

# Conflict of Philosophies of Education in Public vs. Private School Discourses: An Investigation of English Language Teachers' Teacher-room Talk in Iranian Context

Davud Kuhi

Islamic Azad University, Maragheh Branch, Iran

Hamzeh Pazhuman

Islamic Azad University, Maragheh Branch, Iran

**Abstract**—The purpose of this study is to uncover the cultural beliefs and values that underlie the public school and private language institute teachers' representations of their professional identities and figured worlds, through examining discourses that manifested themselves in their teacher-room talks with their peer teachers. The data was collected by means of video recordings of the teachers' natural and face-to-face interactions. Using a multi-layered approach, we analyzed the two groups' speech patterns: 'I-statements', 'narrative lines', 'act sequences and schematic move structures', 'tenses of verbs', 'pronouns', 'hedging vs. boosters', 'topics of talks', 'in-group insults', 'teasing humor', 'mentoring talk', 'professional humor', 'phatic communion and social talk vs. core business talk', 'everyday vs. technical vocabularies', 'laughter', 'lexical density', 'pacing of talk', 'repetition and dramatization', 'the amount of English language used and code-switching' and non-linguistic factors like 'tools', 'objects', and 'bodies' as identity-markers used by the two groups. The findings revealed that speech patterns of the two groups of teachers differed dramatically. The most pervasive macro-speech patterns among public school teachers were 'narratives' and 'social dispute arguments' and that of English language institute teachers were 'work and professional talk with code-switching from Turkish to English' and 'mentoring and viewpoint-giving arguments'. The school teachers' narratives, and social phatic communion talk, in the form of mainly gossip, depicted a 'master dispute figured-world' against authorities, whereas mentoring, viewpoint-giving arguments, work negotiation, and work experiences told by institute teachers were a sign of their 'master work and success figured-world'.

**Index Terms**—philosophy of education, teachers' room talk, macro-discourses, speech patterns

## I. INTRODUCTION

In an excellent discussion on how the practice of language teaching can be influenced by the dominant philosophy of education, Widdowson (2003) talks about two [macro-discourses] which co-occur with some [micro-discourses] of language pedagogy including the roles of participants (teachers and learners), the way learning ends are to be defined and selection of E (Externalized) vs. I (Internalized) conception of language. In one philosophy of education, which he calls a retrospective philosophy, education is conceived as the initiation of students into an established culture of knowledge and belief, a continuation of heritage. In this view, the dominant philosophy is past-oriented and dedicated to the maintenance of traditional social values on the assumption that they will be of continuing relevance. However, in alternative view, which Widdowson calls a prospective philosophy of education, the focus is on future, on initiative rather than initiation; this view anticipates change by representing education as the means whereby individuals are prepared to cope with unpredictable eventualities. Widdowson argues that a retrospective philosophy of education usually co-occurs with emphasis on teacher authority (in assigning roles to participants), code knowledge (in characterizing learning outcomes), and an Internalized conception of language (in prioritizing a philosophy of language and communication), whereas a prospective philosophy usually co-occurs with emphasis on learner autonomy, communicative knowledge and an Externalized conception of language. Of course, here we understand Widdowson's conservative voice in the use of the verb "co-occur" by which he is trying to avoid and also prevent any implicational interpretations since in that paper he is encouraging language teachers to move beyond pre-determined educational structures and take initiatives and have their own voices in resetting the existing parameters. However, the fact is that the relationships here are constitutive: retrospective and prospective philosophies of education should be regarded as macro-discourses which inevitably construct and are reconstructed by micro-discourses. Hence, in our argument, we have avoided any representationalist conception of discourse and have rather adopted a constitutive one (for a detailed discussion on the difference of these, see Shi-Xu, 2005). We believe that all types of academic discourses (including teacher-room talk which is the focus of the present research) produced in educational institutes can be regarded as

reliable sources of understanding where the policy-makers desire to push the outcomes: are they dedicated to reproduction of values that belong to past or are they preparing the learners to deal with unpredictable eventualities.

It should, of course, be mentioned that teacher-room talk is not an uncharted land in applied linguistic research, but what is missing in the literature is the constitutive interpretation we have adopted in the present study.

From among the studies which have followed a similar tendency, we can refer to Vasquez (2007) who explored two types of workplace narratives – reflective and relational narratives – produced by a group of professionals who were non-experts: in this case, novice language teachers. Specifically, the study illustrated how the moral stance that a novice constructs within a narrative may be formulated in uncertain terms, may be destabilized by the primary narrator, or may be subject to revision by other participants. Finally, the study highlighted the relationship between the narrative dimensions of moral stance and teller-ship, and suggested that participant structure, participants' role relationships, and institutional power asymmetry were especially relevant factors to consider in any further analyses of novices' workplace narratives.

Ignatieva (2010) studied the cultural beliefs and values that underlie American and Russian teachers' representations of their professional identities and their understanding of power in education in the context of globally disseminated education reforms, through examining discourses that manifested themselves in their talks. Only some pronouns as linguistic features and social dominant discourse models manifested in teachers' talks and interviews in two countries were analyzed and discussed in this study.

Irwin and Hramiak (2010) in an investigation of trainee teacher identity in online discussion forums state that teacher education involves an identity transformation for trainees from being a student to being a teacher. This study examined the online discussion board communications of a cohort of trainee teachers to better understand the situated identities of the trainees and how they were presented online. Their discussion board posts were the primary method of communication during placement periods and, as such, provided insight into how the trainees situated their identities in terms of being a student or being a teacher. During the analysis, the community boundaries, language and culture were explored along with the tutor's power and role in the identity transformation process. This involved looking at the lexis used by the trainees, the use of pronouns to refer to themselves and others such as teachers and pupils, the types of messages allowed in the community and the effect of the tutor's messages on their communication.

Gee (2010) reports a project where a university history professor (Dr. Vogel, not her real name) wanted to work with middle-school teachers to have their students engage in oral history to collect information about the history of their neighborhoods and the city in which they live. There were historic tensions between the university and the city and, in particular, tensions between people who taught at the university and people who taught in the public schools, tensions over status and commitment to the city.

We believe that studies like the ones quoted above have contributed to our understanding of many dimensions of teacher talk, but we find our unique in indicating the embeddedness of such talk in the dominant values of educational philosophies. What adds to the value of such research is the juxtaposition of these conflicting philosophies in a single context. English is taught in two different educational systems in Iran (public school system and private language institutes) and the fact is that these two systems operate with totally different approaches to language, learning and interaction. In what follows a detailed description of the context of the study is provided.

## II. METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in Naghadeh (also known as Sulduz), a small town in western Azerbaijan province of Iran. The participants of the research were teachers of a public high school and a private English language institute. They spoke a local variety of Azerbaijani Turkish as their mother tongue.

Using a multi-layered approach, in the present study we analyzed the two groups of teachers' talks in terms of the following features: 'I-statements', 'narrative lines', 'act sequences and schematic move structures', 'tenses of verbs', 'pronouns', 'hedging vs. boosters', 'topics of talks', 'in-group insults', 'teasing humor', 'mentoring talk', 'professional humor', 'phatic communion and social talk vs. core business talk', 'everyday vs. technical vocabularies', 'laughter', 'lexical density', 'pacing of talk', 'repetition and dramatization', 'the amount of English language used and code-switching' and non-linguistic factors like 'tools', 'objects', and 'bodies' as identity-markers used by the two groups.

The data were recorded from *the teachers' room talks* at their break time between their classes. Nearly four and a half hours of their talks were recorded at different intervals and in different sessions. As the school teachers' rest times were relatively longer than institute teachers' break times, from 4.5 hours of data collected nearly 3 hours belong to the school teachers and about 1.5 hours to institute teachers (this difference in the amounts of data also is due to, in part, long unhurried narratives of the school teachers). This amount of data were collected in 24 sessions (13 sessions for the school and 11 sessions for the institute). The public school consists of different teachers teaching various kinds of content subjects like: Biology, History, Sociology, Chemistry, Mathematics, English language, Arabic language, and so on (a heterogeneous context). But the English language institute consists of only professional English language teachers (a homogeneous context).

For more than three decades there has been a sort of political and personal tensions between the teachers of public schools, between the Fundamentalists and the Reformists. The two groups were fighting (and still they are fighting now) against each other for occupying the top status-chairs of the educational office of the town. These conflicts have caused

great damages to the process of education and teaching children in the public schools so that most of these teachers have forgotten their teaching careers and have been seeking the higher status of manager-ship in whatever way possible. At the public high school in which I have collected my data, most of the teachers have been teaching for more than fifteen years on average. English language teachers at the institute are all young energetic teachers with no more than eight years of teaching experience in the private language teaching center. Most of them had been the students of the institute before getting their teaching diplomas.

#### A. Analysis of Two Excerpts from Public High School Teacher-room Talk

All school data in this research is in Turkish language. The teachers are teaching in different subject areas and the context is heterogeneous but they all speak Turkish, their mother tongue. The most pervasive discourse strategy among school teachers is narrative and storytelling which is a cue showing their dispute and interactional figured world.

##### *School data - excerpt (1)*

Zein is telling a social story which happened to him last year (The names of the teachers have been changed. Zein is a Mathematics teacher. Behi is a theology teacher. They are talking in Turkish.):

**Zein:**(1) (Turkish) bildir..elabilan haman...bu ruze moalem uchin tagdir eliyanda..bu..bu nezami gardashdarimiz birini bizim familardan da, galmishdi bir yerda mitdanirdi, “vallah! yarim sa”at dir bu moalemlara gura..allaf oldikh...flan behman.” O adamda gardashi etifagan moalemidir, oda bir ikidana suz dedi ki az galdi dura gacha.

(English) last year ..perhaps in that...this, the teacher’s day for thanks-giving them..this..this, one of our **military guys** from our relatives had come somewhere saying that, “oh God! it was half an hour for the sake of these teachers ..we wasted our time”...this or that. that guy’s brother ,by chance, was a teacher. That person told him one or two things that the guy was nearly to get up and run away.

**Behi:** (2) (Turkish) yakhchi! diyardin, “san niya garnagrisina tushisan. sanin adamnigin moalemin sayasinda...”

(English) well! you might have told him, “ why you get stomach-ache[cursing]. Your becoming a human being [cursing] is because of the teachers’ **helps**...”

In this story, Zein mentions a military person who, he thinks, has treated the teachers rudely saying that in Teachers’ Day, the teachers have wasted his time. Zein, Behi, and other teachers in the school know that most of the military persons have got their diplomas by the “teachers’ **help**”. The teachers have given the military persons high scores in their exams without even answering the questions of the exams. Now most of those military persons have higher ranks, status, and salaries in the town. So Zein’s story puts forward the discussion on an obvious breaking of the educational law, i.e. scoring. In line (2) Behi, in a reaction to Zein’s story, calls this breaking of the law as “teachers’ **help**”. Behi reveals their own beliefs and values in terms of scoring the students. In their view, giving scores to the students without their studying and pain-taking is considered to be “**help**”. This and other problems which we talk about in the other excerpts have damaged the system of public education in this town to a great extent. Here the teachers are guilty of breaking the law. They see the source of the problems outside themselves in the others. Behi uses cursing language twice in a reaction to the guy’s sayings quoted by Zein in line (2) (“why you get stomach-ache” meaning you get sick and “your becoming a human being” meaning your improvement). Zein’s hesitations and inconsistency in line (1) (that...this, ...this...this, ...this or that) and his use of indicators in his address terms (this guy, this or that) shows his being driven into his emotions, getting angry, using demeaning language, and reacting to what the guy had said about teachers. Some other features in this excerpt are: talking about past and expired things, long and elaborated language (giving the concrete details of what has been said or done), dramatization, i.e., talking both his own and others’ turns in direct speech, angry tone of voice, a cyclical schematic “Move Structure” (Swales, 1981, 1990; Kuhl, 2008) (in all the school teachers’ talks) which starts with Move 1 (posing a social problem, here the teachers’ status), leads to arguments about the causes of this problem in Move 2, then Move 3, giving some narratives and examples to prove this. This move structure is common both in overall school talk and in narratives. Narratives are repeatedly told between argument turns. This cycle goes on and on. The above narrative is just one part of the cyclical move structure. The function of all these features are demeaning and downplaying the authorities of the town.

##### *School data- excerpt (2)*

Behi tells a story which he has heard from one of his relatives:

**Behi:** (1) (Turkish) doctoraye shimi alanarin biri bizim familimizdi, uzi deirdi, deirdi, “aga daneshghadan bizi yoladilar getdikh beonvane bursiya doctoraye shimi alakh galakh Tehrana,” deir, “getdikh ustad orda danishir..bu **alchanin** turshashirin vadasidi..**chagala** vadasidi.” deir, “bakhdim gurdim ustad orda dars deir, manda bir naylon alchani goymusham burda bagalima..satli ashgald bir az uzagtaydi ela burden...fiiiisht...deir, “o basketball atan kimi **veyiram** chagalnin..zadini atiram ordan..chovdaine oraya.” san fikretilisan bu danishjoye doctoraye shimi ki ustad dars diadia chagala **tanagul eiliyer**..haha..gedib duzadigi shiaf darmani...dardi darman eilijag ya yokh!

(English) One of those who are getting their doctorate in chemistry is our relative, he was himself saying, he was saying, “sir, they sent us from university, we went as supported doctorate chemistry students to get our degrees and return to Tehran,” he says, “we went and saw the professor there speaking...it was the time of prune when it is sour and sweet, the beginnings of prune,” he says, “I looked and see the professor who is teaching there, and I have a packet of prune beside me, I am eating it...there was a bit away a rubbish bin, just from here I...**fiiiisht...[a sound like a missile]**,” he says, “like basketball playing I am eating prunes...and its what.. I throw its cores from here to there.” You

think this doctorate of chemistry student, while his professor is teaching, he is eating prune ...**haha...[laughing mockingly]** he goes and makes a drug, whether this drug will cure the diseases or not!

In this excerpt Behi talks mockingly about one of his relatives who had gone abroad to get his doctorate in chemistry. Behi quotes his relative's way of attending one of his classes; while his professor is teaching, the student is eating prunes and playing. Behi, using a teasing language, tries to mock this student and his authorities who sent him abroad. He uses "chagala" which is an everyday word instead of "alcha" for prune in line (1). In their culture eating "chagala" is a kind of diversion and recreation because it is the beginning of "alcha", so people use it for recreation. Behi says that as if the doctorate student has gone there for recreation rather than gaining knowledge. He uses the verb "tanagul eiliyer" instead of "yeyir" for "eating" to give the word a recreational tone and meaning because it is used when talking about a higher rank person eating something recreationally. Behi skillfully dramatizes the scene by using "...fiiiisht...[a sound like a missile]" and his gestures and body movements which we can see in video recordings. He also uses direct speech as speaking the other person's turns to dramatize the scene; he both talks his own and the other persons' turns. He laughs mockingly when talking about the student's behaviors. We see that Behi here uses all kinds of resources of his native language, i.e. words, verbs, and sounds and body movements and laughing and also the shared culture of his group and people to build a demeaning and teasing activity against authorities. We see these skills and resources as their patterns of speech in their talks in all other excerpts. These patterns build their "figured-world and identities" (Gee, 2010). In all the school teachers' talks we see this move structure and "act sequences" (Hymes, 1972): starting with argument about a social problem in short but sometimes overlapped turns (Move 1, past time), then relating something to this problem and accusing the authorities as being guilty of this (Move 2, present time), bringing some examples in narratives and stories to prove the existence of the problem (Move 3, past time). And this cyclical pattern (argument-argument-narrative one-argument-argument-narrative two-....etc.) goes on and on in order to demean the authorities. We do not see and hear any talk about their work or their desires for future work success (which is dominant in the institute teachers' talks). They remain in the present and mainly in the past, reacting to what others said or done and dramatizing them according to their own wills and purposes (i.e. positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation). The above excerpt is only one of those narratives in the overall pattern.

#### *B. Analysis of Some Excerpts from Private Institute Teacher-room Talk*

In all institute data in this research, teachers, who are all English language teachers in a homogeneous context, talk in English. "Code-switching" from Turkish into English is the most pervasive "discourse strategy" (Gumperz, 1982) among institute teachers and is a "contextualization cue" (Gumperz, 1982) showing their shared identities and work success figured world as English teachers.

##### *Institute data - excerpt (1)*

The English institute teachers have just come from their classes to the teachers' room. Miss Aliz, an English language teacher of the institute, talks about a thirteen-year-old girl she talked about in the previous class with her students. Miss Nas and Miss Ferra are other English language teachers of the English center. Miss Faz, my daughter (the researcher's daughter), is one of Aliz's students who was in her class discussion and now is recording the teachers' room talk for me. They are all talking in English:

- (1) **Aliz:** she is a thirteen-year-old girl, and now she is in university
- (2) **Ferra:** it is unbelievable!
- (3) **Nas:** where?
- (4) **Aliz:** in Tehran, I think. Was it Tehran?
- (5) **Faz:** yea
- (6) **Ferra:** is she from Nagad?
- (7) **Aliz:** no, no
- (8) **Ferra:** is she from Tehran?
- (9) **Aliz:** yes, she is just thirteen and she studies medicine. After eight years she will be a doctor, you can go to her, a nineteen-year-old doctor.
- (10) **Faz:** do you think she will be successful?
- (11) **Ferra:** yes, why not?
- (12) **Faz:** in that age?
- (13) **Ferra:** yes, she...she will be successful.
- (14) **Aliz:** I don't think so.
- (15) **Ferra:** why?
- (16) **Aliz:** because, you know, she is just a teenager, in our class I told that a teenager is a teenager and a child is a child and an adult is an adult, she must go to school, you know, university's atmosphere is different than school and she will go to class with boys and girls who are twenty, eighteen, nineteen, I think that would be different for her. do you think so?
- (17) **Ferra:** maybe, yes.
- (18) **Aliz:** maybe, yea.
- (19) **Nas:** she doesn't understand them, maybe.

(20) **Aliz:** yea, maybe.....but the students' reactions were really funny, you know, some of them said, "it is really good, and we want to be like her", some of them said, "no, it is not ok." .....I think, as a teenager, they like, they like to be like her.

(21) **Ferra:** they like to go to university with their classmates

(22) **Aliz:** yea...university is a very strange place

(23) **Ferra:** why... why strange?

(24) **Aliz:** well, you know, I am thinking it is a very strange place... [some of the students try to enter the room]... they are waiting for us to come to the class, but it is not the time. that were all my students, all the time they are here.

(25) **Faz:** well, how was your class?

(26) **Ferra:** I have very smart students, they are so motivated.

(27) **Aliz:** oh yea, I've seen them, they are perfect. Lucky you for having them, I wish I could go and teach them. they are smart, intelligent, they usually talk, laugh.

(28) **Ferra:** yea

(29) **Aliz:** How is their English? Can they speak?

(30) **Ferra:** good, yes, they can speak very well and they can talk with each other

(31) **Aliz:** don't you have problem with those who can not speak English?

(32) **Ferra:** no

(33) **Aliz:** because I know them... two of them are really naughty...

(34) **Ferra:** but they are.....

In this excerpt, in lines (1-24), the teachers are talking about a thirteen-year-old girl pursuing her doctorate degree in medicine and considered to be a successful model for the students in the institute. Mentioning this case in the class drives the students into their fidelities to persuade them talk about their feelings and to watch their reactions. In line (20) Aliz says "but the students' reactions were really funny..." and "...I think, as a teenager, they like, they like to be like her." In line (21) Ferra says "they like to go to university with their classmates" or in lines (10) and (13) Faz and Ferra say "do you think she would be *successful*?" and "yes, she...she will be *successful*". All these lines and others in the institute data show that they are nearly always thinking about their work and future success and this in turn build their work and success figured world and identities. They talk with each other in question-answer sequences of acts in relatively short turns compared with the public school teachers' long elaborated narrative turns. They also use reflective verbs as mitigators and softeners and hedgings as a sign of their indirect non-assertive knowledge-based talk. In lines (16), (18), and (20) Aliz says "I think that would be different for her", "I think, as a teenager, they like...", "maybe, yea" or in lines (16) and (20) she uses "you know" three times. "You know" as a mitigator and a discourse marker also means that the speaker and the hearer have a shared knowledge of the case at hand and acts as a bonding device in interpersonal relationships. In lines (2) and (20) Ferra and Aliz use the personal discourse markers "unbelievable" and "really" as devices to express their personal feelings. Institute teachers also use present and future verbs which show their desires and wills for future success and achievements (e.g. "they like to go..." in line (21), "she will be successful" in line (13)), compared with past verbs which the public school teachers use in their narratives and talks as a sign of their thinking about and dealings with what has gone away and what is outside themselves rather than their own work and success. In lines (25-34) they change the topic to their own students' levels of speaking. In line (25) Faz asks Ferra "well, how was your class?" Here the word "well" as a discourse marker is used for changing the topic of the talk. Before that in line (24) when Aliz was talking about the girl's case some of the institute's students try to enter the room which is used in their class after the break-time is over. Here a pause occurs in Aliz's turn "I'm thinking it is a very strange place...[students try to enter the room]...they are waiting for us to come to the class". This break in Aliz's turn also is a sign of topic change in their talk. The institute English teachers have a specific and linear move structure which is realized by a combination of linguistic, paralinguistic, and non-linguistic devices, features, and resources. In Move 1, they put forward a work-related problem like "a teaching point" from their textbook or "a successful educational case, in this excerpt". In Move 2, they negotiate and give their own viewpoints about the problem or the case one by one and with a relatively short turns. In Move 3, they try to reach at some results. In Move 4, they try to come to a decision about the problem. The linear move structure is: (negotiation-negotiation-negotiation-....-decision). They also use short and non-elaborated non-narrative turns and work-related negotiations as a sign of their short break-times and spending less time to talk about others' actions and sayings and more about their own teaching career, less attention to others' sayings and doings and reacting to them, not explaining concrete details of the things said or done, talking about abstract issues, using first person pronouns (e.g. we, I, me, us) to attach themselves to their colleagues as a sign of their alignment, the humorous, gentle, and friendly work-related jokes, gentle and friendly laughing, indirect language with more mitigators and softeners as a sign of their deferential and respectful language, their happy and satisfied tone of voice in nearly all of their talks, their non-hesitations and consistencies in their talks, with social meanings as a sign of their rational and knowledge-based talks, all these are the prevalent resources used by the institute teachers which I analyze in the other excerpts.

#### ***Institute data - excerpt (2)***

Mr. Delm, an English language teacher and the supervisor of the institute, wants to get some practical ideas from another English language teacher, Miss Jafa, about how to teach a particular point in his class. Jafa, once, was his own student:

(1) **Delm:** today's class, today I'm going to teach superlative adjectives, I was wondering if you have any ideas to make it more interesting for students, some more activities, for superlative adjectives.

(2) **Jafa:** superlative adjectives...emm...well, we can relate it to their own real lives, for example, I myself always use, for example, monsters for superlative adjectives.

(3) **Delm:** for all the levels or teenagers, ha?

(4) **Jafa:** yea, for teenagers and all levels, the most frightening, the most amazing...I don't know, using their language, it always helped me teach superlative adjectives better.

(5) **Delm:** is it a good idea to compare the teachers? the teachers of canon?

(6) **Jafa:** I have no idea to compare them, but they can compare themselves and their friends.

(7) **Delm:** so what do you think about the good idea for adults? you know, that one day I couldn't use most of the words.

(8) **Jafa:** as I remember you always used pictures on words.

(9) **Delm:** yea, last session I did it, for people, I draw them, persons, Peter, Jack, in boys' classes they usually compare cars, Ferrari, Station, Jian. I need some ways to make it something different, you know, I want to make it really different.

(10) **Jafa:** why don't you want their own ideas? Students will be happy to play teaching, suggest games, role-plays, or...even sometimes I can't teach the grammar with the vocabularies.

(11) **Delm:** what about the students who supposed to give lecture about superlative adjectives? They may speak mechanical and in school-time.

(12) **Jafa:** I guess they memorize it.

(13) **Delm:** I want to push them into their fidelities and then through that, inductively, teach this grammar.

(14) **Jafa:** I know always every student has his own pattern, as my students get photos...eh...some nice things to bring to the session to study between us.

(15) **Delm:** well, thank you very much, I got some nice tips, about their real life, for example, what is your most invaluable position? what is the most expensive thing you have? what is the cheapest thing you bought last year? good idea, thank you very much.

In this excerpt, in line (1), Delm says "I'm going to teach superlative adjectives..." which shows his desire for future work and success. In the institute, the teachers are, nearly in all the data, trying to improve their own teaching career, so they think and talk about their own work and have desires for future success in their work. In line (1) Delm also uses a formal indirect request "I was wondering if you have any idea to make it more interesting for the students". This indirect request is used as a softener and mitigator which is a sign of deferential and respectful talk and also a sign of their rational and knowledge-based talk, compared with the public school teachers' direct, assertive, emotional, and everyday interactional talk. They also use first person pronouns, that is, "I" and "we" together with reflective verbs and achievement statements about their activities, desires or efforts that relate to their achievements, accomplishments, and their distinctions. In line (1) Delm says "I am going to teach..." or in line (2) Jafa says "we can relate it to their..." or in line (13) Delm says "I want to push them into their fidelities..." and a lot of other instances. Also they use modal verbs as hedging (like in lines (2) and (6) Jafa uses "we can..." or "they can..." and in line (11) Delm uses "they may..."), "if-clauses" as polite requests, asking others' ideas, and thanking each other for their helps (Grice, 1975) all are signs of the institute teachers' work solidarity and attention to self, compared with the public school teachers' uses of third person pronouns, that is, "he" and "they" together with their direct dramatic talk with less mitigators and softeners which are all signs of their attention to others' sayings and doings outside themselves and their dispute figured world against authorities. Also they express their feelings by using personal discourse markers as a bonding device to make their interpersonal relationships stronger. In lines (9) and (15) Delm says "I want to make it *really* different" or "...*good idea*, thank you very much". In this excerpt the institute teachers also use technical language related to their English language teaching career. In line (13) Delm says "I want to push them (students) into their fidelities and then through that, *inductively*, teach this grammar". Here, Delm explicitly mentions the inductive method of teaching grammar within the students' real lives. Or in lines (11) and (12) Delm and Jafa talk and exchange ideas about the students' lectures on grammar points "...they may speak mechanical and in school-time" "I guess they memorize it". These and others in the data show their knowledge-based technical talks and their work success figured world. One noticeable thing in most of the institute video-recordings is that they always have their textbooks at hands and repeatedly refer to and discuss its different points which they are going to teach in their classes. As if the books are their partners and interlocutors. They are the "tools" (Jaworski & Coupland, 1999) of their identity makers. In line (1), as Delm turns over the pages of the Headway textbook, he requests Jafa about giving practical ideas to make the teaching point interesting. They also bend their bodies over the textbook as they discuss on its points; they use even their bodies as their identity builders.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The public school teachers in our data use language to fashion their identities in a way that is attached to a world of everyday social and dialogic interaction. But, the English language institute teachers use language to construct their identities in a way that detach themselves from everyday social interaction and orient more towards their personal work experiences and achievements defined by the norms of their institution. In addition, the institute teachers use the abstract language of rational argumentation to defer their quite personal interests and fears, whereas the school teachers much more commonly use a personalized narrative language to encode their values, interests, and themes. One way, among many, to begin to get at how the school and the institute teachers build different socially situated identities in language is to look at when they refer to themselves by speaking in the first person as “I”. We call these “I-statements” (Gee, 2010). We categorize different I-statements in terms of the type of predicate or “type of processes” (Halliday, 1994) that accompanies “I”, that is, in terms of what sort of thing the teacher says about him or herself. We will consider the following kinds of I-statements: Cognitive statements, Affective statements, State and Action statements, Ability and Constraint statements, Achievement statements.

TABLE 1.  
DISTRIBUTION OF I-STATEMENTS IN TEACHERS’ TALKS

Category	Public school teachers			Language institute teachers		
	Behi	Zein	Moha	Delm	Aliz	Jafa
Category(A)						
Affective	3	3	13	9	14	5
Ability/Constraint	0	3	0	7	16	26
State/Action	91	74	74	30	21	26
Sub- total(A)	<b>94</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>87</b>	46	51	57
Category(B)						
Cognitive	6	20	13	36	30	32
Achievement	0	0	0	18	19	11
Sub- total(B)	6	20	13	<b>54</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>43</b>

Table 1 above shows the distribution of different types of I- statements in terms of the number of each type out of the total number of I- statements the teacher has used in his or her whole talk in our data. In Table 1 I have sub- totaled and categorized the scores for Affective, Ability- Constraint, and State- Action I- statements, on the one hand, and the scores for Cognitive and Achievement I- statements, on the other. I call the first combination Category (A) and the second, Category (B). When we make such combination, we find something interesting and suggestive. The school teachers are high in category (A) and low in Category (B), while the institute teachers are low in A and high in B. It shows that Behi, Zein, and Moha have used the Category (A) I-statements **94, 80, 87** times, whereas Delm, Aliz, and Jafa have used Category (B) I-statements **54, 49, and 43** times, respectively. One other indication that the school teachers are more focused on the world of interaction than the institute teachers is the fact that they narrativize far more than the institute teachers. The school teachers dramatize within their narrations, i.e., they talk both their own turns and the others’ and talk about the concrete details of what the others said or done. The institute teachers devote most of their talks to negotiation, mentoring each other, assessments (of self and others), evaluations, and viewpoint giving and argumentative talk about their own career as English language teachers. The percentage of lines in each teacher’s transcript of his or her whole talk involved in narrative is given in Table 2 below (line here means micro-line, basically clauses or tone units).

TABLE 2.  
PERCENTAGE OF NARRATIVE LINES USED IN TWO CONTEXTS

Type of lines	Public school teachers			Language institute teachers		
	Behi	Zein	Moha	Delm	Aliz	Jafa
Argument	334	241	143	153	186	43
Narrative	196	71	175	30	43	8
Total numbers	530	312	318	183	229	51
Narrative(Percentage)	<b>34</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>16</b>

Building different identities in language always implicates different social languages, since it is in and through different social languages embedded in different discourses, that we enact, perform, and recognize different socially situated identities. The school teachers engage in narrative much more than do the institute teachers. As Table 2 shows, Behi, Zein, and Moha have used narrative lines **34, 23, and 55** percent out of their total number of their talks, respectively, but this is **16, 19, and 16** percent for Delm, Aliz, and Jafa. And this is part of the difference between the distinctive social languages the teachers are using in their talks. The institute teachers are focused on knowledge claims, assessment, evaluation, the movement towards achievement, and the relationship between the present and the future. The school teachers are focused on social, physical, and dialogic interactions. It is important to see that these teachers not only build different socially situated identities in language, they also build different worlds. The school teachers make “the material world” (Halliday’s Transitivity System, 1994) and the institute teachers “the world of abstracts and institutions”, which mean different things. The institute teachers’ language appears more technical and professional in large part because they distance themselves from everyday social interaction, and mediate everything they say through

their relationship to achievement and success in their work. They sometimes defer their material interests with abstract argumentative talk in which they fail to directly mention their own personal interests and concerns.

The school teachers use past-tense verbs more than present and future tenses, whereas the institute teachers use present and future verbs more than past tenses. This shows that the school teachers live in the past with what has happened and expired, but the institute teachers live in the present and desire for the future success in their career.

TABLE 3.  
THE PERCENTAGE OF VERB TENSES USED IN THE TWO CONTEXTS

Verb Tenses	Public school teachers			Language institute teachers		
	Behi	Zein	Moha	Delm	Aliz	Jafa
Present	30	11	7	89	124	22
Future	10	4	11	25	50	10
Past	110	40	115	39	48	9
Total	150	55	133	153	222	41
Present & Future Total	40	15	18	114	174	32
Present & Future (Percentage)	27	27	14	75	78	78
Past (Percentage)	73	73	86	25	22	22

As Table 3 shows, Behi, Zein, and Moha have used past-tense verbs **73**, **73**, and **86** percent of the total numbers of the verbs, respectively, whereas Delm, Aliz, and Jafa have used present and future verbs **75**, **78**, and **78** percent. The school teachers' uses of past-tense verbs show their interactional and dispute figured world, whereas the institute teachers' extensive uses of present and future verbs are the signs of their work and success figured world and their desires for the future success and achievement.

In this study we found that the analysis of the argument part and the narrative part of the school teachers' talks can mutually support each other, helping us to achieve validity in terms of criteria like coverage and convergence, as well as linguistic details, as we draw on a variety of different aspects of language. For this, first step is to look across the whole talks for themes, motifs, or "frames" (Goffman, 1974) that collocate with each other, that is, themes, images, motifs, or "macro-structures" (van Dijk, 1980) that seem to go together. Such related themes connect diverse parts of the talks together and give it a certain overall coherence, texture, "structure" (van Dijk, 1997). Using these motifs and themes, we form claims about some of their situated meanings and figured worlds, claims that we can then check by further consultation of different parts of the data.

As Table 4 below shows, school teachers use the pronouns: he, she, they, him, her, and them (Category A) more than the pronouns: we, you, and us (Category B). But the institute teachers use Category (B) more than Category (A).

TABLE 4.  
THE PERCENTAGE OF PRONOUNS USED IN THE TWO CONTEXTS

Pronouns	Public school teachers			Language institute teachers		
	Behi	Zein	Moha	Delm	Aliz	Jafa
Category(A) (he, she, they, him, her, them)	66	20	58	20	70	11
Category(B) (we, you, us)	13	3	7	42	70	14
Total	79	23	65	62	140	25
Percentage of Category(A)	84	87	89	32	50	44
Percentage of Category(B)	16	13	11	68	50	56

The percentage of Category (A) for Behi, Zein, and Moha are **84**, **87**, and **89**, respectively. And the percentage of Category (B) for Delm, Aliz, and Jafa are **68**, **50**, and **56**. This shows that the school teachers pay more attention to outside themselves and their group members, whereas the institute teachers pay attention to their work and their in-group members. Also, it is a sign of the school teachers' disalignment and the institute teachers' alignment among group members.

In Table 5 below, it is depicted that the school teachers use boosters (e.g. 'definitely', 'I'm sure', etc., as interpersonal certainty markers) more than hedgings (e.g. 'maybe', 'nearly', 'I think', etc., as interpersonal uncertainty markers).

TABLE 5.  
THE PERCENTAGE OF HEDGINGS AND BOOSTERS USED IN THE TWO CONTEXTS

Markers	Public school teachers			Language institute teachers		
	Behi	Zein	Moha	Delm	Aliz	Jafa
Hedgings	4	4	2	15	43	7
Boosters	13	9	8	8	20	4
Total	17	13	10	23	63	11
Hedging Percentage	24	31	20	65	68	64
Booster Percentage	76	69	80	35	32	36

Percentage of boosters out of the total numbers of these two interpersonal markers used by Behi, Zein, and Moha are **76**, **69**, and **80** percent, respectively. And percentage of hedgings used by Delm, Aliz, and Jafa are **65**, **68**, and **64**. This shows the school teachers' interactional, unacademic, and everyday practical knowledge, but the institute teachers'



rational, academic, and knowledge-based views of the realities.. As the Table 6 below shows, in school teachers' talks we can discern a specific schematic and cyclical move structure. CARS is a suitable move model for long and more complicated genres like our school teachers' move patterns. In Move 1, the school teachers establish a territory of problem: social, political, educational, economic, etc. In Move 2, they establish a Niche and relate that problem to something outside themselves. In Move 3, they bring examples by narratives and story-telling to render a positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation to occupy the Niche. This process occurs over and over and takes a cyclical shape. This move structure is common both in overall school talk and in narratives.

TABLE 6.  
SCHEMATIC MOVE-STRUCTURES IN THE TEACHERS' TALKS IN THE TWO CONTEXTS

School teachers(cyclical move structure)		Institute teachers(linear move structure)	
argument		negotiation	
+ argument		+ negotiation	
+ narrative (1)		+ negotiation	
+ argument		+ negotiation	
+ argument		+ negotiation	
+ narrative (2)		+ negotiation	
.		.	
etc.		decision	
(endless)		(end)	

Narratives are repeatedly told between argument turns. This cycle goes on and on. The function of this move structure is demeaning and downplaying the authorities. The institute English teachers have a specific and linear move structure which is realized by a combination of linguistic, paralinguistic, and non-linguistic devices, features, and resources. In Move 1, they put forward a work-related problem like "a teaching point" from their textbook. In Move 2, they negotiate and give their own viewpoints about the problem one by one and with a relatively short turns. In Move 3, they try to reach at some results. In Move 4, they try to come to a decision about the problem.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

After analyzing the talks of the two groups of teachers in different levels of discourse, i.e., functional linguistic, cognitive, and socio-cultural levels, and after working on different speech patterns, features, and resources of the talks, it was depicted that the school teachers, within a heterogeneous context and with different teachers teaching in different subject areas, have an interactional and dispute figured-world. They are challenging the authorities who are thought to be the causes of most of the social, political, and cultural problems in their town. The institute teachers, within a homogeneous context and with the same teachers teaching only English language, have a rational, work, and success figured-world. They are mainly dealing with their own language teaching career. These discourses manifested themselves in their actual behavior in reality of "classrooms" (Cots, 1995). In school teachers' culture a good teacher is one who controls and directs learners and who maintains a respectful distance between the teacher and the learners. Learners are the more or less passive recipients of the teacher's expertise. Teaching is viewed as a teacher-controlled and -directed process. In institute teachers' culture the teacher is viewed more as a facilitator. The ability to form close interpersonal relations with students is highly valued, and there is a strong emphasis on individual learner creativity and independent learning. Students are encouraged to question and challenge what the teacher says. The school teachers choose more bureaucratic and restricted teaching approach, while the institute teachers prefer more democratic and dialogic way. The outcomes of this study can be used in teacher education courses (both for English language teachers and other teachers in general) to transform their discourses to improve their teaching career and to make it more successful and effective. Within these courses teachers become familiar with discourse and its influence on teaching and learning processes.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Cots, J. M. (1995). Bringing discourse analysis into the language classroom. *Links & Letters* 3, 77-101.
- [2] Gee, J. P. (2010). Introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- [3] Goffman, E. (1974). Frame analysis. New York: Harper and Row.
- [4] Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 3, Speech acts. New York: Academic Press.
- [5] Gumperz, J. J. (1982). Discourse strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). An introduction to functional grammar. London: Edward Arnold.
- [7] Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communication competence. In J. B. Pride and Janet Holmes (eds.) *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth,

Middx: Penguin Books.

- [8] Ignatieva, R. P. (2010). Positioning teachers: A discourse analysis of Russian and American teacher identities in the context of changing national assessment mandates. PhD dissertation. Kent state University.
- [9] Irwin, B. and Hramiak, A. (2010). A discourse analysis of trainee teacher identity in online discussion forums. *Technology, pedagogy and education*, 19 (3), 361-377.
- [10] Jaworski, A. & Coupland, N.(eds.)(1999).The discourse reader. London: Routledge.
- [11] Kuhi, D. (2008). An analysis of the move structure of textbook prefaces. *Asian ESP Journal*, 2(4), 63-78.
- [12] Schiffrin, D. (1994).Approaches to discourse. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- [13] Shi-Xu (2005). A cultural approach to discourse. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [14] Swales, J. (1981). Aspects of article introductions. Birmingham, UK: Prentice Hall.
- [15] Swales, J. (1990).Genre analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [16] van Dijk, T. A. (1980). Macrostructures. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [17] van Dijk, T. A. (1985). Handbook of Discourse analysis.Vol.2: Levels and Dimensions of Discourse Analysis. London Orlando: Academic Press.
- [18] van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as structure and process. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- [19] Vasquez, C. (2007). Moral stance in the workplace narratives of novices. *Discourse Studies*, 9(5), 653-675.
- [20] Widdowson, H. G. (2003). Defining issues in language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Davud Kuhi** received his PhD in Applied Linguistics from the Islamic Azad University of Tabriz, Iran in 2001. He got his MA in TEFL from the same university in 2008. Dr. Kuhi is the academic member of the Department of English Language Teaching at Maragheh Azad University, Iran. His area of interest and research is Applied Linguistics, ESP, EAP, TEFL, Discourse Analysis, and Sociolinguistics.

**Hamzeh Pazhuman** has a BA in English Language and Literature from Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. He also has an MA in TEFL from the Islamic Azad University, Maragheh Branch, Iran. He is now a PhD candidate in TEFL at Urmia University, Iran. His area of interest and research is Applied Linguistics, TEFL, Discourse Analysis, critical discourse analysis, and Sociolinguistics.