



Multi-Layered Discourse Analysis of Students' Classroom Talk in Two Contexts: Rural vs. Urban

Davud Kuhi

*Assistant Professor of TEFL, Department of English,
Islamic Azad University, Maragheh Branch, Maragheh, Iran*

Sirous Khoubkar* (Corresponding Author)

*MA in TEFL, Department of English,
Islamic Azad University, Maragheh Branch, Maragheh, Iran
E-mail: s.khoubkar135@gmail.com*

Abstract

This study aimed at discussing and representing discourse analysis of classroom talk in two contexts. It is significant, since it considers different genres of talk, cultural and social identities, social relations, different ideologies and many other aspects in this analysis. It attempts to analyze the dominant classroom patterns in two contexts. Two cases of study were analyzed in this study: a rural setting which includes 28 participants, and an urban setting including 32 participants. Using Schiffrin's model of study with different principles – speech act theory, Interactional sociolinguistics, pragmatics, ethnography of communication, conversation analysis, and variation analysis – we tried to interpret and analyze different forms and functions of utterances, different social orders, ideas, thought processes and social identities of participants in each context. Frank talks, simple constructions of utterances, simple action clauses and their referents are common in rural setting, while intertextuality, literal phrases, similes and metaphors, ellipses and complicated action clauses and their referents are popular in urban settings. The findings of this paper direct us toward a complete needs analysis and designing new courses in two contexts. These indicate that there are many differences among two groups.

Keywords: Discourse, Discourse Analysis, Multilayered Analysis, Rural Context, and Urban Context

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: Thursday, April 20, 2017

Accepted: Monday, July 24, 2017

Published: Thursday, September 28, 2017

Available Online: Tuesday, October 10, 2017

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22049/jalda.2017.13649>

Introduction

Nowadays we live in a crowded talkative society and a world of interaction. We communicate with each other to create interaction through our languages and ideas. Thoughts, conceptions, worldviews, and our ideologies are the most important characteristics of our identity that are reflected in our talks, so we cannot deny the importance and the effect of talk in our interaction. Talk patterns are very different in every context. Even we cannot deny the importance of it in class. It strongly depends on contextual factors. Discourse analysis tries to find the effects of these facts. It provides us with many solutions in our teaching. Considering talk patterns contributes us to be familiar with many different behaviors in every context, especially within a class and helps us to create relationships with our interlocutors. Although the meanings and functions of utterances are not explicit, they need to be inferred in context.

Research on classroom discourse began in the early 1950s in the field of teacher education. It was initially motivated by the search for an “objective” evaluation of classroom teaching through obtaining a factual record of pedagogical events which could, in turn, provide students, teachers with feedback on their teaching competence. The evaluation and feedback focused on aspects of teacher behavior related to learner’s performance. In order to achieve these objectives, tools for systematic observation of classroom interaction were proposed. One of the first and most widely adopted tools was Flanders’ Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) (Flanders, 1960). FIAC classifies classroom talk into teacher talk and student talk. Teacher talk is further categorized according to whether the teacher is exerting direct or indirect influence on students’ behavior, whereas student talk is further categorized into predictable and unpredictable responses. This kind of analysis provides an overall picture of teaching patterns that occur in a lesson in terms of the proportions of teacher talk and student talk, direct and indirect teacher influence, and the types of student behavior elicited by various teacher behaviors (Simpson, 2011, p.274).

Apart from general education research, L2 classroom discourse research was also influenced by L1 classroom discourse research that began in the 1960s as part of the language across the curriculum movement in Britain. The movement drew attention to the important role of language in education and a number of studies were conducted on L1 content classrooms. Particularly influential was the work of Barrens (1969) on the types of teacher questions, the types of learner responses elicited, the types of learner-talk and the mental processes reflected by learner-talk.

By the late 1980s and early 1990s, it became clear that studies of the observables needed to be illuminated by the unobservables that also shaped classroom discourse. Researchers (Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Tsui, 1996) suggested that learners’ participation in the classroom could be affected by their learning styles, psychological states, cultural background, and beliefs about classroom behavior (as cited in Simpson, 2012, p.276).

Talk patterns of the students are the texts and sites of discussion in class and students are the bearers of these discussions. Discourse analysis should create unity and coherence between different parts of talk and other events in class and reflect the linguistic and cultural changes. It should make clear the identity of those who are bearing these characteristics. Classroom is a kind of context within which different kinds of talks, ideas,

and behaviors can create networks and chains of text for itself. Fairclough (2003) calls this reiteration and recreation of texts chains of texts. Where such chains move and relink across different media and context, networks of texts develop. (Cited in Bloor and Bloor, 2007)

Seedhouse (2004) adopted a (CA) approach to the analysis of classroom discourse and pointed out that, similar to the context in conversation, contexts in the classroom are not static throughout the whole lesson but fluid and mutually constructed by participants in the moment-to-moment development of the discourse (see also Markee, 2008). He proposed a model in which classroom discourse data can be analyzed at three levels of context: micro discourse, L2 classroom, and instructional context. This model, according to Seedhouse, enables us to link the micro with the macro, and to see the specificity and diversity of instances of L2 classroom discourse at the micro level, as well as the commonalities between them at the macro level. Based on data from different L2 classroom contexts, Seedhouse further demonstrated how the (CA) approach illustrates reflexivity of the interactional organization of classroom discourse, as managed by participants, and pedagogical focus (as cited in Simpson, 2012, p.276).

Kumaravadivelu (1999) proposed a critical approach to classroom discourse analysis based on poststructuralist (e.g. Foucault, 1972) and post colonialist (e.g. Said, 1978) perspectives of discourse. He maintained that analysis of classroom discourse should capture not only its sociolinguistic dimension but also its sociocultural and sociopolitical dimensions. He suggested critical ethnography as the research tool to unravel the “hidden meanings and underlying connections” in classroom discourse “through posing questions relating to ideology, power, knowledge, class, race, and gender” (1978, p.476), (as cited in Simpson 2012, p.280)

The analysis of classroom talk (methods and methodologies) is an article by Neil Mercer (p.1) that describes methods for analyzing classroom talk, comparing their strengths and weaknesses, with a discussion of mixed use of such methods. The researcher uses linguistic ethnography, sociocultural research, and conversation analysis to show how education depends upon the creation and maintenance of intersubjectivity or common knowledge (p.2). The research indicates that a pressing need is to provide more strong empirical evidence of how involvement in talk affects educational outcomes (p.10). The researcher says that they need larger scale studies which use a combination of qualitative analysis and quantitative assessment to consolidate and extend that evidence base and to show more clearly how talk can enable classroom education to be successful. (2010, p.80, 1-4)

Other work journal is related to the examining the effects of classroom discussion on students' comprehension of text, (a meta-analysis). This study indicates that no syntheses have quantitatively reviewed the vast body of literature on classroom discussion for their effect on students' comprehension and learning. This comprehensive meta-analysis of empirical studies was conducted to examine evidence of the effects of classroom discussion on measures of teacher and student talk and on individual student comprehension and critical-thinking and reasoning outcomes. Results revealed that several discussion approaches produced strong increases in the amount of student talk and concomitant reductions in teacher talk, as well as substantial improvement in text comprehension. Few approaches to discussion were effective at increasing students' literal or inferential comprehension and critical thinking and reasoning (Murphy, Karen, Wilkinson, Soter,

Hennessey, & Alexander, 2009, pp.740-764).

Studies of Asian learners' participation in multi-ethnic classrooms showed that they are, in general, less willing to volunteer answers and they take fewer turns than their non-Asian counterparts (Johnson, 1995), and their observable behaviors are partly shaped by their cultural values and learning styles (Duff, 2002). Similarly, the way in which teachers pose questions and provide feedback, and the kind of interaction they engage in with learners, is shaped by their conceptions of teaching and learning, and their lived experiences of classroom events (as cited in Simpson 2012, p.276). These and many other related works indicate that, whether the study has been done in a particular context or the comparison has been done within the interaction in L₂. This unique study fills this gap and provides an appropriate result for the comparison of participants in two different contexts with their own structures and concepts of talk in their own language and also a very systematic transcription in necessary conditions.

The main purpose of this study is to analyze the dominant classroom discourse patterns in two contexts (rural vs. urban). It attempts to determine the effects of contextual and environmental factors on talk or the effects of context on text and vice-versa. Discourse analysis of students' classroom talk from different contexts will help us to have a comprehensive understanding about the effects of these contextual factors on the interpersonal relationships, identities, pragmatic use of language, talk coherence, linguistic features of the participants' utterances, interactional relationship, and their social orders. It is a multi-layered analysis providing a comprehensive understanding about different characteristics of participants, because each context includes the heterogeneity of participants in itself (Kurds and Turks), that is, the mixture of different cultures is a kind of language practice and this in its turn provides a rich and colorful knowledge and awareness about different varieties of talk in different situations and contexts, that is, considering different patterns of talk makes us familiar with different ideologies, concepts and thinking, and this is important. With this in mind, we would have different alignments to different situations in our life and classroom is one of them.

Methodology

Corpus

This research was conducted in Nagadeh, West Azerbaijan, Iran, during school time, in fall 1392, Iranian calendar. The research would be about two different groups of students in two contexts. (Urban vs. Rural). Hasheminejad secondary school with urban students, grade 3, and Beigzadeh secondary school with rural students, grade 3, too. Urban context includes 32 participants and rural context includes 25 participants. They are all male and are 14 or 15 years old. The research was conducted qualitatively. It was done by collecting data from two different contexts through video recording and observation. The large part of data recorded from participants includes conversation and interview. Talk patterns of participants were recorded from two different contexts in different CDs. Four CDs, each one including 30 to 45 minutes' data, were selected randomly to increase our accuracy and validity in the analysis. Each CD includes different samples. Among these, we selected 6 samples, each one including 10 to 15 minutes' data. It should be mentioned that different parts of these samples were used as other small samples to be analyzed in details in different sections. The procedure for each sample in every context would be as follows: at

first each sample would be analyzed based on six principles of Schiffrin's approach, i.e., speech act theory, interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, pragmatics, conversation analysis, and variation analysis. They would be transcribed in necessary conditions. However, it should be noted, considering any aspect of utterances in each sample was not an easy task. So, each sample would be analyzed according to one of the principles of Schiffrin's model in one context with its contrasted one in another context.

Using a multi-layered approach, the theory model outlined above contributes us in the present study to analyze the two groups of participants in two different contexts by following speech patterns of participants in different aspects such as: orders, requests, offers, advice, speaking for another, chopping in and butting in (alignments), discourse markers, referents and their pragmatic meaning, speech acts and their sequences in speech events, turn taking, overlaps and interruptions, code switching, and different types of text in two contexts which would be considered in our analysis.

Model(s) of this analysis

In discourse analysis of participants' talk, we would use Schiffrin's six principles mentioned above to consider and investigate talk patterns of participants from different aspects.

Speech act theory

Schiffrin states that how we do more than one thing at once with our words (i.e. the multiple functions of an utterance) is part of the important issue of indirect speech acts. Searle's view of indirectness (like his taxonomy of speech acts) draws upon his analysis of the conditions underlying speech acts. An indirect speech act is defined as an utterance in which one illocutionary act (a primary act) is performed by way of the performance of another act (a "literal" act). Hearers are able to interpret indirect speech acts by relying upon their knowledge of speech acts, along with general principles of cooperative conversation, mutually shared factual information, and a great ability to draw inferences (1994, p.59).

She states that an utterance can do more than one thing at a time. Some utterances have multiple functions because one act is being performed by way of another: these are called "indirect speech" acts. The conditions underlying speech acts provide an analytical resource for indirectness. Those conditions can have this analytical functions are possible because they have a critical role in our knowledge of speech act types. When more than one act is performed by a single utterance, the conditions for the two speech acts nevertheless have a systematic relationship to one another. Thus, it is relationships between underlying conditions that allow utterances to do more than one thing at a time (Schiffrin, 1994, p.60).

Interactional sociolinguistics

Schiffrin states, the concept of participation status in interactional principles- a set of positions that individuals within perceptual range of an utterance make takes in relation to that utterance (1994, p.104). She states that Goffman differentiates four positions or participation statuses: animator, author, figure, and principal. Although those positions can be filled by different people, a single individual can also fill different participations lot: to

simplify a bit, an animator produces talk. An author creates talk, a figure is portrayed through talk, and a principal is responsible for talk. Goffman's focus on social interaction complements Gumperz's focus on situated inferences: Goffman describes the form and meaning of the social and interpersonal context that provide presuppositions for the decoding of meaning (as cited in Schiffrin, 1994, p.105).

Schiffrin refers to Goffman's opinion in which each position within a participation framework is associated with codified and normatively specified conduct (Goffman, 1981a, p.3) such that our recognition of shifts among animators, figures, authors, and principals is facilitated by our normative expectations about the concept appropriate for each position. Schiffrin states that the conduct of frame (Goffman, 1974) and footing (Goffman, 1981c) provide two additional links between participation frameworks and social interaction. Frames are the organizational and sustained as experiences (Goffman, 1974): footing concerns "the alignments we take up to ourselves and others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance" (1994, p.104).

Ethnography of communication

Schiffrin states that: the classificatory grid that Hymes proposed is known as the SPEAKING grid: each letter is an abbreviation for a different possible component of communication. The SPEAKING grid can be used to discover a local taxonomy of communicative "units" that are in some recognizable way bounded or integral. The largest such unit is the speech situation. Although speech situations may provide the setting or scene in which speech occurs, they are not themselves governed by a single set of rules. The next unit is the speech event: "activities, or aspects of activities, that are directly governed by rules or norms of the use of speech" (Hymes, 1972b, p.56). The smallest unit is the speech act. Schiffrin states that acts can be defined through their illocutionary force. Although discourse is important to all the units, it seems to be the speech act level that is most fundamental to the local, turn by turn management of discourse. "Discourse may be viewed in terms of act both syntagmatically and paradigmatically" (Schiffrin, 1994, p.142).

Schiffrin believes that the ethnography of communication is the most integrative approach. This reflects the fact that culture itself encompasses or embraces a totality of knowledge and practices. Thus, an ethnographic approach to discourse in general can combine speech act and interactional approaches within a larger framework of inquiry. Constitutive rules - knowledge of the conditions by which we recognize as speech act - are part of our interactions and displays our identities. Since our knowledge of what words and meanings are appropriate for a given time, place, purpose, and so on is cultural knowledge, the use of contextualization cues to convey the contextual presuppositions of an utterance displays our communicative competence as a member of a certain culture and situates as in particular web of beliefs and actions specific to that culture (1994, p.144).

Pragmatics

Schiffrin states that in pragmatics, we must rely on and use actual utterances that have been produced by speakers in contexts rather than rely on constructed sentences that are treated as if they were contextualized utterances (1994, p.203).

She states that Gricean pragmatic provides a way to analyze the inference of speaker

meaning: how hearers infer the intentions underlying a speaker's utterance. It is not intended as an approach to the analysis of discourse, i.e. to sequences of utterances. Viewing referential processes as pragmatic is important not just for the general reasons, but also because it may help us account for distributional differences between definite and indefinite forms, and explicit and inexplicit forms. Referring terms that are definite are noun phrases with definite article (the), possessives, pronouns, names, titles; those that are indefinite article (a), with quantifiers, and with numerals. Indefiniteness can also be the predicates in existential (there) sentences. This distributional restriction is important, since some forms can be used for both definite and indefinite references.

Conversation analysis

CA is like interactional sociolinguistics in its concern with the problem of social order and how language both creates and is created by social context (Schiffrin, 1994, p.232).

Schiffrin believes that participants' understandings of action and knowledge provide for the stable organization of their social activities and this social activity provides a practical basis and a sense of intersubjectivity through which further activity can be sustained (1994, p.233).

Schiffrin believes that CA focuses upon the details of actual events. The focus is on specific events that occur during the conversation. And in keeping with relationship noted above between action and knowledge, the events that are focused upon are said to reflect and realize practical knowledge (1994, p.235).

She believes that the CA treatment of context is also ethnomethodologically locates utterances not just in a world of social relations, but in a world of other utterances. Furthermore, each utterance in a sequence is shaped by a prior text and provides a context for a next utterance. The notion of context as being both retrospective and prospective can be seen as yet another meaning (and knowledge) that are continually adjusted and sequentially emergent. Schiffrin believes that CA approaches to discourse consider the way participants in talk construct systematic solutions to recurrent organizational problems of conversation. The existence of these problems- and the need to find such solutions- arises out of the ethnomethodological search for member's knowledge of their own ordinary affairs. Knowledge that reveals and produces a sense of order and normalcy in everyday conduct. (Schiffrin 1994, pp.235-9)

Variation analysis

The initial methodology and the theory underlying variation studies are those of William Labov. She provided a systematic framework for the analysis of oral narratives - a framework that illustrates quite well the variationist approach to discourse unit. This framework according to Schiffrin discusses that, this framework defines a narrative as a particular bounded unit in discourse, and it defines parts of narrative as smaller units whose identities are based on their linguistic (syntactic and semantic) properties and on their role in the narrative. Labov's interest in narrative, however, arose not just out of a search for discourse unit per se, but also out of a set of social and political concerns stemming from the notion of verbal deprivation: Schiffrin has introduced narratives in this way not only to show that variation analysis is socially realistic but also to lead to an understanding of why

narratives have provided so fruitful a source of data for analysis. Narratives are a discourse unit with a fairly regular structure that is largely independent of how they are embedded in surrounding talk. Narratives have a linear structure in which different sections present different kinds of information. Each section has a different function within the story. In addition, each section is comprised of different clauses whose syntactic and semantic properties contribute to their identity as units within the story, and to their function. Narratives are opened by an abstract, a clause that summarizes the experience and presents a general proposition that narrative will expand. Orientation clauses (typically with stative predicates) follow the abstract. They describe background information such as time, place, and identity of characters (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 283).

Schiffrin believes that most variationists' attention to discourse units has focused on narratives. But it is also important for her to find another type of discourse with regular forms and functions. She suggests lists that are descriptive structures that center on categories and category members. She uses narrative structures as a backdrop for the discussion of lists. This is meant not only to elucidate the structure of lists, but also to suggest that comparing textual structures (variation across text types) is a much an application of variation as is comparing forms and structures within texts (variation within a text type) (1994, pp.291-2).

Result and Discussion

Utterances in speech patterns of participants which are the small units of discourse in language use have been comprised of different structures in each particular context.

Frankly talks, simple constructions of utterances, simple action clauses and their referents, lack of notice, noisy, the existence of 2 or 3 dominant speakers in group, most of interruptions and overlaps, being indifferent, lack of concentration among the group and weak coherence of utterances, hesitations, repetitions, false starts and jumping to each other's talk, using TABOO words are common in rural setting, while intertextuality, literal phrases, like simile and metaphors, ellipsis, complicated action clauses and their referents, distribution of turn-taking democratically and equally among participants, silence, notice, lots of concentration on the subject, taking turn in suitable time and showing an appropriate signal for it and contributing to each other in directing the conversation forward, which are essential factors in learning and using language, are popular in urban setting. This indicates that how cultural identities and social orders are affected by different factors in each particular setting.

In interaction, participants in rural setting refer to any aspect of language use to share and expand more information to the text, which mostly violates a negative face among participants, while in urban setting, participants are very cautious and consider their social status in expanding information about each other and always try to create this shared knowledge in a positive and polite way. Using mindful, thoughtful, logical phrases, and being cautious in expanding the information play an important role in urban setting.

This indicates that intertextuality is a complicated clause action that takes place more in urban setting. Literal diversity of language use, different forms of language and their functions in use, creativity, productivity, intended way of interpretation of actions and utterances, politeness, indirectly expressing their ideas, attribution to the other's statements

and many other aspects of language usage and use are the results of these contextual factors' effect and their reflection on participants' utterances in urban setting and create those kinds of complexities in talk.

Ethnographic study of communication in rural setting indicates that participants mostly deal with physical activities, hardworking, farming, and animal husbandry. Critical points, sarcastic and mocking phrases in the speech patterns of participants in rural setting are the representative of special kinds of speech styles, lack of noticeable cooperation and a large amount of displeasure in that context. These claims are proved by different types and levels of participants' talk in two contexts and indicate that how these two different styles and strategies in talk and speech patterns of participants are effective on their level of competence. Hyland (2006, p.65) states that Ethnography is an interpretive and qualitative approach to research based on the study of behavior in naturally occurring settings. While acknowledging that language is always an important part of such settings, ethnographic studies take a wider view to consider the physical and experiential contexts in which language is used. This perspective therefore gives greater emphasis to what people actually do, locating acts of communication – of speaking, writing or listening – in the behavior of groups and employing methods which are interpretive, contextualized and respectful of participants' views.

First mentions and their referents in rural setting have simple relations with other parts of text and only in some rare cases these relations create problematic issues. The referring expressions and their referents in the text are not so far away from each other and in many cases the repetition of referents are obvious in the texts, while referring expressions and their referents in urban setting are full of problematic and abstract issues, which are comprised of a lot of complicated clause actions and literal phrases, and their understanding involve the readers having a content, background knowledge about text. Usually in these texts, referring expressions are represented in the first part, and then they are developed and expanded in an abstract and literal way by their referents, and in the last part, they are clarified by some other more information to the readers. Participants in rural setting mostly use narrative stories with linear structures within which the units of language have a temporal relationship with other parts of the text. These units are small and independent of surrounding talk. This sequential order of units creates a syntagmatic relationship in the text, while participants in urban setting, in addition to creating this kind of relationship are able to describe more categories and subcategories to their text in narrating it. They use lists as a backdrop to describe more entities to make clear their main category. These entities are permanent and completely dependent on the surrounding talk, that is, they can create not only a syntagmatic relation between the syntactic and semantic structures of a text, but also a paradigmatic relation between these units.

Success and ability in language use, diversity and using different colorful types of texts with literal and rhetorical phrases completely depend on the situation where we live. Environmental restriction lessens this ability, because language use involves an interactive and dynamic nature. Using language involves more interaction to shape, reshape, and renew itself in a particular situation. More interaction among participants contributes a lot to this dynamicity and renewing. This interaction is not only the language interaction within the language user; but also other social interaction in language use. The integration of these two characteristics contributes to the ability and success in language use.

Considering the behaviors and talk patterns of participants indicates the quality of contextual factors' effect on each particular context, and the amount of the interactions of these participants with different structures and organizations. The amount of these interactions reflect the level of competence in each group, that is, the amount of learning in each group strongly depends on the kind of interactions that these participants are engaged with different layers of society, and the amount of growth that they have developed in their own culture. This means that how these cultural characteristics are situated and correlated with different levels such as high, medium and low class of a society comprising the texts of participants in their talk patterns in each group. The kind of correlation in each text indicates the amount of learning, competence, the kind of strategy and speech styles in each context. We can paraphrase and conclude that in modern approach, text is a mediator; we can consider meaning residing in the mind of the speaker which is negotiated and interpreted in the context, that is, it is by the context that we put a meaning into the text and produce that kind of text (Widdowson, 2004, p.19). This in itself reflects the level of competence, worldview and the effect of contextual factors on the amount of learning in each group. As Akmajian, Demres, Farmer, and Harnish state: When we communicate directly, we perform just one communicative act, and when we communicate literally, what we say is compatible with what we mean. Crudely put, in direct and literal communication we say what we mean and mean what we say. We have been advocating the idea that even the "simplest" forms of linguistics communication are complicated affairs. And that once we drop the idealizations that the Message model imposes, we can see that we need more than just rules of language. Rather, we need notions like intended influence, shared contextual beliefs, and various presumptions to explicate the connection between sounds and communicative intents (2001, p.373). These findings indicate that every context in a discourse community has different versions of needs. On the other hand, we believe that language learning should meet our needs, but what is important is that considering speech patterns of participants in rural setting indicates that the subjects exposed in syllabus design- in school and educational setting are not compatible with participants' needs and don't provide and qualify the necessary and enough condition for learning. That is, they have a contradiction with social structures and cultural needs of participants. So, these findings should contribute us toward organizing a very systematic and special kind of education in learning. Dudley-Evans & St John (2005, p.124) refer to Halliday and Cooke's (1982, p.133) statements: To establish a workable course design, means analysis is suggested as an adjunct to need analysis. Means analysis, according to Dudley-Evans and Maggie Jo St John, looks at the environment in which a course will be run or, as the original metaphor that generated the term, the environment in which a project will take root, grow healthily and survive, the two key factors considered are the classroom culture and the management infrastructure and culture. Vygotsky refers to the tools of the culture into which the child is born, the language of those who relate to the child, and the ingenious means produced by the child himself, including the use of his own body (1978, p.123).

This research paves the way for many researchers to consider different needs of participants in different contexts. One of the most implacable and effective cases of this study is to extend it to other levels of education such as primary, high schools, language institutions and even to the university levels and provide appropriate subjects and syllabuses according to the needs of participants in different cultures and contexts.

The table below represents the main differences between rural and urban contexts:

Table 3.1: Talk differences between rural and urban contexts

Urban context	Rural context
Intertextuality, literal phrases like similies and metaphors and indirect strategy of language are usual in language use	Frankly talk, TABOO words and direct strategy of language are usual in language use
In alignments participants in urban setting mostly use politely aspects of language use	In alignments participants in rural setting mostly refer to negative aspects of language use
Mindful activities and relationships with different structures, organizations and institutions are the basic specifics of participants	Hardworking physical activities animal raising and farming are the most characteristics of participants
Participants are silent and careful about their status	Participants are neglectful and noisy
Suitable overlaps are created to help each other the conversation	Full of interruptions among participants
Complicated close actions and utterances are common	Simple close actions and utterances are common
Repetition of the same referents are very low	Repetition of the same referents are common
Acceptable knowledge of second language use (Persian)	Verbal deprivation and code switching in second language use (Persian)
Abstract knowledge in referents is more	Abstract knowledge in referents is low
Turn taking takes place in suitable times	Turn taking doesn't takes place in suitable times
More discipline	Anarchism
Conversation mostly is distributed democratically among all participants	Conversation mostly is distributed among two or three participants

Conclusion

The nature of every discourse analysis is pedagogic. By considering talk patterns of participants in two contexts, we try to find the main differences in organization of these patterns and how these patterns are originated from different cultural, educational, social and interactional feedbacks, since learning especially language learning heavily depends on the reciprocal interaction of these feedbacks in different contexts. People's life in village is combined with farming, raising animal, physical activities and gardening. They all are familiar with the meaning of these activities and this kind of culture creates a concrete sense in their existence. These findings indicate that every context in a discourse community has different versions of needs. On the other hand, we believe that language learning should meet our needs, but what is important is that considering speech patterns of participants in rural setting indicates that the subjects exposed in syllabus design - in school and educational setting - are not compatible with participants' needs and don't provide and qualify the necessary and enough condition for learning. That is, they have a contradiction with social structures and cultural needs of participants. So, these findings should contribute us toward organizing a very systematic and special kind of education in learning, especially language learning. Creating itinerant scientific centers, holding programs that contribute to the promoting the level of families' information and also holding mid-time camps during students' education for developing the interaction and familiarity of students with different cultures and customs of different layers of society in different contexts that

are effective in the learning of the participants, are the most important implications that can be resulted from this research. These all are effective in promoting the quality of speech patterns, the forms and functions and also the behaviors of participants in every context.

References

- Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A.; Farmer, A. K., & Harnish, R. M. (2001). *Linguistics: An introduction to language and communication* (5th ed.). London: The MIT press.
- Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2007). *The practice of critical discourse analysis, an introduction*. Hodder Arnold.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & M. J. St. John (2005). *Developments in English for specific purposes: a multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Mercer, N. (2010). The analysis of classroom talk: Methods and methodology. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 1-14.
- Murphy, P. K.; Wilkinson, I. A. G.; Soter, A. O.; Hennessey, M. N., & Alexander, John F. (2009). The effects of classroom discussion on students' comprehension of text: a meta-analysis, *journal of education psychology*, vol.101, No, 3, 740-64.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Simpson, J. (2012). *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext: Critical issues in discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Appendix

(1)

- (a) Teacher: Aha,yani maneh moallem,entezar daram, shoma keh kelas miayeed, mishineed, raftaretan, goftaretan, hameh cheezeton ba oon kasi keh dars [nakhoondeh?=
(b) Salehi: [yeki nabashsd]
Continues ...

(2)

- (a) Ayyub: aga, demiramyoldash adami chokh pis yola [chakar?=
(b) Teacher: [Yakhchi sizin da]
(c) Ayyub: Hami da aga pool,aga neja pool chokh versan ushaga?
Aga ushaga chokh pool versan alinda [dastalad ola?=
(d) Hooshyar:[aga, jebin doldoora poola]
(e) Ayyub: Haya aga, masalan chokh vasayel alar. aga o pis yola chakilar, chokh pis yola chakilaar, kharab yollara saritar ono chakallar, aga yoldash ... aga, goy demiem ono, adamin ela pooloona banzar da, poolo olsa ...continues ...

(3)

- (a) Teacher: O ki mooallem ushagidi, Nagaadeidah zad olor, ba neya ojor olub?
(b) Ayyub: aga,demiramyoldash adami chokh pis yola [chakar?=]
(c) Teacher: [Yakhchi sizin da]

(d) Ayyub: Hami da aga pool, aga neja pool chokh versan ushaga?

Aga ushaga chokh pool versan alinda [dastalad ola?=-]

(e) Hooshyar: [aga, jebin doldoora poola]

Continues ...

(4)

(a) Teacher: khob, man yek soale digeh miporsam. Alan shoma ta hoodoodi savadeh khandan va neveshtan dareed digeh dorosteh?

Agar kasi bashad aslan savadeh khandan va neveshtan nadashteh bashad, na mikhaheed ba oo barkhod ya raftari dashteh bashed? Beshineed? Boland shid? Sohbat koneed? Berid o biayeed?

(b) Shadkam: chera dareem! Anha fagat nakhoondand.

(c) Teacher: aha, begeed.

(d) Manafee: aga, biz garah olardan ebrat alakh, olar okhomooyooblar, biz da aga gororeekh kopr kimin delar, aga bizda garah olardan ebrat alakh ki azomooz okhoyakh.

Continues ...

(5)

(a) Teacher: Kelasa gedib elamirsan?

(b) Shafeei: Kheir. (low voice)

(c) Teacher: Aslan?

(d) Shafeei: Aslan.

(e) Teacher: Istamirsanda gedasan?

(f) Shafeei: Kheir, aga. (added emphases)

(g) Teacher: Yani, man istiyeram bo sozo sizdan soroshaam, sizing hozooreez cholda. vaje bdi da?

(h) Students: Bali.

(i) Hooshyar: Aga, manim dadam tak takina cholda ishtamaz ki?

Continues ...

(6)

(a) Teacher: Alageyeh shakhsiiyeez namanadi?

(b) Pourfooli: aga, deyeem?

(c) Teacher: bali. Man amadeham.

(d) Pourgooli: aga man istiyeeram doktor, mohandes olam.

(e) Teacher: yakhchi, bo sozi demaga nia ba utanersan?

(f) Manafee: aga, deyeer gorkhoram goolala.

(g) Teacher: ha?

(h) Manafee: goolala. Goolala

(i) Teacher: kim goola masalan... nia akhi masalan ellatin deh da.

(j) Pourgoli: bilmiram aga.

(k) Teacher: masalan mani ki istiyeeram bir dana ayandada doctor olam. Bo sozi istiyeeram deeyam... bo akhi doctor login olmagi na pisdigi vardi ki bo ushaglar goolajakhdi masalan mana?

(l) Manafee: deyeer, aga bunun shaninda dayeer, goolalar deyeer.

(m) Teacher: bali?

(n) Manafee: deyeer bunun shaninda dayeer birdan chikhammaz.

(o) Teacher: neja ki bunun shaninda dayeer, magar shan ensan budi ki garah zad olar, shan ensan harasindadi?

- (p) Manafee: aga, bizim jamehamiz bujordi.
(q) Teacher: najordi masalan?
(r) Manafee: [aga, ela har sheya bujoor goolallar sheydi=]
(s) Pourgooli: [aga, bizim ela farhangimiz bujordi.]
(t) Teacher: [bir lahza gardash, yeh lahzeh, aha.
(u) Manafee: aga, masalan goror biri evda biri evda dars okhoyan dayeer yakhji?
Alaki aydan bir eecharida okhoyor, vali bu eshinda dars deyer da.
(v) Teacher: Aha
Continues ...

(7)

aga man fekr mikonam panj, shish salam bud, ba pedar bozorgam raftam mazraeh, yek jae bud esmesh sham...sham...sham, derakhtha chi azash roshd mikard, pishesh jangaleh, tagriban.

Aga man ham olaghha, chi paridand daryacheh, yek rudeh kheili bozorgi bud aga, aga yek rudeh bozorg bud. Olaghha az anha, az on kuch kardand. Man shena balad nabudam, baba bozorgeh man ba olagheh man raft onvar ta agor biareh migoftand tuyeh chiz onja gorg hast. Gorg o goraz. Aga man ham pish khodam kheili tarsidam. Yek taraf ra mididam kharash garg shodeh bud. Fekr mikardam gorgeh, az an dur, kheili dur bud. Aga man raftam, dastamo negah daram, haddagal pisham bud on beh khialam khof bud, on ham raft pishesh baba bozorg. Man tanha mundam, bad yeh ta keik didam, hanuz chizash ham baz nashodeh bud naylonash. Aga fased ham nashodeh bud, fekr kardam tazez az daryacheh az in man ham khordam, ta khordanesh on ham amad, bad raftim khoneh.

(8)

- (a) Teacher: deh zad
(b) Shapouri: aga, neja khareji zabandi aga ... okhomagida [chatindi]
Teacher: [na lahzadan?]
(c) Shapouri: aga, masalan ushag dark eliammirda, aga, aga, bu zaban [biza lazimdi,=]
Teacher:[bir lahza gardash]
(d) shapouri: masalan deyeer, aga, kharejia gedmiyagayig, kharejada ishimiz yokhdi aga, zabani neya oygashakh?
(e) Ayyub: galanda, bir dalili da var aga, aga bular neja avalda okhomooyublar?
Continues ...

(9)

Bir gun aga yazlagdan galirdim, iki nafaridig, aga yek ruz az gesglag mi amadim, do nafar budim, aga man sham mipokhtam, aga hameh chiz ra amadeh mikardam, dostam ham dashteh davar ra micharond, aga gusfand ra micharond, aga umad behem goft, namak rikhti tu gaza? Goftam na az aga ... aga... aga bejaye namak, aga paf...paf...paf, pudreh raktshuee ra dadam rikht tu gaza. Gaza pof kard, aga rikhteh bud birun, madareh dustam aga yeh masteh gav gozashteh bud, aga khordim va khabidim, aga dahanam dasht misukht.

(10)

Teacher: what are your expectations from the society?

Kamalee: masalan, aga, bizim shahreh mohammad...

O kichih bir shahar dayeer da? Bir chikkela yekadi da?

Nesbat beh Nagadeya chikkeladi.

Teacher: bali?

Kamalee: aga, bizim indi Mohammadyarda birdana khiabaneh aslimiz var, birdana matabbimiz var, bir dana bimarestan, masalan kichih bimarestan yokhdi ki masalan orda amal anjam tapa, doktorlar masalan orda chokh ish gora.

(11)

Hooshmand: aga masalan baziha aga masalan omreshan, beduneh barnamehrizi az dast midahand. Masalan aga... masalan in agar tou nabudi... aga beh donbaleh lebasshaieh, anchenani va vasayel khubeh enchenani mioftand.

Yani ma nabayad beh fekreh danayae va in chizha bashim, masalan shaer bayad= aga aga bazi miayand tu madrash, aga barayeh regabet ba ino an miayand mige in az man zaeftareh, man gavitarom, behtar midunam, aga ageh inham nabasheh khodat dari mituni bekhuni, vali aga masalan tou donbalesh ageh yek ... aga masalan aga ageh tou yek abeh jam nadashteh bashi, az tala basheh, aga mituni bazham ba dasthat ab bekhori, vali masalan ageh yek lebas az ... parcheh asl, atlas basheh, ...abrisham basheh, bazham yeki digeh, yek dalg gohan, parcheueh abrishami, aga pirmardhayeh fagir mipushid baz ham, ... aga mituni dashteh bashi, masalan aga, hameh chiz mituni beh jayeh harchiz yek chiz behar bebari, vali aga masalan on chiz, tanha chizi keh tekrar namisheh va dafeyeh digari nadareh omreh.