International Journal of Research and Review
[Indexed, Peer-Reviewed Journal]
Volume 13; Issue: 3; March 2026
Website: www.ijrrjournal.com
Review Paper *E-ISSN: 2349-9788; P-ISSN: 2454-2237*

Ways of Improving Discourse in the School Environment

Hamidova Nigar Shirkhan

Department of Foreign Languages, Azerbaijan State University of Economics Baku, Azerbaijan
ORCID 0009-0003-5124-0215

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20260315

ABSTRACT

In a given communicative situation, an individual's role and status may not necessarily coincide. Status encompasses a wide range of social positions, including age, gender, professional activity, marital status, affiliation groups, positions of prestige, religious beliefs, and the individual's political views. Role, understood as a set of cultural models associated with a particular status, integrates the following types of relations: values and modes of behavior prescribed by society for the individual. It implies characteristic repertoires of speech activities that an institutional agent is expected to perform in specific situations. The central characteristic of a role lies in the expectations held by others toward the role performer. Primarily, a social role is determined by an individual's professional and social activity. The common domain for social status and role is professional activity. For this reason, status reflects the characteristics of a social institution and incorporates the rights and obligations of the institution's subjects, as well as its overall goals and functions. This, in turn, is manifested in social interaction. In other words, by integrating status and role characteristics, the individual constructs their verbal and non-verbal behavior in accordance with the expectations of students, while making use of the services of social institutions. From this, it follows that each social institution possesses its own strategic mechanisms for organizing discourse and discursive behavior. This situation explains the diversity of discourse types and genres. The teacher's discursive personality is a complex structure that includes both integral and distinctive features. The integral features link it to other professional discursive personalities.

Keywords: discourse, school environment, discursive behavior, discourse and subject-specific features

INTRODUCTION

As a bearer of the norms of the literary language and of speech behavior, the teacher's authority finds its confirmation in the unity of culture and education. The high requirements imposed on the level of the teacher's communicative competence are conditioned by their status role. The teacher is required to possess a confident command of linguistic resources as well as the normative rules governing communication.

For those surrounding them, the teacher represents an elite linguistic personality. However, in our view, many teachers function as average carriers of speech culture. It is precisely from this circumstance that the contradiction between the teacher's discursive linguistic personality and their real linguistic personality – that is, their communicative personality – originates.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research indicates that the primary discursive load in classroom settings falls upon teachers. Studies conducted by D. Edwards and N. Mercer (1987) demonstrate that teachers account for approximately 76% of classroom talk. C. Ramirez, S. Yuen (1986), and others have identified the following categories of teacher talk: explanations, questions, commands (or directives), modeling (that is, structuring the form of the lesson), and evaluation (feedback).

According to C. Cummins (1981), teacher talk in the classroom is characterized more by its managerial function than by communication, conversation, or listening. P. Forestal, M. Brubacher, M.R. Payne's. (1990) research likewise shows that approximately 60% of teacher talk consists primarily of asking questions that are instructional in nature. In some cases, questions are posed merely for the sake of questioning. Observations reveal that most teachers ask questions mainly for the purpose of reviewing previously covered material. They pose a question, correct the student's response, and then proceed to the next stage.

In 1998, K.A.J. Mohr (2007) compiled a list of the questions posed by a teacher over the course of one hour. These questions constituted approximately half of the lesson. Of particular importance, however, is not only the presence of questions but also the manner in which teacher–student interaction is constructed within the question–answer sequence. Attention should be directed not toward the quantity of questions, but toward their quality and formulation. Questions posed directly and indirectly, as well as the responses elicited, differ qualitatively. When a teacher communicates with a large audience rather than working in small groups, a greater need emerges for guidance, or more precisely, for the exercise of a managerial function.

R.M. Weber and T. Longhi-Chirlin (2001) argue that asking questions and responding to them constitute the foundation of classroom interaction and should be implemented in all classrooms. H. Mehan (1979) defines this interaction as the "Initiation–Response–Evaluation" (IRE) sequence, while R.G. Tharp and R. Gallimore (1991) refer to it as the "recitation–question–answer" pattern. According to J. Fitzgerald (1993), the "Initiation–Response–Evaluation" interaction is not particularly significant for students learning a foreign language, since for language learners this process is considered convergent. They are not engaged in searching for answers; rather, they are learning to speak. This is particularly characteristic of learners who acquire spoken language through participation in conversation clubs.

However, in institutions of higher education, the "Initiation–Response–Evaluation" interaction may predominate in virtually any classroom context. According to G. Wells and G.L. Chang Wells (1992), within this approach the teacher's role is defined less by evaluation and more by the provision of feedback opportunities for students. This, in turn, reveals the verbal dimension of interaction both between teacher and student and among students themselves.

C.B. Cazden (2001) categorizes the questions posed by teachers into two principal types: traditional questions and learning-oriented questions. Traditional questions are characterized by structural patterns that presuppose specific or socially pre-established responses. In contrast, questions formulated for exploratory purposes (which may also be defined as learning-oriented questions) are designed such that the "student is not placed in a defensive position"; rather, the student's verbal production becomes the object of observation, while explicit guidance is withheld. In traditional (display) questions, however, the teacher may exercise control over the direction of the student's response.

In the former case, the student produces an answer in accordance with previously acquired subject matter, whereas in the

latter case, the response is oriented toward self-presentation. C.B. Cazden (2001) argues that "if potentiality among students is regarded as equally significant within classroom discourse, then particular attention must be paid to who is granted the right to speak during the lesson and whose response is acknowledged as valid."

C.N. Goldenberg (1993) designates the discourse enacted by the teacher as "instructional talk." He conceptualizes this form of discourse as an optimal communicative model, emphasizing its engaging nature, its relevance to learners, and its pedagogical effectiveness. Within this discursive framework, teachers and students engage in sustained interaction and reciprocal exchange of meanings. Under such conditions, the distribution of teacher and student roles may undergo modification. B. Perez (1996) maintains that within this mode of interaction, the teacher demonstrates epistemic respect toward the student's contributions and engages in active listening. In this process, interlocutors generate reciprocal commentary and articulate interpretive positions. According to an alternative viewpoint, "teachers who employ instructional communication adopt a philosophy of shared cognition and dialogic participation, operating under the assumption that a student's cognitive processes extend beyond what is explicitly verbalized, and therefore strive to externalize these latent dimensions."

As reflected in an English expression, "Teachers sometimes learn from their students".

Cognitive processes are conceptualized through linguistic structures, while discourse and communication are likewise understood as processes of reciprocal transmission between the speaker and the listener, through which the content and essence of what is cognized are interpreted. Alongside the knowledge, ideas, and judgments acquired by individuals in the course of life, the generalization, objectification, and manifestation of accumulated experience within linguistic structures are regarded as essential factors in the realization of these processes.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Cognitive academic language, depending on the teacher's personality, enhances the structural organization of students' conversational and academic language. In order to determine this relationship, specialized empirical studies were conducted, and various theoretical approaches presented in the scholarly literature were examined.

DISCUSSION

The intensive investigation of language across diverse fields of the humanities, together with the adoption of discourse as the methodological foundation of scientific analysis, made it possible to speak of a linguistic or discourse turn. As a result, both the object of research and the systems of descriptive coordinates underwent transformation: texts began to be examined in correlation with extralinguistic factors, while the mechanisms and processes of text production became objects of scholarly inquiry.

Consequently, the linguistic agenda increasingly came to include issues such as the linguistic description of the speaker's verbal behavior within the communicative act, as well as problems of verbal interaction across diverse speech situations and discourse genres.

Within discourse analysis, the human speech subject functions simultaneously as speaker, consciousness bearer, subject of linguistic identity, addresser, and addressee.

Under these conditions, the very notion of communication itself undergoes substantial transformation. The understanding of communication as the primary mechanism linking society, as a channel for the transmission of information and the dissemination of knowledge (the transmission model), has given way to a broader conceptualization of this phenomenon as a process through which the

symbolic formation of participants' identities takes place, and through which their social relations and interactions, emotions and viewpoints, as well as their capacity to articulate social realities. are shaped (Craig, 2001). This model foregrounds the crucial role of communication in the formation of the individual.

The discussion concerns the linguistic personality of the textbook author and the philologist-teacher who participates in speech activity and possesses a structured body of knowledge and conceptual representations. Within the notion of the linguistic personality of the scholar-methodologist (the textbook author), one understands the totality of creative and sociolinguistic abilities and characteristics that ensure both the production of speech activity and its comprehension, reflecting the relevant features of the individual's personality and, consequently, possessing a defined cognitive and communicative-pragmatic orientation as well as a structurally integrated linguistic system (Jane; Beth, 2008).

Sociolinguistic competence presupposes the sociocultural conditions of language use. Pragmatic competence is associated with the realization of linguistic means in accordance with the speaker's communicative intention (Weideman, 2014). As can be observed, many linguists and methodologists examine the linguistic personality primarily from the perspective of communicative activity. As constituent components of the linguistic personality, such elements as "lifestyle," "behavioral style," "linguistic taste," "language philosophy," "linguistic competence," and "language ability" are distinguished.

According to the authors of the *Pedagogical Speech* dictionary, a teacher must possess language and subject-matter competences, as well as linguistic and pragmatic competences. Language competence encompasses knowledge of linguistic units and the rules governing their combination. Linguistic competence is characterized by knowledge pertaining to linguistics as a scientific discipline. Subject-matter competence reflects the relationship between language and the objects of the surrounding world. Pragmatic competence represents the capacity to implement speech activity conditioned by communicative goals; it presupposes the selection of linguistic material, the ability to employ variant forms, the choice of speech type, and consideration of functional-stylistic differentiation (Adamson, 1993). Indeed, the communicative competence of the philologist-teacher must be differentiated in linguistic, subject-related, and pragmatic terms.

Instruction, in its essence, constitutes an expression of personality. According to R. Wodak (2009), the understanding of instruction as an expression of personality represents a task directly related to the teacher's performance or presentation. She conceptualizes this task as a practical one. We believe that this position may be supported, since it is more appropriate to regard teaching not merely as a profession, but as a form of practice: teaching never becomes obsolete, and knowledge is never extinguished. In the processes of teaching and learning, the teacher plays a crucial role within the classroom, as they function as an effective and positive model.

At this point, the learner factor must also be taken into consideration. Learners differ considerably from one another. In certain cases, the same learner may internalize different methods in different ways depending on the situation. Under such circumstances, a significant responsibility rests with the teacher. The teacher must possess the ability to know and understand learners and their individual characteristics. In order to provide learners with the necessary information and knowledge and to guide them safely toward their educational objectives, the teacher must assume a leadership role within the classroom and display strong leadership qualities.

The teacher's personality serves as a model for the learner. Any learner seeks, to varying degrees, to reflect the personal characteristics of their teachers. For this reason, the teacher's personality is often regarded as the most decisive factor in both the success and failure of schools or students. Accordingly, V. Bennis (1966) directs particular attention to teachers' leadership capacities. In his view, in addition to possessing subject knowledge, a teacher must necessarily be familiar with leadership concepts and leadership styles.

C. Brophy (1981) compares leadership to the notion of beauty. In his view, leadership resembles beauty in that it is difficult to define and can only be recognized when it is encountered.

Another important issue merits consideration. Every teacher encounters situations in which certain students or pupils are unwilling to attend classes. Such individuals can often be found in cafeterias, dining halls, along roadsides, in shops, or in cafés. At times, however, even high-achieving students may miss classes or refrain from attending lessons. This phenomenon can be observed in any country in the world. The primary responsibility for addressing such situations lies with the teacher. To this end, the teacher must first and foremost be capable of increasing students' interest in their classes. In order to introduce changes in classroom engagement, the teacher should adopt interactive modes of behavior with one or several students or pupils.

A teacher may exert influence by foregrounding their cognitive knowledge, psychological skills, or emotional states. Similar viewpoints have been expressed in the scholarly literature: there is substantial evidence indicating that the teacher's personality exerts an influence on interpersonal behavior, students' perceptions, and learning outcomes (Nuthall, 2001).

Learners assimilate presented knowledge through the processes of accommodation and assimilation, while also acquiring new knowledge from their own experiences. When assimilation occurs, individuals incorporate new experience into an already existing cognitive framework without modifying that framework. Adaptation to new experiences involves the process of restructuring the mental representation of the external world. Accommodation may be understood as a mechanism through which failure gives rise to learning.

According to available data, conflict between teachers and students (pupils) constitutes a widespread issue in contemporary society. Since students and teachers do not always share identical viewpoints, disagreements frequently arise within the classroom environment. Teachers may, at times, display harsh or inappropriate behavior toward students, which can result in learners' unwillingness to listen to them. In such situations, students often adopt a critical stance toward teachers and, in certain cases, demonstrate forms of noncompliance or disobedience. One of the principal causes of teacher–student conflict in the modern era is related to dress and appearance, a problem observed in many countries. Empirical studies likewise indicate that such conflicts between teachers and students represent a common phenomenon in contemporary society.

"Effective instruction and effective communication must always function in conjunction, or do so simultaneously" (Macaulay, 1988). In other words, teachers must learn to communicate with students in a manner that ensures their willingness to listen. When this condition is not met, the resulting situation inevitably affects the instructional process. Consequently, teacher–student relationships may exert a significant influence on learners' academic achievement.

The school constitutes an institution whose meaning extends far beyond that of a space dedicated solely to the teaching and acquisition of knowledge and skills. Within this environment, each member engages in continuous interaction and influences the behavior of others—that is, the personalities

of both teachers and students (Nuthall, 2000). According to social learning theory, individuals learn from one another through observation, imitation, and modeling. For this reason, the central issue lies in how students learn from teachers, how they construct their evaluations of them, and why they perceive certain teachers as effective and others as ineffective.

Personality may be understood as the dynamic organization of an individual's distinctive traits and characteristics. These include abilities, achievements, responsibility, status, and related attributes. Individuals must structure and display their traits and behaviors in accordance with their social position, since personality constitutes not only the property of the individual, but also that of the institutional organization within which they function (Brophy, 1981). Personality represents the totality of ways through which an individual interacts within society. It constitutes a dynamic mode of unique adaptation to the surrounding environment. The development of personality is a continuous process, consisting of a sequence largely grounded in available learning opportunities and the process of socialization.

This implies that personalities differ. Each individual demonstrates behavior aligned with distinct patterns across different situations. Students structure their interaction with teachers in accordance with the teacher's personality. For instance, learners may at times develop a tendency to avoid classes or seek opportunities to disrupt lessons in various ways.

During classroom presentations, the teacher's outward appearance is also of considerable importance. Physical appearance exerts an influence on the surrounding environment, and this environment, in turn, affects the individual's personality; therefore, people tend to interact with a person in accordance with their external presentation.

Activities that contribute to an effective classroom environment may include active learning, student participation, critical thinking, the use of examples, questioning, and explanation. All of these dimensions are likewise associated with the teacher's personality. According to D. S. Srivastava and S. Kumari (2017), "effective teaching does not depend on one's ability to impress students, but on one's capacity to facilitate their learning." If examined at a deeper level, the teacher's personality should be characterized by self-confidence, resilience to pressure, emotional maturity, and integrity. These qualities enable teachers to simplify complex tasks, make critical decisions, and maintain cooperative relationships among students, subordinates, and administrators. A high degree of responsibility is therefore required of the teacher. In other words, alongside pedagogical competence and subject knowledge, the teacher must possess a strong and stable personality structure (Weideman, 2014).

After conducting a thorough analysis of learning types, lesson content, and its optimal sequencing, the teacher must be well informed about the instructional techniques to be employed. The most effective teacher resembles an orchestra conductor, providing direction while simultaneously allowing students the opportunity to perform (Williams, 2001) The teacher must demonstrate patience and sustain it until all students acquire the required competences.

The teacher functions as a mediator in the transmission of knowledge, rather than as a master. Their personality must be engaging. The teacher must be capable of understanding diversity among students with respect to culture, family background, traditions, values, and peer environments. In this regard, the views of D. Keirsey and M. Bates (1984) are particularly noteworthy: individuals are fundamentally different. They desire different things; they possess diverse motivations, goals, values, needs, actions, impulses, and challenges. Nothing is more significant than this diversity. Individuals believe differently, think differently, perceive differently,

conceptualize differently, and interpret reality in distinct ways. Naturally, patterns of behavior and emotional expression governed by desires and beliefs may either adapt to society or diverge from it in profound ways.

The teacher's personality demonstrates a strong and positive correlation with students' attitudes. The teacher's personality and manner of interaction with students play a decisive role in the formation of interpersonal relations; therefore, the teacher functions as a principal agent of change influencing the learning environment. In addition to the aforementioned, we maintain that the teacher's personality may be conceptualized as a dynamic organization within the individual, encompassing the systems that determine their characteristics, behavioral patterns, and modes of thinking. While emphasizing personality, this conceptualization proceeds from the assumption of individual uniqueness, yet simultaneously presupposes the presence of relatively stable and recurrent traits within the individual.

Our study contributes to an understanding of how the teacher's personality facilitates students' learning within the classroom environment and additionally identifies pathways for the development of personal attributes and presentation strategies.

According to G. Nuthall (2001), widely recognized as the founder of personality theory, traits represent the distinctive qualities or dispositions of an individual. Traits constitute a readiness to think or act in similar ways in response to diverse stimuli or situational conditions. From the perspective of personality theories, the study of personality encompasses virtually all aspects of human behavior – that is, nearly everything that a mature human organism does or is capable of doing.

When students are asked about the qualities of effective teachers, they most frequently express a preference for teachers who possess a sense of humor, demonstrate kindness, motivate learners, maintain discipline, exhibit organizational skills, engage in cooperation, and have an appealing voice.

Experts likewise emphasize largely similar qualities in educational contexts, considering it essential for teachers to be communicatively competent, emotionally stable, punctual, capable of managing heterogeneous classrooms, professionally oriented, positively disposed toward their educational institution, attentive to personal appearance, and able to encourage students toward discovery-based learning.

Observations indicate that one of the most significant qualities for a teacher is professional competence. In addition to skills, teachers must demonstrate effective performance. A successful teacher should be multifaceted and capable of establishing meaningful connections with each student or pupil. To achieve this, the teacher must, first and foremost, value their profession, acquire a high level of professional expertise, and take pride in their occupational role.

Let us consider several illustrative examples characterizing the teacher as a linguistic personality:

1) Let us begin a new topic. Today you will become acquainted with the formation and usage rules of the present perfect tense. Your task is to identify the sentences in the given text that correspond to this rule and transform them into the appropriate forms.
2) As we previously learned, the present perfect tense is formed using the appropriate forms of the verb *to have* and the past participle (Participle II). Let us now examine their personal distribution on the board.
3) Let us turn our attention to the columns on the board. Here, two columns illustrate the formation of the present perfect tense according to grammatical person. The first column contains forms expressed with regular verbs, while the second presents forms constructed with irregular verbs: *He has opened; She has opened* (regular verbs); *She has gone;*

He has gone (irregular verbs), and so forth.

4) Now, who can provide an example illustrating the formation of interrogative and negative forms of the present perfect tense? Good. Do you agree?
5) Let us summarize what has been discussed.
6) Now open your textbooks and read the rule. Tahira, where is your textbook? - I forgot to bring it. - You forgot? Narmin, place the book between you so that both of you can read. Ahmed, you are searching in your bag too much. The textbook should be on the desk before the lesson begins.
7) Nahida, read the rule aloud (the student reads the rule aloud). Thank you. Nothing is written here about verb types. However, you should be aware of this for your general linguistic knowledge.
8) Ahmed, repeat the rule (the student repeats the rule).
9) Very well. Thus, we have learned a new rule. Now it is time to consolidate the material we have studied.

A fragment illustrating the instruction of new material is presented here. The principal aim of the discursive genre, the "heuristic conversation," is the formation of knowledge and skills. Informative function: during the explanation of new material, the main function of the discursive genre of the "heuristic conversation" consists precisely in the provision of information, the acquisition of new conceptual representations, and the renewal of previously taught knowledge and skills. In relation to the information itself, a sequence of actions is carried out:

1) New information concerning the object under investigation, previously unknown to learners, is introduced;
2) Learners are provided with the opportunity to verify the validity of this information, the means of its acquisition are demonstrated, and the process of its assimilation is explicated;
3) In presenting the logical conclusion, the teacher takes into account that learners will subsequently employ it in the acquisition of new knowledge.

Thus, the formulation of the communicative objective determines specific patterns of verbal behavior on the part of the teacher as a discursive personality.

In the process of explaining new material, the teacher pursues two interrelated aims: to transmit subject-related knowledge and to operationalize instructional material encompassing the new topic. The lesson constitutes a form of goal-oriented instruction characterized by its own methods and instructional instruments.

As discourse unfolds, the epistemic status of knowledge shifts from problematization toward relative certainty. This transformation occurs within problem situations that define the direction of core judgments, modes of justification, and interpretative frameworks. In the example provided above, knowledge is presented as incomplete, principled knowledge. The teacher guides students in resolving cognitive tasks. Problematization and indeterminacy are reflected in the organization of individual discourse fragments (e.g., This is not a complete definition. Let us clarify. Provide evidence. Give examples. Name…, etc.).

The axiological dimension of knowledge is associated with the modeling of behavioral stereotypes:

a) behavioral directives fulfilling a regulatory function (direct: Place the book on the desk; indirect: You are searching too much in your bag. The book should be on the desk… Take the book out quickly);
b) axiological evaluations (Good! Correct! Well done!);
c) etiquette formulas (Thank you.).

At the motivational level, the teacher selects the most optimal variant of explanation. When students, under the teacher's guidance, observe linguistic phenomena, generalize them, and independently arrive at conclusions, the instructional interaction

takes the form of a heuristic dialogue. This instructional method is typically employed when both the material itself and its analytical procedures are already partially familiar to learners.

A teacher is a professional communicator operating within the field of the educational system and possessing pedagogical competence as well as techniques of pedagogical communication. Pedagogical competence represents a set of issues whose resolution constitutes an essential task of the teacher. Pedagogical competency (that is, possession of competence; acquisition of knowledge; the ability to formulate judgments concerning a given subject) denotes the level at which each participant in the pedagogical process possesses the necessary knowledge and skills. Thus, competence constitutes a prescribed norm, whereas competency reflects the individual's attitude toward their own activity and represents a personal quality of the individual.

In considering the teacher as a discursive personality, we shall focus on their communicative competence.

The practical mastery of speech genres constitutes an essential aspect of the teacher's professional competence as a discursive personality.

CONCLUSION

Thus, within scholarly literature, both systemic and functional approaches to the personality of the speaker (in this case, the teacher) are observed. In their speech activity, the teacher constantly functions simultaneously as a linguistic personality and as a communicative personality. In addition, their individual character likewise requires special consideration. However, despite claims to linguistic and communicative individuality, individuals often behave in similar ways within analogous communicative situations. This phenomenon is explained by the fact that, throughout their speech biography, the speaker continuously demonstrates patterns of group-specific speech behavior.

The language user thus appears to integrate multiple linguistic personalities within themselves. For example, they may simultaneously function as an urban linguistic personality, a student linguistic personality, a linguistic personality of a twenty-year-old individual, and so forth. The speaking individual thereby becomes a multidimensional object of research, whose uniqueness is determined by distinct social and psychological characteristics.

In our view, there exists a need for a conceptual category capable of reflecting personality behavior within a typical communicative situation. Such a category is the discursive personality, understood as the capacity of communicants, acting as representatives of particular social institutions, to produce and interpret texts under the typical conditions of communicative situations.

Declaration by Authors

Acknowledgement: None

Source of Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: No conflicts of interest declared.

REFERENCES

1. Adamson, H.D. (1993). Academic Competence: Theory and classroom practice: Preparing ESL students for content courses. New York and London: Longman University Press, 191 p.
2. Bennis, W. (1966). Beyond Bureaucracy: [Electronic resource]. URL: https://books.google.az/books/about/Changing_Organizations_Essays_on_the_Dev.html?id=eclnzwEACAAJ&redir_esc=y
3. Brophy, J. (1981). Teacher praise. A functional analysis // Review of Educational Research, –No 51, – p.5-32.
4. Cazden, C. B. (2001). Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
5. Collier, V.P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language // TESOL Quarterly, No 23, – p.509-531.
6. Craig, R.T. (2001). Communication. Encyclopedia of Rhetoric. Ed. T.O.Sloane. – N.-Y.: Oxford University Press, 2001. – p.125-137.

7. Cummins, J. (1981). Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada: A reassessment // Applied Linguistics, No 2, – p.132-149.
8. Edwards, D. (1987). Common knowledge: The development of understandding in the classroom. New York: Methuen, – 193 p.
9. Enkvist, N.E. (1989). From Text to the Interpretability: A Contribution of the Discussion of Basic Terms in Text Linguistics // Convexity and Coherence: Analysis of Text and Discourse /Ed. by W.Heydrich. – Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, – p.369-382.
10. Fitzgerald, J. (1993). Literacy and students who are learning English as a second language // The Reading Teacher, No 46, – p.638-647.
11. Forestal, P., Brubacher, M., Payne, M.R. (1990). Talking: Toward classroom action // Perspectives on small groups learning. Theory and Practice. Oakville, ON: Rubicon, p.159-173.
12. Goldenberg, C.N. (1993). Instructional conversations: Promoting comprehension through discussion // The Reading Teacher, No 46, – p.316-326.
13. Jane, A. G. K., Beth, R. (2008). Differentiated School Leadership: Effective Collaboration, Communication, and Change Through Personality Type. SAGE Publications, - 214 p.
14. Keirsey, D., Bates, M. (1984). Please Understand Character & Temperament Types. 5th edition. Prometheus Nemesis Book Company, – 207 p.
15. Macaulay, D. (1988). The Ways Things work. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, – 384 p.
16. Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, - 227 p.
17. Mohr, K.A.J., Mohr, E.S. (2007). Extending English-Language Learners' Classroom Interactions Using the Response Protocol // The Reading Teacher, No 60 (5), – p.440-450.
18. Nuthall, G. (2000). Understanding how classroom experience shapes students' minds // Paper presented at the 17th congress of the German Association for Educational Research (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft). – Germany: Gottingten, – p.612-626.
19. Nuthall, G. (2001). Student experience and the learning process: Developing evidence-based theory of classroom learning // Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. – Washington: Seattle, – p.6-22.
20. Perez, B. (1996). Instructional conversations as opportunities for English language acquisition for culturally and linguistically diverse students // Language Arts, No 73, – p.173-181
21. Ramirez, J.D., Yuen, S.D., Ramey, D.R. (1986). First year report: Longitudinal study of immersion programs for language-minority children. – San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International, – p.1-53.
22. Reyes, P., Scribner, J.D. (1999). Lessons from high-performing Hispanic schools: Creating learning communities. New York: Teachers College Press, – 223 p.
23. Srivastava, D.S., Sarita, Kumari. (2017). Education: Instructional Methods. – Isha books, –308 p.
24. Tharp, R.G., Gallimore, R. (1991). Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, – 330 p.
25. Weber, R.M., Longhi-Chirlin, T. (2001). Beginning in English: The growth of linguistic and literate abilities in Spanish-speaking first graders // Reading Research and Instruction, No 41 (1), –p.19-50.
26. Weideman, A. (2014). Why is academic literacy important? // Introduction to Weideman & Van Dyk (editors). Academic literacy: test your competence. – Bloemfontein: Geronimo, – p. II-IX.
27. Wells, G., Chang-Wells, G.L. (1992). Constructing knowledge together: Classrooms as centers of inquiry and literacy. – Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, – 192 p.
28. Williams, J.A. (2001). Classroom conversations: Opportunities to learn for ESL students in mainstream classrooms // The Reading Teacher, No 54, – p.750-757.
29. Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse of Politics in Action. Politics as usual. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, – 252 p.

How to cite this article: Hamidova Nigar Shirkhan. Ways of improving discourse in the school environment. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2026; 13(3): 119-128. DOI: *https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20260315*

******