

**DISCOURSE BETWEEN TEACHER AND STUDENT**

*Andijon davlat chet tillar instituti*

*Ingliz tili va adabiyoti fakulteti*

*Xorijiy til va adabiyoti yo'nalishi 411- guruh talabasi*

***Xamrayeva Mushtariy Abduhoshim qizi***

***Teacher: Egamberdiyeva. I.A***

[mushtariyy70@gmail.com](mailto:mushtariyy70@gmail.com)

**ANNOTATION:** *This study explores the structure, functions, and pedagogical implications of discourse between teachers and students within classroom settings. Drawing upon both theoretical frameworks and empirical observations, the research investigates how language functions as a tool for instructional delivery, feedback provision, and cognitive development. By analyzing authentic teacher-student interactions, the study reveals patterns of questioning, scaffolding, negotiation of meaning, and power relations embedded in educational discourse. The results highlight the importance of interactional competence in effective teaching and the necessity for teachers to adapt their discourse strategies to enhance student engagement and comprehension. The study also presents two tables: one illustrating common discourse moves used by teachers and another detailing student response types and their frequencies. Overall, this article contributes to the growing field of educational linguistics by offering practical insights for improving pedagogical discourse.*

**Keywords:** *teacher-student discourse, classroom interaction, educational linguistics, discourse analysis, pedagogical communication*

**АННОТАЦИЯ:** *В данном исследовании изучаются структура, функции и педагогические последствия дискурса между учителями и учениками в классе. Опираясь как на теоретические основы, так и на эмпирические наблюдения, исследование изучает, как язык функционирует как инструмент для предоставления обучения, предоставления обратной связи и когнитивного*



развития. Анализируя подлинное взаимодействие учителя и ученика, исследование выявляет закономерности постановки вопросов, создания структур, обсуждения смысла и властных отношений, заложенные в образовательном дискурсе. Результаты подчеркивают важность интерактивной компетентности для эффективного обучения и необходимость для учителей адаптировать свои стратегии дискурса для повышения вовлеченности и понимания учащихся. В исследовании также представлены две таблицы: одна из них иллюстрирует распространенные приемы речи, используемые учителями, а другая подробно описывает типы ответов учащихся и их частоту. В целом, данная статья вносит вклад в развивающуюся область педагогической лингвистики, предлагая практические рекомендации по улучшению педагогического дискурса.

**Ключевые слова:** дискурс учителя и ученика, взаимодействие в классе, образовательная лингвистика, анализ дискурса, педагогическая коммуникация.

## **INTRODUCTION**

In educational environments, discourse serves as the principal medium through which teaching and learning occur. The interaction between teacher and student is not merely a vehicle for transmitting information; rather, it is a dynamic, dialogic process that shapes students' intellectual development and social positioning in the classroom. The communicative exchanges that take place in this context influence how knowledge is constructed, understood, and retained. Over the past several decades, discourse analysis has emerged as a valuable tool for investigating the nuanced interactions that define educational practices. From sociocultural theories of learning to applied linguistics, numerous disciplines have emphasized the centrality of language in education.

This paper seeks to explore the nature and function of teacher-student discourse from a linguistic and pedagogical standpoint. While traditional models of instruction often viewed the teacher as the sole authority figure dispensing knowledge, contemporary research points to a more interactive model in which dialogue fosters deeper understanding and critical thinking. The study addresses key research questions:



What discourse strategies do teachers employ to facilitate understanding? How do students respond, and how does this influence the learning process? What linguistic features define successful pedagogical interactions?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY**

### **Literature Review**

Discourse between teacher and student has been the subject of extensive scholarly inquiry. According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model is a foundational pattern in classroom discourse, wherein the teacher initiates a question, the student responds, and the teacher evaluates the response. This model has been critiqued for its rigid structure, yet it remains useful for identifying interactional norms. Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory introduced the idea of scaffolding, where teachers guide students through their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) using supportive dialogue.

More recent studies (Mercer, 2000; Walsh, 2006) have emphasized dialogic teaching, which involves encouraging extended student responses, reasoning, and peer discussion. Such discourse patterns are believed to foster critical thinking and autonomy. Research by Alexander (2008) argues for the importance of cumulative talk—discourse that builds shared understanding over time.

### **Methodology**

The study employed a qualitative discourse analysis approach. Authentic classroom interactions were audio-recorded and transcribed from five different secondary school English language classrooms. Each session lasted approximately 40 minutes. Transcripts were analyzed using a coding scheme adapted from Walsh's (2006) Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) framework. Codes focused on teacher questioning techniques, student response types, discourse markers, turn-taking mechanisms, and feedback strategies.

The sample included 5 teachers and 150 students aged 14–16. Data analysis was conducted using NVivo software, which allowed for systematic tagging and pattern identification. Two tables were generated to summarize the findings: one categorizing teacher discourse moves and another quantifying student responses.





## **DISCUSSION AND RESULTS**

### **Analysis of Discourse Strategies**

The discourse analysis revealed a diversity of strategies employed by teachers to manage classroom interaction. The most frequent teacher moves included open-ended questioning, reformulation of student responses, and the use of metadiscourse (e.g., "Let's think about this in a different way"). Teachers also regularly employed confirmation checks and clarification requests to guide student understanding. Feedback moves ranged from evaluative ("Good job") to elaborative ("That's correct, and you can also think about..."), which were more effective in sustaining student engagement.

### **Student Response Patterns**

Student responses varied in complexity and initiative. While many students offered minimal replies (e.g., "Yes", "No", or short phrases), others produced extended utterances, particularly when prompted with open-ended questions or encouraged through scaffolding. The data showed that higher student participation was linked to teachers' use of dialogic techniques.

**Table 1: Common Discourse Moves Used by Teachers**

<b>Discourse Move</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Example</b>
Initiation (question)	184	'What do you think about this poem?'
Recast/Paraphrase	72	'So, you're saying the character felt betrayed?'
Scaffolding	63	'Let's try to break this idea down together.'
Confirmation check	49	'Do you mean...?'
Praise/Evaluation	108	'Excellent observation!'
Elaboration prompt	37	'Can you explain why you think that?'

**Table 2: Types and Frequencies of Student Responses**

<b>Response Type</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Description</b>
Minimal Response	91	One-word or short phrase answers
Extended Explanation	56	Detailed, multi-clause contributions



Response Type	Frequency	Description
Clarification Request	22	Student seeks explanation of a concept or instruction
Peer Interaction	18	Student addresses or responds to a peer
Repetition of Teacher's Words	33	Student echoes part of the teacher's language

The data support the view that student discourse becomes more elaborative and meaningful when teachers facilitate interaction using open-ended questions and avoid solely evaluative feedback. The inclusion of scaffolding and dialogic questioning encourages deeper cognitive engagement.

### **CONCLUSION**

The discourse that unfolds between teacher and student within the classroom is a complex, layered phenomenon that has significant implications for pedagogical effectiveness. As this study demonstrates, the quality and structure of classroom interaction directly influence student engagement and learning outcomes. Teachers who employ dialogic strategies, including scaffolding, elaborative feedback, and open-ended questions, create a more inclusive and cognitively stimulating environment. Such discourse enables students to participate not just as passive recipients of information, but as active constructors of knowledge.

Moreover, student responses tend to reflect the depth and flexibility of the teacher's communicative approach. The frequency of extended responses in this study is a strong indicator that language-rich environments—where interaction is reciprocal rather than hierarchical—foster greater learner autonomy and deeper comprehension.

It is essential for teacher training programs to integrate discourse analysis into their curricula, equipping future educators with the linguistic awareness needed to manage classroom talk effectively. Additionally, ongoing professional development should encourage reflective practice around discourse use in the classroom. This can be supported through video analysis, peer observation, and targeted feedback.

In sum, the study underscores the importance of viewing language not merely as a medium of instruction but as a pedagogical tool that shapes classroom dynamics,



affects student attitudes, and mediates learning itself. Future research should consider cross-cultural variations in teacher-student discourse and examine how digital platforms alter traditional interaction patterns. Ultimately, the goal is to foster communicative environments where all learners can thrive through meaningful discourse.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975. pp. 45–76.
2. Vygotsky, L. S. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978. pp. 84–119.
3. Mercer, N. *Words and Minds: How We Use Language to Think Together*. London: Routledge, 2000. pp. 110–155.
4. Walsh, S. *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. London: Routledge, 2006. pp. 23–68.
5. Alexander, R. *Towards Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom Talk* (4th ed.). York: Dialogos, 2008. pp. 36–91.
6. Edwards, D., & Mercer, N. *Common Knowledge: The Development of Understanding in the Classroom*. London: Routledge, 1987. pp. 101–129.
7. Cazden, C. *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2001. pp. 17–52.