefore is to reinforce a directive or elicitation by suggesting that the teacher is no longer requesting a response but expecting or even demanding one.
Clue	Realized by a statement, question, command or mood less item. It is subordinate to the head of the initiation and functions by providing additional information, which helps the pupil to answer the elicitation or comply with the directive.
Cue	Realized by a closed class of which we so far have only three exponents, 'hands up', 'don't call out', 'is John the only one'. Its sole function is to evoke an (appropriate) bid.
Bid	Realized by a closed class of verbal and non-verbal items – 'Sir', 'Miss', teacher's name, raised hand, heavy breathing, finger clicking. Its function is to signal a desire to contribute to the discourse.
Nomination	Realized by a closed class consisting of the names of all the pupils, 'you' with contrastive stress, 'anybody', 'yes' and one or two idiosyncratic items such as 'who hasn't said anything yet'. The function of nomination is to call on or give permission to a pupil to contribute to the discourse.
Acknowledge	Realized by 'yes', 'OK', 'correct', 'mm', 'wow', and certain nonverbal gestures and expressions. Its function is to show that the initiation has been understood, and, if the head was a directive, that the pupil intends to react.
Reply	Realized by a statement, question or mood less item and non-verbal surrogates such as nods. Its function is to provide a linguistic response, which is appropriate to the elicitation.
React	Realized by a non-linguistic action. Its function is to provide the appropriate non-linguistic response defined by the preceding directive.
Comment	Realized by a statement or tag question. It is subordinate to the head of the move and its function is to exemplify, expand, justify, and provide additional information. On the written page, it is difficult to distinguish from an informative because the outsider's ideas of relevance are not always the same. However teachers signal paralinguistically, by a pause, when they are beginning a new initiation with an informative as a head; otherwise they see themselves as commenting.
Accept	Realized by a closed class of items – 'yes', 'no', 'good', 'fine', and repetition of pupil's reply, all with neutral low fall intonation. Its function is to indicate that the teacher has heard or seen and that the informative, reply or react was appropriate.
Evaluate	Realized by statements and tag questions, including words and phrases such as 'good', 'interesting', 'team point', commenting on the quality of the reply, react or initiation, also by 'yes', 'no', 'good', 'fine', with a high-fall intonation, and repetition of the pupil's reply with either high-fall(positive), or a rise of any kind(negative evaluation).
Metastatement	Realized by a statement which refers to some future time when what is described will occur. Its function is to help pupils to see the structure of the lesson, to help them understand the purpose of the subsequent exchange, and see where they are going.
Conclusion	Realized by an anaphoric statement, sometimes marked by slowing of speech rate and usually the lexical items 'so' or 'then'. In a way it is the converse of a metastatement. Its function is again to help pupils understand the structure of the lesson but this time by summarizing what the preceding chunk of discourse was about.
Loop	Realized by a closed class of items – 'pardon', 'you what', 'eh', 'again', with rising intonation and a few questions like 'did you say', 'do you mean'. Its function is to return the discourse to the stage it was at before the pupil spoke, from where it can proceed normally.
Aside	Realized by statement, question, command, mood less, usually marked by lowering the tone of voice, and not really addressed to the class. As we noted above, this category covers items that we have difficulty dealing with. It is really instances of the teacher talking to himself: 'It's freezing in here', 'Where did I put my chalk?'

Six categories constituting the data analysis of this study may be seen in Table 2 below.

On the Table (2.), except the categories and the basis which were followed to analyze the teachers' oral instructions, the main foci of every category are also seen clearly. That is, 'syntactic analysis' reveals the linguistic structure of instructions, 'quality', 'content' and 'recipient' categories serve for analyzing pedagogical functions of teachers' oral instructions. Unlike the mentioned categories above, 'classroom acts' and 'speech acts' serve for analyzing discourse functions as their primary functions. However, it must be noted that there is not a clear-cut boundary between discourse functions and pedagogical functions of teachers' utterances since they complete each other.

All of the mentioned categories comprising the data analysis of the study are described below in descending order.

Syntactic Forms of Instructions

Syntax studies structural units of a language: phrases and sentences (Akmajian, et. al., 1997). Atwater and Morris analyzed the structures of teachers' oral instructions under four sentence types: 'direct imperative', 'let's imperative', 'question' and 'declarative'. However, during the analysis regarding syntax, one additional sub-category was identified in this study and named as 'ellipses'. The examples indicating 'ellipsis' or 'elliptical forms' will be defined in the following chapter. Other categories defining sentence forms are described below.

a) *Direct Imperatives:* (e.g. "Circle the blue triangle.")
b) *Let's Imperatives:* (e.g. "Let's put our coats into our lockers.")
c) *Questions*: (e.g. "Would you sit down, please?")
d) *Declaratives*: (e.g. "It is time to put our work away.")

Additionally, in this study questions and declaratives were also subcategorized based on the examples elicited from the data and in line with these syntactic categories of
Eken (1996) were also partially used.

Quality

Quality of instructions includes analyzing the instructions issued by the speaker whether they 'prompt' or 'suppress' the addressee's behavior. In this respect, 'quality' of instructions was analyzed under two titles adopted from Atwater and Morris (1988), namely, 'positive instructions' and 'negative instructions'.

a) *Positive Instruction*: Positive instructions are those to prompt child behavior.
"Please, sit down."
b) *Negative Instruction*: Negative instructions are those to suppress behavior.
"Stop running around the room.
(Atwater & Morris, 1988, p. 158)

Content

Content of instructions includes analyzing the instructions according to the teacher's aims, that is whether instructions are used with students for handling the tasks or directing the general classroom behavior (Atwater & Morris, 1988). Content of instructions has been analyzed as 'task-related' and 'non-task'.

a) *Task-related:* Task-related instructions guide the child's performance of a task.
"Count the squares on this page."
b) *Non-task:* Non-task instructions direct general classroom behavior.
"Try to be quiet during the film."
(Atwater & Morris, 1988, p. 158)

Recipient

There are a variety of ways in which classroom activities may be organized, but four are typical of elementary classrooms. The most common is the teacher interacting with all the students as a class. The teacher determines whether his or her talk will be for all the students or to individuals. The teacher may elicit individual or chorus responses, and may allow students to volunteer or call on them. The second most frequent type of interaction is for the teacher to meet with one student as an individual. In this context, the students must respond individually since the teacher's purpose is often to evaluate individual performance. The third type of activity is for students to work independently at their desks with a teacher available to help. Students must approach the teacher or raise a hand to obtain this help, and the interaction is not heard by the other students. The fourth type of interaction consists of group work that students themselves run with little supervision from the teacher (as in reading or writing groups) (Hatch, 1992).

Philips (1983), who worked with Warm Springs Indian Children in Oregon, notes that although the first two types of interaction occur most frequently in American elementary schools, they are also the types of interactions in which the Indian children felt most uncomfortable. The children were more talkative and relaxed in the last two types of interaction because, Philips explains; those ways more closely match how learning is done in the home: by observation, listening, supervised participation, and private self-initiated self-testing. Language classrooms differ, at least in some ways, from ordinary classrooms. Depending on the methodology adopted for instruction and the age and the proficiency level of the students, there may be a greater deal of small group work, there may be much project work, or there may be teacher-fronted instruction or even choral drills.

According to Atwater and Morris's (1988) study**,** the recipient of the instructions could be an individual child or a group of two or more children. In this research, recipient category includes 'individual', pair ', 'group and whole classes.

The following parts give a brief summary of classroom acts and speech acts which constitute the other tools to describe and analyze the teachers' instructions on this research.

Instructions as 'Classroom Acts'

Sinclair and Coulthard's classroom acts taxonomy has been another base for analyzing teacher talk to reveal the functions of their *instructions*.

Apart from Sinclair and Coulthard, Searle's speech act categories were also the other tools used to investigate the functions of teachers' instructions in detail. Hence, in the next section, Searle's Speech Act Taxonomy is described.

Instructions as 'Speech Acts'

Most types of utterances in talk do not involve simply communicating a meaning; rather they have the function of accomplishing something, such as convincing someone of a belief, getting someone to do something, etc. (Austin, 1962).

Just as linguists have tried to understand how speakers might be able to produce an infinite number of sentences given a very finite set of rules for sentences, philosophers have tried to understand how an infinite number of sentences might reflect a very finite set of functions. The philosophers reasoned that since the number of things we do with words is limited, we ought to be able to assign functions to utterances (Hatch, 1992).

The problem with assigning functions to sentences is that speaker intent and sentence meaning is not always the same. Speaker intent may be more or less, or actually the opposite, of sentence meaning (as in sarcasm). Thus, no utterance is completely context free in terms of meaning or function (Hatch, 1992).

Bach (1998) defines these different types of actions which we are trying to accomplish with our utterances as "speech acts". A long tradition of research has attempted to develop categories and classifications of speech acts, but philosophers such as Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) have shown that it is possible to classify utterances into a very small set of functions. Here, the well-known taxonomy that has been used in natural language processing, is described by Searle (1969, 1975, and 1979). In his taxonomy, Searle categorizes speech acts according to their illocutionary purpose (i.e. What the speaker is doing with the utterance). For instance, a speaker may assert information, order someone to do something, promise to do something, apologize for someone and state a situation with the help of her/his utterances.

According to Searle's basic taxonomy, there are five main categories: representatives, directives, commissives, expressive and declaratives.

Representatives

Representatives commit a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition. Representatives may vary in terms of how hedged or aggravated the assertion might be. The lexical items like "approximately", "very", "almost", and

"extremely" which strengthen or weaken the assertion may be used. Hedges are not always the same as "weasel words", which temper the directness of a statement (the two terms reflect a different point of view. "Weasel words" is pejorative – we are trying to avoid responsibility for our claims. "Hedges" qualify, soften, or make claims more polite) (Hatch, 1992). These speech acts include 'asserting', 'concluding' and 'claiming'.

'I went to the Amish quilt exhibit'. (Asserting)

Directives

The syntactic form alone does not tell us how to interpret the speaker's intent and cause the hearer to take a particular action. Maybe a request is being made so that someone will do or stop doing something. Social constraints suggest that when we make a request, we expect that request to be complied with. Some researchers believe that the greater the risk of refusal, the more indirect the directive will be. That is, all languages have directives, but the variation in directive forms within a language must be sensitive to social constraints. When we do not pay attention to these constraints, people may feel offended or think there is something wrong with the communication (Hatch, 1992). Directive Speech Acts include 'ordering', 'commanding', 'begging', 'requesting', 'asking questions', 'urging', 'forbidding' , 'suggesting', 'advising', 'warning', 'dismissing'.

'Watch out! The ground is slippery!' (Warning)

Commissives

Commissives commit a speaker to some future action; these are statements that function as promises or refusals for action. Like directives, commissives vary in strength; they may be very strong or highly hedged in either positive or negative directions. The forms used for commissives vary according to social relationships; forms used may differ, not only across status and situation but also by gender. Women are thought to use more hedged commissives than men. It has also been claimed that women in general are not assertive. In face-to-face encounters, it is fairly clear who is making the promise – that is, who is committed to the content – but in other circumstances (e.g., when we are watching television), it is not so clear. All languages have commissives. When they are used and in what forms vary along social lines. The appropriateness of commissives (as well as directives) also varies across language and culture groups (Hatch, 1992). The commissives consist of 'promising', 'vowing', 'pledging', 'alliance'.

'I will bring your dictionary tomorrow.' (Promise)

Expressives

All languages have utterances that can be classified as having an expressive function. Expressives express on the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards the proposition, our statements of joy and disappointment, likes and dislikes, e.g., 'thanking, 'apologizing', 'congratulating' and 'excusing'. Compliments can be expressions of like or dislike. If, during the next few days, you listen to and log the compliments that you hear, you will find only a small number of syntactic structures. In all speech acts, we have mentioned a continuum of strength of the forms from indirect to director of hedge to aggravated. Expressives, too, can be arranged along a continuum of strength. The range is mediated by social factors (ritual constraints again). For example, men and women are expected to use different lexical expressives in English, and the range of "acceptable" strength of expressives may differ by gender as well.

'I am sorry, I have broken the glass.' (Apologize)

Declaratives

(Austin calls these performatives) these are speech acts that, when uttered, bring about a new state of being. Declaratives change the reality in accordance with the proposition of the declaration, e.g. 'pronouncing someone guilty', the accused status has changed from innocent to guilty, 'declaring peace', 'christening a baby', 'firing an employee' and so on. If the speaker has no right – that is, no special role that allows for such a pronouncement – no real change will occur as a result of the uttering. There are special role requirements that go with the uttering of declaratives. If someone other than a certified person says "by the power invested in me", no marriage occurs. That is, the person who utters a declarative must have the power (inherited from the role in the script) to do so. Otherwise, it is all play acting (Hatch, 1992).

'You are fired, from now on finding a new job!' (Firing an employee)

Three taxonomies having different categories and aspects have been tried to be defined in this chapter since they are the tools of the study. In the following chapter, findings and discussion of the study will be presented.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

In this chapter, the findings obtained as a result of the analysis of teachers' instructions under six categories are presented with respect to formal and functional aspects. The frequencies related to each category are demonstrated in tables, and finally illustrated through excerpts from the data.

Syntactic Forms in Teachers' Oral Instructions

The examination of the data comprising of 520 teacher's oral instructions has revealed that the teachers have used five types of structures while issuing instructions: 'direct imperatives', 'let's imperatives', 'questions', 'declaratives' and 'elliptical forms' (see Table 4.). Out of 520 instructions, instructions in the form of 'direct imperatives' have been the most frequently used structure by teachers (42 %). 'Declaratives' accounting for (23%), 'elliptical forms' accounting for (20 %) and 'let's imperatives' accounting to (11%) have been the other forms of instructions performed by teachers.

Table.4 'Syntactic' Distribution of Teachers' Instructions

Syntactic Categories	Tokens	%
Direct Imperatives	220	42.30
Declaratives	122	23.46
Elliptical Statements	107	20.57
Let's Imperatives	59	11.34
Questions	19	5.96
TOTAL	539	100

Instructions in the form of 'questions' have been the least used structure by the teachers (5 %).

Each category will be described and exemplified by the relevant excerpts below.

Table 5. Instructions as Declarative Sentences

Category No:	Types Of Declarative Sentences	Tokens	%	Sample Utterances
1	Modals "have to" "should" "can" "need to"	 7 6 17 -	24.59	You have to write something for the company. You should narrow your topic sentence down. You can use this list to come up with a topic sentence and ideas to support it. -
2	"present simple"	25	20.49	Then you think about it.
3	"be going to"	35	28.68	These are the words that we are going to talk together.
4	"will"	24	19.67	I will give you some situations.
5	"present cont."	8	6.55	The meaning of enormous? I'm looking forward.
Total Number of Declarative Sentences		122	100	

Direct Imperatives

An imperative sentence has an understood subject '*You*' and the verb e.g. '*shut*' is in simplest form (Fraser, 1996). It can be used to give directions; orders e.g. '*Turn right at the corner*' / '*Shut the door'*. Direct Imperatives can also be used to make a polite request, when the word "please" is added e.g. '*Please, shut the door'*. In this study, of the total 520 instructions observed in 8 ELT classrooms, direct imperatives are the most commonly used structures performed by teachers accounting for 42% as illustrated in Table 4. Excerpts 1, 2 and 3 exemplify teachers' instructions which are in the form of direct imperative. See Appendix 1 for the rest of the direct imperatives samplings.

Table 6. Instructions in the form of 'Let's Imperatives'

Let's Imperatives	Sample Utterances	Tokens	%	Total Number Of Instructions
	Now let's go to part seven. Well, let me ask you this question. Let's go to our reading .Let's talk about part C. Now let's come to this one. Let's repeat every one.	59	11.34	520

Excerpt 1:

13 T: Any questions?
14 SS: No.
15 T: So, **go and connect the second part.**
[Students are doing the exercises and the class is silent for a few seconds].
16 T: I think you are finished?
17 SS: Yes.

In excerpt 1, the teacher provides an instruction (Turn no: 15) in the form of a direct imperative to guide the students towards doing the next exercise following the no response from the class. Also in the next excerpt (excerpt 2), the teacher tries to direct students to do a task through the instruction ('ok, come in part A') in order to do a classroom work more efficiently. part of the exercises ('And also part B…'), the teacher performs another instruction (Turn no: 148).

Excerpt 2:

148 T: **Ok, come to part A.** Read and answer to main or supporting idea. **Go on,** ok? And also part B. **Give the examples for each type.**
149 S: Teacher what is the supporting idea?
150 T: Supporting ideas and main idea. For example I say something and then I give examples for that to support my idea, that's supporting the idea.

Excerpt 3:

188 T: Number 3?
189 S: Forgetful.
190 T: Forgetful. **Part B, go and write the topics.**
191 S: Ironic.
192 T: Thank you, number 2?

Finally, the instruction shown in excerpt 3 is a common example of how the teacher makes a clear and sharp shift into a new task effectively by means of a statement in the form of a direct imperative.

Declaratives

The term 'declarative' is used in the grammatical classification of sentence types, and usually seen in contrast to imperative, interrogative, etc.

Table 7 Instructions as Questions

Types Of Questions	Sample Utterances	Tokens	%
Yes-No Questions (Elliptical Forms)	Really? No idea?	4	21.05
Modal Questions	Han couldn't find or didn't find? Can you say? Would you please match these sentences?	15	78.94
Total Number of Questions		19	100

It refers to verb forms or sentence clause types typically used in the expression of statements, e.g. "The man is walking" (Crystal, 1997, p. 104).

However, declaratives also have a different value in classroom contexts since they may be preferred by teachers in order to make polite attempts to get their students to do something (Holmes, 1992). Similarly, the participant teachers in the study tend to use instructions in the form of declaratives to address their students in a polite way and the results indicate that almost ¼ of the teachers' instructions (23 %) were realized in the form of 'declarative' sentence types as illustrated in Table 5. The second most frequently performed category in teachers' oral instructions which constitutes 'declaratives' have also been classified according to declarative sentence types set up in this work (see Table 5).

Table 8. Teachers' Instructions Regarding 'Quality'

Categories Regarding 'Quality'	Tokens	%
Positive Instructions	491	94.42
Negative Instructions	29	5.57
Total	520	100

As it is seen in Table 5, instructions on different forms of declarative sentence types used by teachers demonstrate that teachers mostly preferred statements in several tense forms: 'be going to'(28 %), 'present simple'(20 %), 'will' (19 %) and 'present continuous' (6 %) in order to express their demands to their students. These instructions generally conveyed teachers' informing about an upcoming action which the teacher(s) expect students to take. Mostly used other declarative types which constitute the modal forms, such as; 'have to', 'should', 'can' and 'need to' also reach a high proportion (24 %). Excerpts 4, 5 and 6 represent teachers' choice about using declarative sentences. The rest of the instructions in the form of 'declarative' in the data may be seen in Appendix 1.

Table.9 Teachers' Instructions Regarding 'Content'

Categories Regarding 'Content'	Tokens	%
Task-related	505	97.11
Non-task	15	2.97
Total of Instructions	520	100

Excerpt 4:

257 T: **Today we are going to study page nine** as in terminal program is obvious, but I want to make this a little nine and nine and half, to make it better.
258 S: Teacher good news! I can't come Friday.
259 T: So bad news!

The teacher explains what he wants to do in that session through an instruction in the form of a declarative statement, including 'be going to' to signal obligation in excerpt 4 above.

Excerpt 5:

415 T: You didn't find the meaning in the dictionary? Why?
418 SS: We couldn't find it.
419 T: Really? Can I find it for you in your dictionary?
420 S: Yes.
421 T: Han couldn't find or didn't find? (Students are laughing).
422 T: **You have to find it yourself.**
423 S: Teacher at home I will find.

Besides excerpt 4, the teacher's declarative statement in turn 422 in excerpt 5 is an obligation for students to find new words from the dictionary.

Table.10 Teachers' Instructions Regarding 'Recipient'

Recipient Categories	Tokens	%
Whole Class	435	83.65
Individual	78	15
Pair	7	1.34
Group	-	-
Total	520	100

Excerpt 6:

597 T: So, talk about your ideas. Do you have any idea what it is? Brainstorming, what does it mean?
598 S: An idea.
599 T: Yes, **you write your ideas down,** ok? **You find some ideas,** for example **you are going to talk about should have (pp),** ok. Then **I will give you some situations,** for example I had an exam, I didn't study; now I've failed. Ok?

4.2.3. Elliptical Statements

Halliday (1985) defines ellipsis as "substitution by zero". Traditionally, items which undergo ellipsis are often described as understood elements. Ellipsis is very common within the sentence, but intersententially it is more frequent in spoken than in writing text. For example, in the following sentence the verb phrase has not been used for the second time considering that the meaning is understood.

"This party is criticized for its lack of practicality, and that party [ ] for its lack of humanity." (Bloor, 1988, p. 7) is criticized.

Table.11 Teachers' Instructions as Classroom Acts

Classroom Act Types	Tokens	%
Directive	437	84.03
Prompt	49	9.42
Clue	34	6.53
Total Number of Teachers' Instructions	520	100

Sometimes we do not even need to provide a substitute for a word or phrase which has already been said. We can simply omit it, and know that the missing part can be reconstructed quite successfully. Instead of answering Would you like a glass of beer? With Yes, I would like a glass of beer. We can just say Yes I would. Knowing that like a glass of beer will be understood. Or if someone says What are you doing? We can just answer Eating a mango. Instead I am eating a mango. Because we know that I am is understood and does not have to be said. Omitting part of sentences on the assumption that an earlier sentence or the context will make the meaning clear is known as an ellipsis (Cook, 1989).

Coulthard and Montgomery (1981) also define these elliptical items as 'moodless' items which also relate to the category identified in this study. While analyzing the syntactic forms of teachers' oral instructions, apart from four structures –direct imperatives, let's imperatives, questions and declaratives- , another structure has emerged from the data accounting for 20 % (see Table 4.) and it has been labeled as 'elliptical forms'. Excerpts 7, 8 and 9 below illustrate teachers' instructions on elliptical forms.

Table.12 Teachers' Instructions as Speech Acts

Sub-Categories of "Directive"	Tokens	%
Commanding	269	51.73
Suggesting	118	22.69
Urging	68	13.07
Requesting	43	8.26
Warning	16	3.07
Forbidding	6	1.15
Total number of instructions	520	100

Excerpt 7:

179 T: Which page?
180 S: 57, 58.
181 S: 57.
182 T: **So, Exercise five from 56**.
183 S: Yes, 56.
The teacher asks about the page they want to review by means of elliptical statement dropping the 'come to' compliment from the sentence.

Excerpt 8:

633 T: So, let's go to part B. Listen again. Are these statements true or false? Check the correct answer as you are listening.
634 T: All right, so number 1, Pouya please read number 1.
635 S: [Student is reading number 1].
636 T: Very good. **Mohammd, next one.** (Mohammad read next one).
'Next one' appears to be ordering Mohammad to read the next exercise and it drops the verb compliment from the sentence.

Excerpt 9:

422 T: You have to find it yourself.
423 S: Teacher at home I will find.
424 T: **At home no, here in the class** (You should find it).
425 S: Here … (Unclear speaking for the researcher).
426 T: I give you time, you say I don't have time. I Give time for you to find. Check it again yourself, please.
Unlike excerpts 7 and 8, this last excerpt (excerpt 9) involves a warning made by the teacher's use of an instruction in the elliptical form, dropping the verb phrase. The reasons for using oral instructions in elliptical forms may be the concern that the teachers want to use time efficiently and generally they use to apply this kind of elliptical forms. The rest of the instructions which are in the form of elliptical forms and what kind of tasks or parts they generally point can be seen in Appendix 1 (part e.).

4.2.4. Let's Imperatives

Let's imperatives are statements to make suggestions to the addressee or addressees (Fraser, 1996) and in classroom teachers seem to create an in-group identity, thus a more friendly atmosphere in the classrooms by using 'let's imperatives'. Let's imperatives which enable the speaker to make suggestions to perform a mutual action with the hearer were also detected in cases in our data.
Out of 520 teachers' oral instructions, 11% comprised 'let's imperatives (see Table 4.). Instructions in the form of 'let's imperatives' are seen in excerpts 10 and 11 below (also see the rest of the samples in Table 6).

Excerpt 10:

509 T: Now **let's see in part B,** what should each person do differently in the future? For example for the number one, for the girl let's say. Or what about this trendy outfit?
510 S: Yes, somehow exaggerated the matter.
511 T: So, what about the others? No, he has gone so far. Let's say stretch the truth. You say the truth but you extend the truth more. What should he do in the future? For the Japan?
512 S: Pay less.
513 T: Pay less, ahan.

Excerpt 11:

758 S: Finished teacher.
759 T: Very good. **Let's talk.** Talk to the class.
760 S: Sir they said that there is one word.
761 T: No, all right **everyone let's go to part four**, collocations for change. What is the meaning of collocation everyone?
762 S: You have… (Teacher interrupts him)
763 T: Collocation, can you say Hamed? The meaning of collocation?
764 S: As I … .

Questions

Questions are used to ask for information by using a question word (Fraser, 1996). A question is an expression of inquiry that invites or calls for a reply. However, in some cases, the speaker's intention in posing the question may not be to elicit a yes/no answer, but to elicit a certain action or non-verbal behavior. For instance, Thomas (1987) tells how she asked a Russian student to read by saying "Would you like to read?" and the student replied "No!" The student had misinterpreted the teacher's question as a request for information rather than understanding it as a polite instruction to read.
As it is seen in the above example, grammatical forms do not generally correspond to communicative intent. Interpretations of these forms can be derived from the culturally understood the rights and obligations of classroom participants. In this study, it has been noticed that teachers use a great number of questions during the lessons. These questions include 'yes-no questions' and 'Wh-questions'. However, our concern with the questions in this study is limited to instructions provided in the form of a question. Therefore, 'yes-no questions' and 'Wh-questions' are not analyzed because they require the students' verbal responses which oblige the addressees to produce an answer (Gomez, 2000). This type of verbal behavior is also identified as an 'elicitation' in Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) taxonomy, which is characterized by a request for a verbal response only. In contrary to this, when a student is given an instruction, s/he is expected to comply with that required behavior rather than verbal responding.
While analyzing teachers' oral instructions which are in the forms of questions, types of the questions have also been revealed out by examining the structures of those questions performed by teachers. Two types of questions have been found out by searching teachers' instructions and these are : 'modal questions' such as 'would', 'can', 'could', 'shall' and 'yes-no questions' (see Table 7.). Expect modal questions, the only two cases of question forms are also observed to be elliptical in form. ELT teachers at the Foreign Language Center in Pardisan have used thirty one instruction in the form of questions and the distribution of question types is as follows in Table 7.

In addition to the types of the questions, the results of the data analysis showed that out of 520 teachers' oral instructions, teachers performed 5% of all the instructions in the form of questions in order to make the students comply with the required behaviors (see Table 4). In the following excerpts (excerpts 12, 13 and 14), the teachers state their demands and expect their students to comply for the actions to take by using the instructions in the form of questions. None of these questions are aimed to elicit an answer, but to elicit an action or to provide compliance.

Excerpt 12:

925 T: **Ok, Would you please listen to these and check the one which is correct?** [The class is listening to a tape recording].
926 T: Which one? What's wrong with it?
927 SS: B, it doesn't have any case.
The teacher asks the student to listen to a conversation; she does not expect a no response. Although her utterance is in the form of a 'question'; it is just a directive for students to comply for the required response. Additionally, a sentence adverb, namely 'please' which functions as a marker of politeness is used.

Excerpt 13:

660 T**: Can I go to another part? (**Let's explain the other part).
661 SS: Yes.
662 T: Should have is followed by a past participant. But it has different meanings, if you remember, should have and would have in the previous semester; this is talking about the regret.
As in excerpt 12, excerpt 13 also underlines that the teacher neither wants permission nor asks a question; she just tries to make them ready for the following tasks.

Excerpt 14:

1420 T: **Can you match it?** I see only three or four of you. Ok, let's see A, what is A, in your idea? What is it?
1421 SS: Cream…
1422 T: Ahan, made of cream cheese?
1423 SS: Yes.
The instruction in the question form used in excerpt 14 is a polite and indirect way of the teacher's demand of the students. The teacher wants the students to listen to the conversation on the tape. Edwards and Westgate (1994) comment that 'indirectness' are a very important feature of classroom talk because it softens the tone of teacher's control by giving commands, the form of questions (e.g. Are you listening?) or requests (e.g. Would you please…?) or statements (Someone is being very silly.).

Analysis Regarding 'Quality'

In this section of the study, teachers' instructions are classified into two classes as 'positive instructions' and 'negative instructions'**.** Positive instructions refer to the instructions which are phrased to prompt the student behavior (e.g. "Please sit down") (Atwater & Morris, 1988). On the other hand, negative instructions" denote to instructions which are phrased to suppress student behavior (e.g. "Stop running around the room" (Atwater & Morris, 1988)). The data of this study included various positive and negative instructions as seen in Excerpts 15 and 16 below (See also Table.8.).

a) Positive Instructions

The aim of the positive instruction is to prompt student behavior. Excerpts 15 and 16 illustrate a teachers' desire to create some positive behaviors in students. Of the 520 instructions, positive instructions account for %94 and this result may show that in adult classes, teachers prefer using positive instructions in order to create positive behavior in students rather than to suppress their students' behaviors which may end in students' failure.

Excerpt 15:

781 T: Very nice actually. Ok, let's go to part B. Here everyone, **you are going to use expressions with change to talk with your friend.** How would you react to these situations? **Ok, check it in your dictionaries.**
782 SS: ø
783 T: Can you guess actually?
784 S: Yes.
785 T: No, we don't know.

Excerpt 16:

823 T: It's very good actually to have a quiz. Do you resist or welcome change? **Read this part. Find the meaning of the new words. All right? Underline them. Then we're going to talk about the meanings, too.**
824 S: Teacher, we were going we done this part a few minutes ago, me and Hamed and Sahand.
825 T: So everyone, to cope [writing on the board] means to succeed in dealing with a difficult problem or situation, cope. **We are going to study one page.**

b) Negative Instructions

Negative instructions are used to suppress undesired behaviors of students' by teachers and in this study negative instruction were used less than positive ones. Out of 520 teachers' oral instructions, 29 were negative and the rest of them were positive. The following excerpts (17 and 18) signify the reasons for using negative instructions by teachers in ELT classes. For example in excerpt 17, the teacher has uttered the negative instruction (turn 424) to warn students from finding their new words at home. The teacher's discourse may represent a very indirect way of warning or it may be a direct warning.

Excerpt 17:

418 S: We couldn't find it.
419 T: Really? Can I find it for you in your dictionary? (Be careful)
420 S: Yes.
421 T: Han, couldn't find or didn't find? [Students are laughing].
422 T: You have to find it yourself.
423 S: Teacher at home I will find.
424 T: **At home no, here in the class** (You should find it in the classroom not at home; it suppresses students from finding the new words at home).
425 S: Here … (unclear speaking for the researcher).
426 T: I give you time, you say I don't have time. Give time for you to find (I give time). Check it again yourself, please.

Excerpt 18:

387 T: For example they say the Iran Mordad 1328 we had Reza Khan's chaos. One meaning of chaos is that one.
388 S: Teacher [illegible]?
389 T: No.

390 S: [illegible]
391 T: One meaning, ok. One meaning. The other meaning for example is something, everything is not let's say in its own place, very confused and unorganized state, you can call it chaos.
392 S: Here means [illegible]
393 T: کودتا in the house? How is it possible?
394 S: بوردا نمندی؟
395 T: This is a very confused … [Unclear speaking for the researcher]. **Don't write Persian; come on, in English please.** (Don't translate it into Persian!)

Results of the analysis regarding quality indicated that ELT teachers used positive instructions to prompt students' behavior and negative instructions to suppress students' behavior. High percentage of teachers' instructions (94 %) served for positive instructions in order to prompt the students' behavior, whereas low amount (6%) served for negative instructions in order to suppress the students' behavior. The reason of using low amount of negative instructions by teachers may be the students' being adults. If the students had been younger, the amount of using negative instructions by teachers might have increased or been somewhat different.

Analysis Regarding 'Content'

In this part, teachers' instructions are analyzed according to their content as 'task-related' and 'non-task' based on Atwater and Morris (1988). 'Task-related' instructions include instructions which guide students' performance of a task. On the other hand, 'non-task' instructions include teachers' phrases which direct general classroom behavior. The data analysis revealed that the teachers mostly used task-related instructions rather than non-task instructions as it is seen in Table 8 below. Out of 520 teachers' instructions, 505 were task-related and 15 were accounting only for the non-task.

a) Task-related Instructions

In the following excerpts (19 and 20), the aim of the teachers' instructions is to make the students to handle the activity or the task, rather than to control the classroom order. In brief, task-related instructions are fully related with the teaching process.

Excerpt 19:

351 T: Let's go to our reading, **read the reading part, please. Underline the new words.** [The students are reading the passage].
352 T: I'm going to write some of them on the board and try not to cheat from let's say these flash cards. **Put them in your bag.** [Students put the flash cards in their bags].
353 S: Teacher [illegible]

Excerpt 20:

456 T: **Let's talk about part C.** what do you think would be the best thing about living in this family, Erfan? You know what was the kind of family, yes?
457 S: No.
458 T: you didn't understand? Why? Pouya?
459 S: I didn't got.

b) Non-task Instructions

Non-task instructions involve managing students' behavior in the classroom rather than doing tasks or activities. In excerpt 21 below, the teacher warns the student to stop speaking in Turkish and the teacher's instruction is related with managing her class. In excerpt 22, the teacher states the student that they have studied it before and he could remember the word. None of the instructions in those excerpts are used for task–guiding.

Excerpt 21:

359 T: **I'll give you a negative ten point and you are going to buy ice cream for the class, next session.** [The mentioned student is speaking in Turkish]. Are you ready?
360 S: Close?
361 T: Where is it? Close neat house hold.

The instruction performed in this excerpt shows the teacher's concern about the disruptive student who were continuously speaking in Turkish during the task; therefore the aim of the instruction is to manage the control of the students and it is non-task.

Excerpt 22:

856 S: Teacher give me term program, I have lost it.
857 T: Okay, you can make a copy from your friends. **I will give you a new program that no where it happened.** (Teacher is angry at student for not writing his homework)
503 SS: [Students are laughing].

'I will give you' is also another non-task instruction since its aim is to inform the mentioned student that teacher is angry at him. The participant teachers of the study have performed task-related instructions with the percentage of 97, whereas they have used non-task instructions accounting for 3 %.

Analysis Regarding 'Recipient'

Recipient Analysis involves the identification of whether the teachers address their instructions to individuals, pairs, groups or the whole class. The results of the recipient analysis showed that the participant teachers employed their instructions to three target recipients: whole class (83%), individuals (15%), and pairs (1%). In addition to these determinations, it was observed that none of the instructions was addressed to a group or groups (-). Recipient categories of teachers' instructions and their distributions are seen in Table 10. below.

a) Instructions Addressing Individuals

It was observed that seventy seven instructions out of 520 teachers' instructions were addressed to individuals (15%). In examples 23 and 24 below, teachers addressed their instructions to individuals.

Excerpt 23:

131 T: I don't know your name.
132 S: Raana.
133 T: **Raana go on.**

Excerpt 24:

1407 T: Check your dictionary for pronunciation of this one. Hurry up. But you haven't it in your book. You didn't study. Is it bacon /baken/, /beken/, /booken/, what?
1408 S: Salt or smoked meat.
1409 T: Salt or smoked meat? Ahan, **read it.** (Teacher says to that student who finds the word in the dictionary to read the definition).
1410 S: Smoked pieces of meat from pig.

In both excerpts above the teacher is addressing different individuals to help them to do the task. Besides, the teacher tries to give clues to the students to find the targeted subject.

b) Instructions Addressing Pairs

In total data, only seven instructions were addressed to pairs implying that pair work activities were not generally held in these classes. The mentioned cases generally had the purpose of task assignment by issuing a let's imperative sentences (Excerpt 25 below).

Excerpt 25:

788 T: So, these four situations. **Let's talk with your friends two by two. Mohammad Reza and Amir, let's say you two, you two and you three.** [Students are doing the exercise with their partners].
789 T: All right, come about to other changes. Finished everyone? You read all of the changes?
790 SS: Yes, part six.

c) Instructions Addressing Groups

Results of the data analysis indicated that there were not any instructions addressing a group. It also indicated that group work activities were not employed by the teachers during the classes.

d) Instructions Addressing Whole Class

This part constitutes instructions directed to the whole class where teachers told students what to do for example in Excerpts 26 and 27. Results of the recipient analysis of instructions revealed that out of 520 teachers' instructions, 436 were addressed to whole class.

Excerpt 26:

544 T: Part four. Are the statements true or false? **Check the correct answer. Number one.**
545 S: False.
546 T: False, thank you. Amir Hossein next one.

Excerpt 27:

673 T: Now, **come to part A, page eleven**. **Look at the starting point on page ten again.** Can you find other examples of past modals and phrasal modals of obligation in part one?
674 S: Yes.
675 T: Read the sentence.

Teachers' Oral Instructions as 'Classroom Acts'

Since 'instruction' is defined as "a verbal statement in which teacher informs a child or group of children of an observable behavior to be performed" (Atwater & Morris, 1988, p.159), it directly matched and was realized in this study by three classroom acts 'directive', 'clue', 'prompt' which originally belong to Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) classroom act taxonomy. The data analysis revealed that 440 of 520 (84.61 %) teachers' instructions carried the directive function. Apart from the directive function, instructions had also two other acts: prompt and clue. Out of 520 instructions, 47 instructions accounted for 'prompt' and 33 instructions accounted for 'clue'. The acts and the results can be seen in Table 11. below. In addition, these three classroom acts are defined and exemplified with relevant excerpts one by one below.

Directive

A 'directive' is "an utterance whose purpose is to get other people to do something" (Crystal, 1997, p.117). Sinclair and Coulthard also define 'directive' as "any utterance requesting a non-linguistic response" (1975, p.28). Teachers' oral instructions which have the directive function are described in the following excerpts (Excerpts 28, 29 and 30).

Excerpt 28:

559 T: **Close the books, let's start.** With the books open it's meaningless to ask, you know. Amir Hossein, **close your book**. So, the meaning of humid?
560 S: Damp.
561 T: Yes, moisture.

Excerpt 29:

673 T: Now, **come to part A, page eleven**. **Look at the starting point on page ten again.** Can you find other examples of past modals and phrasal modals of obligation in part one?
674 S: Yes.
675 T: **Read the sentence.**

Excerpt 30:

595 T: Ok, **open your books to page thirty, please.** Again it is the writing session today, and brainstorming.
596 T: Ok, let's start with brainstorming and types of paragraphs. We have many types of essays and paragraphs. Ok, we can discuss them and also we want to see what brainstorming is?
597 T: **So, talk about your ideas.** Do you have any idea what it is? Brainstorming, what does it mean?
598 S: An idea.

All of the excerpts above (Excerpts 28, 29 and 30) show us the teachers' concern about managing and controlling the students' upcoming actions and compliance for the tasks.

Prompt

'Prompt' is one of the classroom acts which have been designed as a classroom talk taxonomy by Sinclair and Coulthard and 'prompts' are defined as "utterances which are always realized by commands suggesting that the teacher is not requesting, but expecting or demanding" (e.g. "go on", "come on" , "hurry up"…) (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p.38). Below, teachers' instructions which have the function of "prompt" might be seen in Excerpts 34, 35 and 36.

Excerpt 34:

612 T: You are free with your brainstorming, whatever comes to your mind, write it down. **Now let's do that.** (The teacher wants students to write their brainstorming; she expects them). [The students are writing].

Excerpt 35:

1051 T: Listen. These are some reading important words that you heard in this movie, ok? **We just talk about them quickly and pass to the other one.**
1052 T: What is controversy or controversial? Hmmm…
1053 S: Disagreement, discussion.

Excerpt 36:

1089 T: Listen. First read the culture part, **one of you come on.** (The teacher wants to complete this part as soon as possible).
1090 S: This part?
1091 T: Yes. (The student reads the culture part).

The common aim of the three prompts performed by teachers above was to reinforce the students to do the tasks which were already required a few times.

Clue

"Clue is a statement, question, command, or moodless item; subordinate to the head of the initiation, which provides additional information to help the pupils answer the elicitation or comply with the directive" (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p.38). Apart from directives, teachers' instructions may also be realized as 'clues' regarding classroom acts. Teachers' instructions serving for clues might be seen in the following excerpts (Excerpts 31, 32 and 33).

Excerpt 31:

682 S: I want to practice reading.
683 T: **Step by step go up**. **You just buy a novel which has the simple story.**

Excerpt 32:

1097 T: Appointed means?
1098 SS: ø
1099 T: **When you appoint something, you?** (A student points to the board). No that's pointing.
1100 S: Choosing.
1101 T: Ahan, appoint means choosing. What is appointment? You know it.
1102 SS: Meeting.

Excerpt 33:

1451 T: Let's see, ahan, the next one. What's it?
1452 SS: ø
1453 T: **An English?**
1454 S: Cold cereal?
1455 T: An English muffin.
1456 SS: An English muffin.

In all of the above experts, students are silent while teacher expects them to respond; in this case teacher guides them with a clue so that the context and the content of the exchange reveal that they are instructions which have the function of clue. Because through these clues, the teachers provide additional information to the student(s) to help them think, find the correct answers and do the tasks successfully. In all these three cases, the teachers are giving clues to their students by their instructions in order to make them find the right idea and to do the exercise correctly.

Teachers' Oral Instructions as Speech Acts

According to Searle's Speech Act Taxonomy, utterances carry one of five main acts, namely: 'representative', 'directive', 'commissive', 'expressive' and 'declarative'. Searle employed a great number of sub-categories for these speech acts e.g. 'Representative' speech act includes the acts of asserting, concluding and claiming. 'Directive' includes the acts of ordering, begging, commanding, requesting, warning, urging, forbidding… etc. 'Commissive' includes promising, vowing, pledging, and alliance. 'Expressive' includes thanking, apologizing, congratulating and condoling. 'Declarative' includes declaring peace, christening a baby, firing an employee and so on.

The definition of 'instruction' only corresponds to one of the main speech act categories 'directive'; however a great number of directive's sub-categories put forward by Searle has shed light to teachers' instructions by revealing their speech act functions. Results of the data analysis have implied that teachers' oral instructions carry the sub-category acts of the main category 'directive', namely 'commanding' (51%), 'suggesting'(22%) , 'urging' (13%), 'requesting'(8%) , 'warning' (3%) and 'forbidding'(1%)(See Table 12).

The following examples from the data (Excerpts 37–50) illustrate a series of speech act functions which are realized through the participant teachers' use of oral instructions.

Commanding

Commanding is the act of "ordering with authority" (Vanderveken, 1990, p.194). In this study, teachers' oral instructions were also examined regarding speech act functions and among several speech act functions, teachers' instructions had only one to one correspondence with 'directive' speech act. Directives had a variety of sub-categories and commanding was one of the speech act functions which teachers' oral instructions carried in this study. According to the results of the data analysis, 269 of 520 teachers' oral instructions (52%) carried the act of commanding (see Table 12). Teachers' instructions which carried the speech act function of 'commanding' are given in the following excerpts (Excerpts 37, 38 and 39). In excerpts 37, 38 and 39, teachers give instructions functioning as commands.

Excerpt 37:

364 S: Teacher, what's the meaning of orphan?
365 T: Where is your dictionary?
366 S: چک الیجاخ دا .
367 T: Ok, **check it.** No, all of them are not going to solve. So if I was going to say all of them, why dictionary? **Check it yourself.**
368 SS: ø.

Excerpt 38:

525 T: **Now Mr. Rezaei, read the diary and underline noun clauses.**
526 S: (Student id reading the diary part). [This part is unclear for the researcher to transcribe].
527 T: Exactly, perfect.

Excerpt 39:

602 T: **Now look at part A,** Brainstorm as many ideas as you can to add to the example below. **Ok, look.** Living on a tight budget, what does it mean?
603 S: Few money.

Suggesting

Suggesting is the act of "bringing up an idea through the reminding of something connected or related with it" (Vanderveken, 1990, p.196). The results of the analysis concerning speech act categories by which teachers' oral instructions were realized showed that 118 of 520 (22%) instructions conveyed the suggesting act. After 'commanding', 'suggesting' was one of the most realized speech act category through instructions.

Excerpt 45:

597 T: So, talk about your ideas. Do you have any idea what it is? Brainstorming, what does it mean?
598 S: An idea.
599 T: Yes, **you write your ideas down**, ok? **You find some ideas,** for example you are going to talk about should have (pp), ok? **Then I will give you some situations,** for example I had an exam, I didn't study; now I have failed. Ok? Then you think about it. It's called brainstorming.

Excerpt 46:

600 T: **Then you can use this list to come up with a topic sentence and ideas to support it,** ok?

Urging

'Urging' is similar to 'prompt' which is a category of classroom acts and has also been used as a category for instructions in this study in part 4.5. in the sense that it is a speech act by which "the speaker demands something from the hearer, further the speaker insists on the hearer to do something" (Vanderveken, 1990, p.195). In this study, it has been observed that the participant teachers urged their students about the tasks and out of 520 instructions, 68 of them (13%) carried the urging act (see Table 12). In the following excerpts (43 and 44), teachers insist on making the students participate in the lesson or for the tasks.

Excerpt 43:

642 T: **You have to listen**; this is one tactic, oh yea. Listen carefully, Mohammad.
643 S: I made a terrible …. Ø.
644 T: I made a terrible decision just the other they. **Listen again.** He talks a little fast. **So try to pay attention**. (The teacher urges the students to draw attention to the task for the second time and listen carefully).
645 SS: ø

Excerpt 44:

756 T: Ok, let's do two and three. Talk with your friends and share your answers.
757 T: **Try to talk.** [Students are asking questions from each other].
758 S: Finished teacher.
759 T: Very good. Let's talk. Talk to the class**.** (The teacher insists on students to talk together and lastly to the class in order to learn the answers.)

Requesting

A request expresses "a desire for the addressee to do a certain thing and normally aims for the addressee to intend to, and actually do that thing" (Vanderveken, 1990, p.194). In excerpts 40, 41 and 42, teachers requested the students to do the tasks and to focus on the task. Like the forms seen in excerpts 41 sampling, Searle (1979) suggests that 'can you', 'could you', 'I want you to' and numerous other forms are conventional ways of making requests.

Excerpt 40:

203 T: **Ok, I want you read this part.** Go on my lovely chef.
204 S: (The students begin to read some sentences).
205 T: Ok, that's for all of the girls, **please, listen carefully.**

Excerpt 41:

583 T: Can I say for example cause a mistake?
584 S: No, make a … (Teacher interrupts her)
585 T: Make a mistake or prevent, ok? **And can you please come up with other collocations?**

Excerpt 42:

628 T: We are going to listen to Frank. What was his decision? And why was it the bad decision? First go through part A, then part B. **Listen everyone, please.** [They are listening to a conversation in a tape].
629 T: So, what's the problem we can say?
630 S: Take care of pet.

Warning

"To warn someone to do something is to suggest that s/he do it, while presupposing that it would be bad for him/her not to do it" (Vanderveken, 1990, p.197). One of the speech act categories which was also realized by teachers' instructions in this study was 'warning'. Unlike the other categories, the speech act of warning was one of the two least realized categories through teachers' instructions (3%). The reason of teachers' using warning statements less for controlling the class than the other categories might be the level of the classes. On the other hand, teachers seem to use the warning act in order to lead the students to the correct task and to organize the flow of the task (excerpts 47 and 48). Out of 520 instructions, only 16 of them conveyed the warning speech act (see Table 12).

Excerpt 47:

352 T: I'm going to write some of them on the board. **And try not to cheat from let's say these flash cards.**
353 T: Put them in your bag.
354 S: Teacher *ậ Θcẫ ч DịŽ.*

Excerpt 48:

355 T: And English to Persian, **do not use never ever. Try not to use them, English to Persian.**
356 S: Teacher dictionary *ч ŭ Ỳ ậ ă Ỳ ŭ J?*
357 T: English to English dictionary.

Excerpt 49:

358 T: You are speaking in Turkish? (Teacher asks the question with a warning tone).
359 S: No, I write in English sentences.
360 T: **If you speak in Turkish, I'll give you a negative ten point and you are going to buy ice cream for the class next session.**

Forbidding

"To forbid a hearer to do something, is just to order him not to do it" (Vanderveken, 1990, p.195). According to the results of the data analysis, 'forbidding' is one of the speech act categories which an instruction can also convey and it was the least realized (1.15 %) speech act category in this study (see Table 12). Out of 520 teachers' instructions, only 6 carried the act of forbidding. In the following excerpt, the teacher forbids the students to speak in their native language since one of the aims of those lessons is to make students to state themselves in the target language.

Excerpt 50:

618 S: What's the meaning of tradition in Persian?
619 T: I can't say in Persian, you are going to find it in Persian. Just I can help you in English; you can guess it in Persian. That is tradition (Teacher helps the student with the pronunciation of the word), tradition, you say traditional.
620 S: سنتی .
621 T: **Ok, try not to say it in Persian.** (Teacher forbids him to speak in his native language).
The Speech Act Analysis of the data implied that out of 520 teachers' instructions, 269 carried the function of "commanding" , 118 instructions accounting for ' suggesting' function, 68 served as ' urging' function,43 had the 'requesting' function, 16 instructions embodied 'warning'

function and lastly only 6 instruction served for 'forbidding' speech act.(See Table 12)

Evaluation of the Research Questions

Research question 1: What are the syntactic forms of teachers' oral instructions?

The analysis of the data showed that teachers' oral instructions were performed in five different types of syntactic forms, namely 'direct imperatives', 'declaratives', 'elliptical forms', 'questions' and 'let's imperatives'. Among these, the most frequent syntactic form usage was 'direct imperatives' (42%). The second frequent type, on the other hand, was 'declaratives' with the percentage of 23%. The analysis showed that the usage of other three forms was less frequent: elliptical forms 20%, let's imperatives 11% and questions 5%.

To specify the results, the high frequency of teachers' preference in employing direct imperatives seems to reflect the teachers' authoritative standing and (i.e. dominance over the students). Holmes (1992) suggests that teachers use very direct expressions of their meaning because of their high status relative to their students and she adds "where status differences are clearly marked and accepted, superiors tend to use imperatives to subordinates" (p.291). However, we suggest that "direct imperatives" might were preferred for the sake of clarity and time efficiency.

As the second category declaratives, they may be indirect means of providing instructions as the teacher describes a specific context from which students are expected to deduce the implied instructions. For example: "I'll give you a negative ten point and you are going to buy ice cream for the class, next session" (If you continue speaking in Turkish) (Turn no: 360). Issuing this instruction, the teacher warns the students directly and the students deduce the real meaning and stop speaking in Turkish language. Apart from this reason, there may be several reasons in issuing instructions in the form of declaratives, such as in order to give detailed information to students about the tasks; in order to make them succeed such as in the following example in our data: "You can use this list to come up with a topic sentence and ideas to support it" (Turn no: 600). Other reason for using instructions in the form of declaratives may be the intention of signaling the expectation of the teacher about the tasks from all of her students. For example: "For next session I want this listening, all of them on paper" (Turn no: 640).

As the third category elliptical form detected in this study may shows that teachers tend to use the time more efficiently by means of utilizing word-economy in their sentences (instructions). According to Holmes (1992), teachers can use minimally explicit forms and be confident in their relationships with their students.

Regarding the requests realized in the form of questions (Can you…?) constituted a small proportion of instructions in this study. It might be due to power asymmetries between the teacher and the students where the teacher does not need to choose the conventional ways of polite forms.

Finally, the let's imperatives as the last category examined in this section implied an in-group identity or "we" message constituted the smallest portion of the instructions. This finding also reflects that there was a low level of asymmetrical relationship and it may seem that teachers kept a social distance between them and their students. As also stated by Holmes (1992), the choice of using different forms of instructions depend on their relative power or status and social distance.

***Research Question 2*:** What types of behaviors are aimed in students as response to the teachers' oral instructions?

Considering types of behaviors which were aimed through teachers' oral instructions, the analysis revealed out that there were two main aims:

1) To prompt students' behaviors
2) To suppress students' behaviors

Following Atwater's (1988) classification in this study, the instructions used to prompt students' behaviors are referred at as 'positive' while the ones used to suppress students' behaviors are named as 'negative' instructions. Analyzing the data, 491 positive instructions (94%) were determined out of 520 total teachers' oral instructions. The other five (5%) were negative instructions. The reason for the dominance of positive instructions may be participant teachers in the study teach adult classes where their objectives in giving instructions, are generally task-related. That is teachers generally give instructions to get non-verbal reactions or compliance for the tasks rather than to carry out non-task issues.

Research Question 3: What kind of pedagogical functions do teachers' instructions carry?

The data was also analyzed to find out the teachers' aims for giving instructions and pedagogical functions that those instructions may carry. Firstly, the results indicated that 97% of instructions were task-related whereas 2% of them were non task. The reason of using high proportion of task-related instructions may be that students were adults who might not need to receive non-task instructions, such as; warning the class to be quiet... which younger students need more frequently.

Regarding pedagogical functions of the teachers' instructions in this study, a variety of purposes in using instructions were observed:

a) To signal transitions between tasks, i.e. to start, to continue or to end a task.
   - For example: "Okay, everyone please open your books". (Turn no: 622)
   - "First go through part A, then part B". (Turn no: 628)
   - "Close your books. That's enough". (Turn no: 1389)
b) To provide clues or further explanations for the students about the tasks.
   - For example: "The answers at the end of the book are for checking not copying. (Turn no: 522)
   - "Then you think about it". (Turn no: 600)
   - "It shouldn't be too specific, nor too general". (Turn no: 616)
c) To direct/to control the students' misbehavior and general class behavior.
   - For example: "Try not to say it in Persian". (Turn no: 621)
   - "If you say wrong, you are going to lose your class part". (Turn no: 641)
d) To give messages in a clear way.
   - For example: "Listen again". (Turn no: 633)
   - "Look at the starting point on page ten again". (Turn no: 673)

e) To express obligations or principles in handling tasks.
   - For example: "Try not to use them, English to Persian". (Turn no: 355)
   - "Don't write the forms which are written here". (Turn no: 680)

f) To monitor and guide the manner of students.
   - For example: "Now go on Mahsa". (Turn no: 221)
   - "Hurry up!" (Turn no: 1561).

Research Question 4: To whom are the teachers' oral instructions addressed?

Regarding the addressee(s) of the teachers' oral instructions, the analysis indicated three main target populations: whole class, pairs and individual. The most frequent one was the whole class instructions with 83%, 14 % of them were directed to individuals and only 1% was for pairs. However, there was no instruction targeted towards groups. Since the teachers were usually tutoring the whole class and were rarely having individual activities, they mainly used whole class instructions. In the lessons observed there was no group activity.

Research Question 5: What kinds of classroom acts do teachers' instructions convey?

Analyzing the data in regard to classroom acts, three types of acts were observed in the study among the classroom acts determined by Sinclair & Coulthard (1975): 'directives', 'prompts' and 'clues'. Although these three categories have different labels, they seem to complement each other. Through instructions, the most frequently used speech act type was 'directives' with the percentage of 84%. Prompts (9%) and clues (6%) were far less frequent ones.

As the first classroom act category, which was realized mostly by issuing instructions in this study, namely 'directive' is "an act the function of which is to request a non-linguistic response is simply an acknowledgement that one is listening" (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, 28). Parallel to its definition, there may be several intentions of teachers' in posing the directives, such as; mainly to direct the class nonverbal behavior which include introducing the subjects, making the students focus on the tasks, describing the steps of the tasks clearly and impeding the students' misbehavior. Regarding the results of the study, teachers' high preference of directives may be due to their concern about using the limited classroom time more efficiently and be sure about giving the messages in a very clear way that students can comprehend the tasks easily.

Although the other two classroom act categories 'prompt' and 'clue' are different individual acts rather than directives, both of them supplement the compliance with the directives. 'Prompt' reinforces the directives and in our study the instructions which convey the act of 'prompt' seem to be used to encourage the students to do the tasks. In addition, this act seems to provide psychological and motivational support to the students.

As the last classroom act category, 'clue' which was also revealed in performing instructions seem to facilitate and support the performance of students' efforts to the targeted behavior.

Research Question 6: What kind of speech acts do teachers' instructions convey?

As for the speech acts, teachers' instructions conveyed six types of speech acts. These were commanding (52%), suggesting (22%), urging (13%), requesting (7%), warning (3%) and forbidding (1%). In fact, speech acts are also types of verbal acts like classroom acts. However, they are not constrained by the classroom situation. However, while the classroom acts are defined in terms of classroom objectives, speech acts bear the illocutionary force in a wider social and psychological context.

To specify, teachers in our study preferred 'commanding' which was the most straightforward type of directive with the highest frequency. This type of speech act not only helps the teacher provide clear-cut instructions, but also reflects the power asymmetries which signify the central role of the teacher.

'Urging' and 'suggesting' were the other speech act types employed by issuing instructions. Both of them are directives; however the former member is presented with more strength than the latter. The participant teachers seem to employ urging and suggesting in order to encourage the students to do the tasks and foster their thinking.

Another speech act type is requesting. The function of requesting is to express someone's demand from the other people and it is a marker of politeness. Little usage of requests by the teachers in the study seems to indicate power asymmetries between teachers and students again.

The last two classroom act categories 'warning' and 'forbidding' were the least realized acts through instructions. This result may be due to the students' being adults, so that teachers do not need to warn the students or forbid some behaviors most of the time.

DISCUSSION

Despite the great interest in the general nature of teacher talk, some aspects of teacher talk have received relatively less attention. One of these patterns is teachers' oral instructions. Using the definition of Atwater and Morris (1988), instruction is "a form of communicated information that is both command and explanation for how an action, behavior, method or task is to be begun, completed or executed" (p.159) . Emphasizing the importance of instructions performed by teachers, Jones (1987) suggests that in order to prevent confusion and performance anxiety, teachers should give clear and simple instructions to students and adds: "Simplicity serves clarity, clarity serves learning" (p.50) to highlight the vital role of instructions in the classroom activities.

There are only a small number of studies which directly focus on teachers' instructions. Among these studies, Atwater and Morris (1988) collected naturalistic data on preschool teachers' instructions and children's compliance and the context of instructional events in preschool classrooms. They made a descriptive analysis of many variables related to instruction rate and compliance probability. First of all, Atwater & Morris obtained data on teachers' instructions to children from preschool and early elementary classrooms. Instructions were classified as 'syntax', 'recipient', 'content' and 'quality'. Differences in the form and frequency of teachers' instructions were compared across activities within preschool classrooms and across three grade levels. After analyzing the whole data according to these instruction types, Atwater and Morris (1988) inferred that direct imperatives were used most frequently by every teacher, accounting for over half the instructions recorded; most instructions were directed specifically to individual children rather than to groups of two or more. In addition, teachers were more likely

to use positive instructions to prompt child behavior than negative instructions to suppress behavior. Of all the instructions used by the teachers, 67% were direct imperatives, 94% were positive in quality, 57% were task related, and 62% were directed to the child individually. Primary concern of two mentioned studies above is to describe the forms of teachers' instructions and their relation to students' behavior. Their focus did not involve discourse functions or classroom acts of teachers' instructions.

Investigating the functions of teacher talk has also been an interesting subject in this area. For instance, Ramirez (1986) analyzed the pedagogical functions of 'explaining', 'questioning', 'modeling', 'feedback' and others. They found an order of dominance across program and grade levels, although commands were significantly different across program types (Chaudron, 1988). Results showed that the pedagogical functions across all programs and teachers involved 'explaining' (23, 7 %), 'questioning' (17, 6 %) and 'commands' (15, 8 %) out of the total teacher talk in the study.

Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

Conclusion

This study mainly focused on investigating and describing the forms, classroom act functions and speech act functions of ELT teachers' oral instructions in Pardisan Foreign

Language Center. In order to obtain the data for this study, eight female and male instructors teaching English for intermediate level classes were tape-recorded during their 90-minute lessons. After transcribing the data, all the instructions performed by the teachers were analyzed regarding their forms and functions. 'Form' is concerned with syntactic structure up to the sentence level, whereas 'function' is concerned with the utterances' purpose (i.e. what the utterance is meant to achieve) (Scott, 2002). In order to analyze the forms of the teachers' oral instructions, categories put forward by Atwater and Morris (1988); namely 'syntax', 'content', 'quality' and ' recipient' were used. Besides, sub-categories of the mentioned categories were also applied. Sub-categories used for the analysis of 'syntax' in this study are 'direct imperatives', 'declaratives', 'questions' and 'let's imperatives'. Since another form was identified in the data, namely 'elliptical form', it was also added to the analysis of syntax. In the 'content' analysis part, teachers' oral instructions were examined according to two subcategories: 'task-related instructions' and 'non-task instructions'. This part aims to reveal the kinds of purposes that teachers' instructions serve for and consequently pedagogical functions realized through these instructions. 'Quality' which constitutes one part of the analysis of the study has two subcategories; namely 'positive instructions' and 'negative instructions'. The reason of analyzing teachers' oral instructions regarding 'quality' is to bring out the types of behaviors aimed to perform by students through teachers' instructions. Apart from those categories, recipients of teachers' oral instructions were also examined. The sub-categories of recipients were coded as 'whole class', 'individuals', 'pair' and 'group'. In order to reveal the functions of teachers' oral instructions, classroom acts put forward by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and speech act categories put forward by Searle (1975) were used.

Furthermore, when the class-work was limited to a textbook, it was observed that negotiation of meaning was reduced to zero when doing the structural- formalistic exercises of the book. However, when there was, say, warm-up discussions at the sessions, learners were more interested in talking and initiating.

This study attempted to present a thorough analysis of the form and function of teachers' oral instructions in ELT classes of adult students. Regarding the 'form', teachers mostly performed instructions in 'direct imperatives' and 'declaratives'. Following these structures, mostly preferred forms were 'elliptical statements', 'questions' and 'let's imperatives'. The second category, namely 'quality' (positive and negative instructions) analysis showed that teachers mostly employed positive instructions to their students rather than negative ones; this can be because of the reason that the students' population was adults so that they do not need to be addressed by so many non-task instructions. As the third category, 'content' of instructions reveals aims and pedagogical functions. They may be divided into two main categories: task-related and non-task. Task-related instructions serve for signaling transitions between tasks, providing clues or further explanations for the students about the tasks, giving messages in a clear way, expressing obligations or principles in handling tasks and monitoring the tasks. On the other hand, non-task instructions serve for directing the students' misbehavior and general classroom behavior. Regarding the 'recipients' of teachers' instructions, teachers mostly addressed to the whole class. The results may show that group and pair works were not held in those classes.

From the functional aspect of view, teachers' oral instructions conveyed a few classroom acts: directive, prompt, clue. Except classroom acts, speech acts which were realized in issuing instructions were: commanding, requesting, urging, suggesting, warning and forbidding. All of these classroom acts and speech acts underlie the roles and the concerns of the teachers in the classes: to direct the class, to make the lessons flow clearly, to foster students' thinking, to give clear-cut messages and to control students' misbehavior.

Pedagogical Implications

Language classroom discourse is a very spontaneously evolving, dynamic, and complicated phenomenon. Pedagogic discourse is characterized by transmission, reception and practice of teaching/learning points where the focus is on knowledge as a product and on accuracy.

The researcher collected the data from eight classes by audio-recording system. The application of more directive statements by the teachers prepared very useful and interesting results for the researcher. Researcher and language teachers should bear in mind that classroom discourse is cooperative in which the teacher and learners cooperate and negotiate with each other in achieving certain instructional goals in the classroom. However, we can encourage natural discourse in the language classroom by making the roles much smoother through interaction, equal participation in the negotiation of meaning through various tasks and thus shifting the focus on the interactional process itself.

Using directives (instructions) and performing speech acts in teacher talk in language teaching classrooms may provide several benefits on the part of teachers and students. First and the most important one is students' acquisition of the target language since directives (instructions) and speech acts are two of the Ellis's eight conditions which suggest that

performing a high quantity of directives and a range of speech acts are central for language acquisition (Ellis, 1984). According to these conditions, students being exposed to variety of directives and speech acts usage performed by the teachers; students model these structures and use them easily.

The clear and meaningful input is the key point in language teaching and learning. In this sense, instructions are one of the tools to give the input in a clear, simple, meaningful way to the learners. Without giving the input clearly, students' acquisition of the language can be hindered.

In respect to these, further studies investigating the types of instructions may provide educators with insight regarding the choice of instructions in the teaching process that are most effective (clear and comprehensible) on students in the process of language learning. Also trying to determine any possible correlation between students' ages and the types of instructions may lead into an improvement in language teaching curriculum.

The results of the study may be shared with the novice teachers and may shed light on their choice of using some structures in their talk while addressing to their learners. In addition all the assessments compiled from this study and the similar studies, may be given in in-service trainings.

Suggestions for Further Research

Through the present study, several questions sparkled to the researcher which seem valuable to be investigated:

1. Does different sex give different results?
2. Does different age and experience of teachers' affect classroom discourse?
3. Does these questions work for any other levels?
4. Is audio-recording of classrooms a good way in improving teachers' education?
5. How the classroom discourse issue can be extended in this type of research?

There are different kinds of classification of classroom discourse, the researcher here chose the Atwater and Morris (1988), Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Searle's (1975) classification to analyze the related parts. Other classroom discourse classifications can be explored.

References

Akmaijan, A., Demers, R. A., Farmer, A. K. & Harnish, R. M. (1997). *Linguistics: An introduction to language and communication.* London: The MIT Press.

Allwright, R.L. (1980). Turns, topics and tasks: Patterns of participation in language learning and teaching. In D.E. Larsen-Freeman (Eds.), *Discourse analysis in second language research*. California: Newbury House Publisher.

Allwright, R.L. (1984a). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 5 (1),* 56-71.

Allwright, D. (1988). *Observation in the language classroom.* London: Longman.

Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: Issues in data collection and analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, L. W. (2004). *Increasing teacher effectiveness*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.

Atkins, A. (2001). Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' model in a one-to-one classroom: an analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 33,* 6-13.

Atwater, J. B., & Morris, E.K. (1988). Teachers' instructions and children's compliance in pre-school classrooms: A descriptive analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 21,* 157–167.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bach, K. (1998). *Speech acts*. In Craig, E. (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of philosophy*. London: Routledge.

Bach, K., & Harnish, R.M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Behanm, B. & PourIran, Y. (2008). Classroom discourse: Analyzing teacher/learner interactions in Iranian EFL task-based classrooms. *Linguarum, 12,* 117-132.

Bellack, A. (1966). *The language of the classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C. M. (1976). *Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective.* Boston, USA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bygate, M. (1987). *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cazden, C. B. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M. Wittrock (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed). New York: Macmillan.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*.

Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Chang, D. (1999). Classroom as discourse communities, Retrieved April 20, 2005, from http:// www. teachers. net/Jul02/change.html.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language research on teaching and learning: Major issues in second language classroom research.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom discourse analysis: A functional perspective*. London: MPG, Bodmin, Cornwall.

Consolo, D. A. (2000). Teachers' action and student oral participation in classroom interaction. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction.* (91–107). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Coulthard, M. (1977). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Classroom interaction*.

Longman: Longman Group Limited.

Coulthard, M., & Montgomery, M. (Eds.), (1981). *Studies in discourse analysis.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Crystal, D. (1992). *Introducing linguistics*. London: Penguin.

Crystal, D. (1997). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publications.

DeBeaugrande, R. (1980). *Text, discourse and process.* London: Longman.

Dincher, A. (2008). A discourse analytical study on teachers' oral instructions in ELT classrooms. Retrieved from the Web October, 2011. http://www. sosyalbilimler.cukurova.edu.tr/tez/1179

Donato, R., & Brooks, F. (2004). Literary discussions and advanced speaking functions: Researching the (dis)connection. *Foreign Language Annals,* **37**, 183–199.

Edwards, A. D., & Westgate, D. P. G. (1994). *Investigating classroom talk*. London: Falmer Press.

Eken, D. K. (1996). The use of modal-imbedded directives in teacher trainer oral feedback to trainees on classroom observation. *IATEFL TT SIG Newsletter*, 18, 8–11.

Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon

Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition*. Oxford: Basil.

Ellis, R. (1998). Discourse control and the acquisition-rich classroom. In Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. New York: Routledge.

Enright, D. S. (1984). The organization of interaction in elementary classrooms. In

Enright, D.S., & Closkey, M.L. (1985). Yes, talking! Organizing the classroom to promote second language acquisition". *TESOL Quarterly, 19(3)*, 431–453.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is sybil there? The structure of American directives. *Language of Society*, 5, 25–66.

Fanselow, J. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. *Foreign Language Annals, 10*, 583-593.

Flanders, N. (1970). *Analyzing teacher behavior*. London: Addison-Wesley.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Two lectures, in Colin Gordon, (Eds.), Power/knowledge: Selected interviews*. New York: Pantheon.

Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics 6(2)*.

Garmash, N.G. (1999). Hesitation reflection on oral discourse organization.*Unpublished PhD dissertation*. Moscow: Moscow State University.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed). London: Taylor & Francis.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method*. (2nd ed). USA and Canada: Routledge.

Glew, P. (1998). Verbal interaction and English second language acquisition in classroom contexts. *Issues in Educational Research. 8*, 83-94.

Goffman, E. (1976). Gender advertisements. *Studies in the anthropology of visual communication. 3*, 69-154.

Goffman, E. (1976). *Gender advertisements*. New York: Macmillan.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Response cries in forms of talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gomez, A.G. (2000). Discourse, politeness and gender roles: An expletory investigation into British and Spanish talk show verbal conflicts. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense, 8*, 97–125.

Greenleaf, C. (1993). Linking classroom discourse and classroom content: Following the trail of intellectual work in a writing lesson. *Discourse Processes 16*, 465-505.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts*, (41–58). New York: Academic.

Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Ruqaiya, H. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Halliday, M.A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K., & Hassan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Harris, Z. S. (1952). *Discourse analysis*. London: Pearson.

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hemmati, F. (2011). A critical discourse analysis five English language classes in Iran. *Iranian EFL Journal, 6*, 159-178.

Hicks, D. (1995). Discourse, learning, and teaching. In Apple, M. W. (Eds.), *Review of research in education 21*. Washington: AERA.

Holmes, J. (1983). *The Structure of teacher's directives*. In Richards, J. C. and Schmidt, R.W. (1983 b) (Eds.), *Language and communication*. London: Longman, 89–125.

Holmes, J. (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Longman: London.

Hymes, D. (1964). *Language in culture and society*. New York: Harper and Row.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Lerner, G.H. (Eds.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 13–31.

Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (1998). *Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics*. UK: Blackwell.

Jonassen, D., & Grabowsk, B. L. (1993). *Handbook of individual differences: Individual differences and instruction*. New Jersey: Hillsdale.

Jones, F.H. (1987). *Positive classroom interaction: The positive helping interaction generic process*. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Kasper, G. (1986). Repair in foreign language teaching. In S. Walsh, *Investigating classroom discourse*. New York: Routledge.

Kramsch, C. (1985). Literary texts in the classroom: A discourse. *Modern Language Journal*, 69, 356-366.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. London: Longman.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 33(3), Critical Approaches to TESOL*, 453-484.

Legarreta, D. (1977). The effects of program models on language acquisition by Spanish speaking children. *TESOL Quarterly, 13(4)*, 521– 534.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: forms and functions of teacher's questions. In S. Walsh, *Investigating classroom discourse*. New York: Routledge.

Lynch, T. (1996). *Communication in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Malamah-Thomas, A. (1987). *Classroom interaction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Malouf, R. (1995). Towards an analysis of multi-party discourse. Retrieved from the Web May, 2007. http://www. hpsg.stanford.edu/rob.

Massi, M. P. (2001). Implementing discourse analysis for intermediate and advanced language learners. *Literacy Across Cultures*, 5, 3–13.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers: What is discourse analysis?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (1994). *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language*

teachers. New York: Longman.

McTear, M. F. **(**1975). *Structure and categories of foreign language teaching sequences*, Unpublished mimeo: University of Essex.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom.* Cambridge, *MA:* Harvard University Press.

Millward, C. (2005). Applying discourse analysis in the classroom with a specific focus on teaching discourse markers. Retrieved from the Web June 20, 2005. http://www. developingteachers.com/ articles_ tchtraining/disl_ceri.htm

Moskowitz, G. (1971). The classroom interaction of outstanding language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals, 9(1),* 35-57.

Nassaji, H., & Wells, G. (2000). What's the use of triadic dialogue? An investigation of teacher student interaction. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 333–363.

Ndoro, V. W., Hanley, G.P., Tiger, J.H., & Heal, N. A. (2006). A descriptive assessment of instruction-based interactions in the pre-school classroom. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 39*, 79–90.

Nunan, D. **(**1987). *The teacher as curriculum developer*. Adelaide: National Curriculum Resource Centre.

Nunan, D. (1990). Using learner data in curriculum development. *English for Specific Purposes, 9(1),* 17-32.

Nuthall, G. A. (1965). *Thinking in the classroom: The development of a method of analysis.* New Zealand: Council for educational research.

Philips, S. (1983). The invisible culture: communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. In E. Hatch, *Discourse and language education.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Podlesskaya, V. I., & Kibrik, A. A. (2004). Speech disfluencies and their reflection in discourse transcription. *Cognitive Modeling in Linguistics, 1*, 194-204.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics.* New York: Longman.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696–735.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers: What is discourse?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Scott, J. (2002). Form and function: An example of spoken discourse analysis. *Spoken Discourse Analysis*, January 2002. *(4)*, 3-6.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1975). Speech acts and recent linguistics. In D. Aaronson and R. Rieber (Eds.), *Developmental psycholinguistics and communication disorders.* (27–38). New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Searle, J. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society, 5(1),* 1-23.

Searle, J. (1979), *Intentionality and the use of language.* In A. Margalit, (Ed.), *Meaning and use,* 181–95. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. **(**1996). Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities. *In ELT Journal*. *50(1).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the second language classroom: A conversational analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sinclair, J. C., & Brazil, D. (1982). *Teacher talk.* Oxford: OUP.

Sinclair, J. C., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils.* London: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. C., & Coulthard, R. M. (1992). *Towards an analysis of discourse:* In M.Coulthard (Eds.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis.* London: Routledge.

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Swain, M. *(*1997*).* Collaborative dialogue: Its contribution to second language learning. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses, **34**,* 115–132.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal, 82*, 320–337.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2002). Talking it through: Two French immersion learners' response to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37,* 285–304.

Thomas, A. M. (1987). Classroom interaction. In C. N. Candlin & H.G. Widdowson (Eds.), *Language teaching: A scheme for teacher education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thoms, J. (2011). Classroom discourse in foreign language classrooms: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals, 45(1),* 8-27.

Thoms, J. (2011*).* Researching the (dis)connection between literary discussions and speaking functions: A replication with intermediate learners. *In* A. Cortazar & R. Orozco *(Eds.), Lenguaje, arte, y revoluciones ayer y hoy: New approaches to Hispanic linguistic, literary, and cultural studies. (*315–345). Newcastle, UK*: Cambridge Scholars Publishing*.

Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and speech acts, (1): Principles of language use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis* (4 Vols.). London: Academic Press.

Van Lier, L. (1988a). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.

Van Lier, L. (1988b). What's wrong with classroom talk? *Prospect*, 3(2), 67-83.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse.* New York: Routledge.

Watson T. (1994). *In search of management*. London: Routledge.

Wells, G. *(*1993*).* Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for

the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, ***5,*** 1–17.

Widdowson, H. G. (1980). Discourse analysis. In R. T. Nasr (Eds.), *The essentials of linguistic science*, 137–149. USA: Longman Group Limited.

Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Woods, N. (2006). *Describing discourse: A practical guide to discourse analysis.* New York: Oxford University Press.

****