

**An Applied Pragmatic Research of
The Teacher-Student
conversations in TV Series:
“Mind your Language”**

Asst. Lect. : Talib Kareem Ali
University of Kufa - Faculty of Nursing



An Applied Pragmatic Research of The Teacher-Student conversations in TV Series: “Mind your Language”

منظور عملي تطبيقي للمحادثات بين المعلم والطالب في المسلسل التلفزيوني:

” اهتم بلغتك “

Asst. Lect. : Talib Kareem Ali
University of Kufa/ Faculty of Nursing
talibk.khashan@uokufa.edu.iq

المدرس المساعد

طالب كريم علي

جامعة الكوفة – كلية التمريض

Abstract

Crystal (2008:380) stated that Applied pragmatics “focuses on problems of interaction that arise in the contexts where successful communication is critical, such as medical interviews, judicial settings, and foreign-language teaching”. This research addresses teacher-student interactions in which teachers often recognize patterns in the speech of students from their utterances and these patterns may affect their judgements. Also, the research presents a model for describing educational contexts and illustrates them with analysis of teaching in

classrooms. In addition, the research attempts to examine applied linguistic conversations through the selected situations in the TV series: Mind your language (season2, episode3). This series directed by Stuart Allen and written by Vince Powell. The main character is Barry Evans who acts as language teacher and tries to teach English to students who were from different countries. Moreover, this research endeavors to investigate the pragmatic concepts through pedagogical process by its definition and identify its scope to achieve the needs of the teaching. In

general, interlocutors are possibly to exhibit pragmatic troubles along with their interactions, but these troubles differ extremely from one person to another.

هذا المسلسل اخرجته ستيوارت الن و كتبه فنس باول . الشخصية الرئيسية فيه هو باري إيفانز الذي يقوم بدور مدرس يحاول تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية للطلاب الذين يعودون إلى بلدان مختلفة. علاوة على ذلك ، يسعى هذا البحث إلى دراسة المفاهيم التداولية من خلال العملية التربوية من خلال تعريفها وتحديد نطاقها لتحقيق احتياجات التدريس. بشكل عام، من المحتمل أن يُظهر المحاورون مشاكل عملية في تفاعلاتهم، لكن هذه المشاكل تختلف اختلافاً كبيراً من شخص لآخر.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التداولية التطبيقية، المحادثة بين المعلم والطالب، الخطاب الصفي.

1.Introduction

Hyland, K. & Paltridge, B. (2011:291) stated that the pragmatic theory can be recognized throughout the educational study of classroom discourse. Classroom discourse analysis refers essentially to the analysis of texts in classroom

Keywords: Applied pragmatics, Teacher-Student conversations, classroom discourse.

المخلص

ذكر كريستال (٢٠٠٨:٣٨٠) أن البراغماتية التطبيقية "تركز على مشاكل التفاعل التي تنشأ في السياقات التي يكون فيها التواصل الناجح أمراً بالغ الأهمية، مثل المقابلات الطبية، والقضايا القضائية، وتعليم اللغات الأجنبية". يتناول هذا البحث التفاعلات بين المعلم والطالب والتي غالباً ما يتعرف المعلمون فيها على أنماط كلام الطلاب من خلال أقوالهم وقد تؤثر هذه الأنماط على أحكامهم. يقدم البحث نماذج لوصف السياقات التعليمية وتوضيحها من خلال تحليل التدريس في الفصول الدراسية. يحاول البحث دراسة المحادثات اللغوية التطبيقية من خلال مواقف مختارة في المسلسل التلفزيوني: (اهتم بلغتك: الحلقة الثالثة من الجزء الثاني).

contexts, and especially to analysis of classroom talk while discourse analysis refers more generally to analysis of connected texts in diverse contexts (such as workplaces, media; law courts).

Teachers who are the staff of classrooms shape the relationships

to make their work success. Proactively, a teacher is able to interpret the processes of these relationships and to affect successfully on the suitability of any class to achieve professional teaching relationships and the classroom management. The importance of pragmatics is unknown outside in/direct conversations. There are many pragmatic theories that can be used in the analytical framework to examine the explanation, assessment and management of the communication. Furthermore, this research used eclectic model which mixes between pragmatic theory and educational practice to understand pragmatic communication and to evaluate the pragmatic theories because its main concern is in the application rather than in the theory.

2. The Overlapping between Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics

According to Yule (1996:3), pragmatics deals with the analysis of meaning which is conveyed by a speaker and is comprehend by a listener throughout using specified words and utterances that identify certain meaning in isolation. Horn,

L. & Kecskes, I. (2013: 357) stated there are a number of events that help to the evolution of pragmatics. Some of these events are: Austin's speech act theory (1962); the emergence of Grice's cooperative principle (1975) which supported by four maxim; and Sperber and Wilson's Relevance theory.

Discourse analysis - on the other hand- can be understood in different ways and in various situations. Thus, it is an interdisciplinary field of investigation (Barron & Schneider, 2014:1). Interchangeably, it may be utilized with text to indicate many written or spoken pieces of language. Furthermore, discourse analysis may deal with some semantic issues or with certain issues of communication (Fetzer, 2014: 35).

Consequently, discourse analysis refers to the process of analyzing of language in action. As a result, this term "discourse analysis" requires a pragmatic perspective in order to perform the analysis because it must take in regard the context in which a discourse appears since that certain linguistic components as deixis needs contextual factors to comprehend the meaning. (Brown & Yule, 1983:27).

The study of the contexts which are used within the language is entitled as discourse analysis, while the study of meaning in context is called pragmatics (McCarthy, M. 2000:5-6). Pragmatics and discourse analysis are sometimes observed such as interdisciplinary fields since they take part the attentiveness in the features of language that are depended on context. Barron and Schneider (2014:1) proposed that the discourse study is coming along with the domain of pragmatics and they can be shown as a combination of parts.

So, there is a need to make integration between these two linguistic fields: discourse analysis and pragmatics in an unified term which is discourse pragmatics that deals with speech and social acts that occur in conversations during the communication. Horn & Kecskes (2013:262) indicate that discourse pragmatics is "an attempt at widening the realm of pragmatics via emphasizing the importance of the social and cultural restrictions for interaction besides the linguistic and semantic properties of utterances".

It seeks to create an advanced form of functions and applications of pragmatics and discourse in ways of

communication by using two sorts of discourse pragmatics: interactional and intercultural sorts.(Verschuieren, J. 1999:7).

3.The Relationship between academic discourse and classroom discourse in pedagogical process:

Discourse analysis includes devices to investigate language in action by using certain texts and contexts in which they are utilized.

Martin-Jones et al. (2008: xiii) characterize classroom discourse is a talk in a classroom interaction in the form of critical discourse as means of comprehension the educational process. Classroom discourse means the talk which happens among teacher and students, and on the other hand among students themselves in schools by utilizing educational contexts.

There are amount of pedagogical uses that faced by students to work completely with main curriculum terms and to introduce the important support to achieve the aims of such pedagogical uses and make them possible throughout macro-contextual factors and micro-contextual factors to shape purposes and design of the "Teacher-Student" interactions. Macro-contextual factors involve: social factors;

poverty; ethnicity in schools; academic skills; literacy crisis; policy and so on. On the other hand, a micro-contextual factors consist of the context and content of the interactions. (Hyland, K. & Paltridge, B. 2011:297).

So, classroom talk considered as a fundamental element in increasing the learning of students. Accordingly, the analysis of classroom talk is an essential way in the teaching and learning uses that students activate together to accomplish the comprehension of course terms. (Watson-Gegeo 1997: 135).

Academic discourse means the techniques of thinking by using language in the academic organization. There are a number of actions that show the importance of academic discourse as educating students, spread knowledge and ideas that depend on language to complete academic mission by using lectures; textbooks; essays; and articles which are crucial to the education and knowledge construction. (Hyland, K. & Paltridge, B. 2011:171). There are many reasons that lead to appear academic discourse including a development of Higher Education in

various countries; the power; and a publishing. The study of academic discourse arises from a many dissimilar directions: “the questioning of a positivist, empirical view of scientific knowledge”.(Hyland, K. & Paltridge, B. 2011:173).

4. Teacher-Student's Interaction:

Generally, Crystal(2008:248-49) states that interaction is a practice that utilized to identify the way of speech in direct communication. Interaction comes back chiefly to the approaches of normal conversation involving patterns of behavior and facial expressions among the interlocutors.

Richards & Schmidt (2010:289-90) state that the analysis of interactional process used to amount and characterize the conduct of teacher and student in classroom. Interaction analysis is also used to recognize the events during a lesson in order to estimate the processes of teaching by a teacher and learning by a student. The academic behavior is detected and many kinds of activities of students and teachers are categorized by using the analysis of interaction. i.e. , the interaction is “

the way in which a language is used by interlocutors”.

Classrooms have not only needed to explore the pragmatic skills, but also to assess pragmatics which can be applied. Thus, the development of communicative competence and communicative language teaching are needed to accomplish more experimental attempts to make this process successful or effective. As a result, the reasons behind the desire to increase academic improvement and experimental study are: To direct a message that the student's ability is suitable in production and understanding language during the various situations; to grant a student a motivate to study hard and self-confidence; and to give an opportunity for teachers to assess whether their students comprehend their assignments during the performance or not. (Ishihara, N. & Cohen, A.2010:264).

The studies of classroom talk among teachers and students represent a variety of conceptions in “applied linguistics, education, ethnography, and ethnomethodology” especially the interaction among the teacher and the student, as well as between students themselves to comprehend how to affect the used language and

the discourse of the classroom. In the studies of language and applied linguistics, face to face interaction in classroom talk is a recognized subject in “discourse, conversation, and text analyses, as well as sociolinguistic and sociocultural features of interaction”. These studies revealed that classroom talk is extremely structured and routinized in which the teacher starts the interaction by asking questions, and waiting the student to comment on or to answers them. The classroom talk is essentially different from other kinds of talk as conversations between friends or members of family. (Mey, J. 2009:64-65).

5. The Pragmatic Strategies used in The Analysis

There are certain strategies which are used to build an eclectic model to be utilized in the analysis:

5.1. Speech Acts

According to Leech (1983:205-206), there are five types of the illocutionary speech acts:

-Assertive Type: It restricts the speaker to the fact of the speech, for example: Trying to persuade the listener that the speech content is real as in: inform, assure, argue, or

swear acts, As in: “Chomsky didn't write about peanuts”.

- Directive Type: It directs the speaker to make the addressee to do an action, as request, or permit acts. For example: “Would you mind to lend me your book ? ”

- Commissive Type: It infers that the speaker will make an action that possibly be in the future as a promise in promising or planning. As in: “ I'll be back”.

- Expressive Type: It means the feelings of the speaker of certain situation or occasion such as in apologize, or acknowledge acts. For instance: “ I'm really sorry!”.

- Declarative Type: It means declaration of a deal or an agreement in the form of talking something which is accomplished with an act as in: “Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife”.

5.2. Deixis

According to Yule (1996:9), deixis means: “pointing via language” that utilized to make reader/hearer able to distinguish things in different contexts. Deixis is “the ability of words to refer to points in time or individuals in the external world”. (Meyer,2009:8). There are five kinds of deixis

-Personal Kind: They are distributed to three main types that characterized by the pronouns of 1st person, 2nd person, and 3rd person: (I, you, he, she, or it). (Yule, 1996:10-11).

- Spatial Kind: They specify the location with relation to the speaker. These kinds of deixis: Spatial or place deixis can be presented chiefly in certain adverbs as: here and there. They can also be shown in demonstratives as: this and that. English has two terms of spatial deixis: one of them is near to the speaker (**proximal**-here) and the second is distant to the speaker (**distal**-there), such as: This book is mine. (Cruse,2006:166) .

-Temporal Kind: They include **proximal** deixis (now) which is used to show the time of the utterance and the time of the voice. The second one is the **distal** deixis (then) which is used to identify the time of speaker's utterance in past, future or in the present time, as in: “It is raining now”. (Yule,1996:14).

-Discourse Kind: There are other ways which relate an utterance to the surrounding text as in: the used utterance is utilized to show that the context is not specified to the former

discourse, but, may be to one or more steps back. (Levinson,1983:85).

-Social Kind: Levinson (1983:89) stated that social deixis are characterized by special realities of the social positions such as: (Mr., Prof. Dr. , Prime minister) in which the speech act happens.

5.3. presupposition

According to Yule(1985:130), presupposition is: “an assumption by a speaker/writer about what is true or already known by the listener/reader”. There are six types of presupposition:

-The existential Type: It is presented in possessive linguistic structures such as: (your, my, his) or by using any definite article as in: The house is new.

-The factive Type: Know, realize, regret or some other verbs are utilized to presuppose the facts such: “She didn’t realize he was ill”.

-Non-factive Type: Verbs like dream, imagine and pretend are utilized to indicate that what is coming is supposed not to be true, as in: “Mary pretended that she was asleep”.

-Lexical Type: It means the use of a word with its asserted meaning is conventionally understood with the

presupposition that another meaning (non-asserted) is interpreted by using verbs such as manage, stop, and start, as in: He started reading the story.

-Structural Type: Certain structures have been used to be true. Any person can use these structures to give more information and to be accepted as true by the listeners/hearers. For example: when, where, etc. which that can be utilized in this type, as in: “When did she travel to Dubai?”.(Yule,1996:29).

-Counter-factual Type: It means what is presupposed is not only true, but is the opposite of what is true, as in: “If Joseph was a merchant , he would buy a new house”.

5.4. Implicature

Grice(1975:44) defined implicature as “ an indirect or implicit meaning of an utterance that is produced by the speaker. It is related to what a speaker can imply ,suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says”. There are two types of implicature:

The first one is conversational:

The nature of implicature is temporary and non-conventional directly with utterance spoken

because it appears in a conversation act.(Levinson, 1983: 117), such as: “Charlene: I hope you brought the bread and the cheese”.

“Malcolm Dexter: Ah, I brought the bread”.

The second one is conventional:

According to Yule (1996:45) stated that Grice(1975) had used conventional to indicate an implicature specified by the linguistic meaning. This means that the meaning is identified by the meaning of the used sentence. A sentence always conveys its conventional implicature, for example: “Bob is rich but sad” .

6. The Analysis of Classroom Talk

The classroom communication that built by the eclectic model in this research introduces that the pragmatic strategies distributed to three stages: The initial stage, the maintaining stage which leads to final stage. The applied element in this research relates to (The selected situations in the Season 2, Episode 3) in TV series namely “Mind your Language”. Indeed, this model (the eclectic model) is developed to analyses the data under study in three stages of the practical framework by using pragmatic strategies. The characters of this series are as the following:

The character	The name
British teacher	Mr. Brown
Foreign student	Ingrid
Mexican student	Juan
Foreign student	Zoltan
Swedish student	Anna
French student	Danielle
Italian student	Giovanni
Indian student	Ranjeet
Pakistani student	Ali

Indian student	Jamila
Japanese student	Taro
Spanish student	Max

a. The Initial Stage:

During his daily working, Mr. Brown (the teacher) entered the classroom and said: “I’m glad to see you’re all working hard”. The teacher began to see what each one of his students had read and started to ask one after one and collect their books, magazines, or newspapers that they had read.

The teacher: “What are you studying Ingrid? , How to improve your bust line! , very educational”.

Ingrid: “You can borrow it if you wish it”.

The teacher: “ No, thank you”.

The teacher: “ What’s keeping you occupied Juan?, Gals Galore: There’s not much English in this”.

Juan: “ No, but some beautiful pictures”.

The teacher: “ Zoltan, Gorgeous Chicks, I’m sure this isn't about poultry farming”

Zoltan: “ But... ”

The teacher: “ Never mind”

The teacher: “ Danielle, Toujours L'Amour, Don't the French ever think about anything else other than love? ”.

Danielle: “ To the French, there’s is nothing else”.

The teacher: “ Giovanni, L'Amore”.

Giovanni: “ In Italy, we’re just like the French”.

The teacher: “ Ranjeet, Cartoon Capers”.

Ranjeet: “ I am reading all about Bugs the Bunny and Woody the pecker”.

The teacher: “ Ali, the world's most exotic dishes, I didn't know you were interested in cookery”.

Ali:“Oh Blimey,when I am buying it, I didn't know it was about Cookery!”.

The first stage pragmatically included a number of pragmatic strategies such as deixis and speech acts. The teacher initiated the communication by talking to his students: “ I'm glad to see you're all working hard”. This sentence included an expressive speech act which reflected the teacher's feelings. It also contained personal deixis (I and you) in addition to implicature by using the word (all). The teacher talked to a student named (Ingrid): “ What are you studying Ingrid? , How to improve your bust line! ”. The teacher's speech involved existential presupposition by using possessive pronoun (your), structural presupposition by using (wh)forms (what) and personal deixis (you). Ingrid answered by saying: “ You can borrow it if you wish it ” which

involved personal deixis (you, it) and counter factual presupposition by using (if). The teacher's answer involved expressive speech act by saying: (thank you).

The teacher moved to another student and said: “What's keeping you occupied Juan?, Gals Galore: There's not much English in this”. The teacher speech involved personal deixis (you), spatial deixis (there and this), structural presupposition by using (what). The student (Juan) replied: “ No, but some beautiful pictures” which included ‘implicature’ by utilizing ‘some’.

After Juan, the teacher talked to Zoltan: “Zoltan, Gorgeous Chicks, I'm sure this isn't about poultry farming” that contained personal and spatial deixis. Zoltan responded: “But...” which included implicature. The teacher replied by saying a directive speech act: “Never mind”.

The teacher moved to a French student ‘Danielle’ and said: “ Danielle, Toujours L'Amour, don't the French ever think about anything else other than love? ”. This sentence involved existential presupposition (the) and non-factive presupposition (think). The student (Danielle) replied: “ To the French, there's is nothing else” which included existential presupposition (the) and spatial deixis (there).

The teacher talked to another student who was ‘Giovanni’ that was also reading the same magazine ‘L'Amore’. The student (Giovanni) talked to the teacher: “ In Italy, we're just like the French”. The student’ speech involved personal deixis (we) and existential presupposition by using (the).

The Indian student ‘Ranjeet’ was reading the magazine ‘Cartoon Capers’ and when he saw the teacher said: “ I am reading all about Bugs the Bunny and Woody the pecker”.

The student’s speech included personal deixis (I), implicature (all) and existential presupposition (the). Finally, the teacher talked to Ali (a Pakistani student): “ Ali, the world's most exotic dishes, I didn't know you were interested in cookery”. This sentence contained personal deixis (I and you), existential presupposition (the) and factive presupposition (know).

On the other hand, Ali’s rspnd involved personal deixis (I and it) and factive presupposition (know) when he said: “Oh Blimey, when I am buying it, I didn't know it was about Cookery! ”.

b.The Maintaining Stage:

The initial stage paved the way to the maintaining stage which included certain pragmatic strategies.

The teacher: “ Now, before we break for tea, I'm going to ask you each a question and anyone who gives an

incorrect answer will be fined 10 p.

The money will go to charity”.

Giovanni: “ Who's this bird charity you're giving our money to? ”.

The teacher: “ Charity is not a bird. It means an organization...a deserving cause”.

The teacher: “ Juan, spell: quiet”.

Juan: “ How much we pay if we're wrong ? ”.

The teacher: “ Ingrid, give me an example of a preposition”.

Ingrid: “ Will you to dinner take me? ”.

The teacher: “ I said a preposition not a proposition. A preposition shows the relation between a noun or pronoun and some other word as: A gift from Mary ”.

Ingrid: “ A date with teacher ”.

The teacher: “ Yes, all right! , I'll accept that”.

The teacher: “ Ranjeet, how do you pronounce the following?, bough, cough, tough”

Ranjeet: “ You are trying to be catching me out, buff, toff, cow”.

The teacher: “ Three out of three wrong”.

Ranjeet: “Thousand apologies”. The student 'Ranjeet' gave the teacher 10 p.

The teacher: “ Giovanni, What is a diphthong? ”.

Giovanni: “ Is it like a dipstick? ”.

The teacher: “ What do you think? ”.

Giovanni: “ I think I owe you ten p”. He gave the teacher 10 p. .

The teacher: “ Ali, what does the term coup de grace mean?, And don't you dare say cutting the lawn”.

Ali: “ I'm never hearing of it, I am having enough worries learning the English”.

The teacher: “ It means the final stroke! It's French, It's a phrase that's in common usage. Ten p. Please”.

The student 'Ali' gave the teacher 10 p.

The teacher: “ Thank you”.

The teacher: “ Taro, decline the verb to jump”.

Taro: “ I jumpo, you jumpo, he jumpso, she jumpso, we jumpo, they jumpo”.

The teacher: “Very good, but you must try not to end every word on O.”.

The teacher: “ Jamila, as oil is to water so, chalk is to...”

Jamila: “ Blackyboard”.

Jamila: “ I am not understanding”.

The teacher: “ It's a fairly common phrase. They are as alike as chalk and cheese ”.

Jamila: “ But chalk and cheese are not being alike”.

The teacher: “ Exactly, so it means they are not alike”.

Jamila: “ I'm thinking it is easier to say they are not alike than to be talking about chalks and cheeses”.

She gave the teacher ten p.

The teacher: “ Yes, I admit we do tend to complicate our language”.

The teacher: “ Max, give me an example of a principal clause”.

Max: “ Santa Claus” . (The rest of students laughed.)

The teacher: “ Quiet. Just for that Max you can write out 20 times. A clause is as sentence which is a part of a longer sentence. Not now, and you can give me 10 p”.

Max gave the teacher 10 p.

The teacher: “ Thank you”.

The teacher: “ Anna give me two different meanings of the word blow”.

Anna: “ You can blow like so, or you can give somebody a blow”.

The teacher: “ Thank you Anna”.

The teacher: “ Zoltan, Can you give me the past tense of the verb to see”.

Zoltan did not know the answer. So, the teacher told him the answer: “ See, saw”.

Zoltan repeated the answer together: “ Ah, seesaw, seesaw ”.

The teacher: “No, Zoltan, today I see, yesterday I saw”. Zoltan gave the teacher 10 p.

In this stage, the teacher began his speech by talking to all students by saying: “Now, before we break for tea, I’m going to ask each one of you a question and anyone who gives an incorrect answer will be fined 10 p. The money will go to charity”. These words involved personal deixis (we, I, you), temporal deixis (now), structural presupposition (who) and commissive speech act by saying (The money will go to charity). At the same time, Giovanni thought that (charity) is a bird, so , he said: “Who’s this bird charity you’re giving our money to? ”. Giovanni’s speech contained personal deixis (you) existential presupposition (our), spatial deixis (this), and structural presupposition (who).

The teacher- after Giovanni- talked to Juan: “ Juan, spell: quiet”. These

words included directive speech act. Juan responded by saying: “ How much we pay if we’re wrong ?”. This answer contained personal deixis (we) and counterfactual presupposition by using (if).

The teacher turned to talk to other student: “ Ingrid, give me an example of a preposition”. This speech involved a directive speech act (give me). Ingrid answered by asking the teacher a question: “ Will you to dinner take me? ” which included personal deixis (you and me). The teacher tried to describe what he meant by saying: “ I said a preposition not a proposition. A preposition shows the relation between a noun or pronoun and some other word as: A gift from Mary”. This description contained personal deixis (I), existential presupposition (the) and implicature by using (some). Ingrid replied by giving an example: “ A date with teacher” . The teacher replied by

saying: “ Yes, all right! , I'll accept that” which included a commissive speech act by using “I'll accept” and spatial deixis (that).

The teacher also talked to another student: “ Ranjeet, how do you pronounce the following?, bough, cough, tough”. This sentence contained personal deixis (you) and existential presupposition (the), while the student’s answer involved personal deixis (you and me) when he said: “ You are trying to be catching me out, buff, toff, cow”. When he knew that his respond was wrong, Ranjeet said: “ Thousand apologies” that imcluded expressive speech act.

The teacher asked Giovanni: “ What is a diphthong?”. This question involved structural presupposition by using (wh form) in (what), while Giovanni’s answer contained personal deixis when he used (it) in: “ Is it like a dipstick? ”. For the second time, the teacher utilized

structural presupposition by using (what) and personal deixis when he used (you) in his speech: “ What do you think? ”. On the other hand, the student used personal deixis to respond the theacher’ question (I, and you) when he said: “ I think I owe you ten p”.

The teacher still move in between his students till he reached Ali: “ Ali, what does the term coup de grace mean?, And don't you dare say cutting the lawn”. The teacher’s speech also involved existential presupposition (the) and personal deixis by using (you) in his question. Ali’s respond contained existential presupposition (the) and personal deixis by using (you) in his answer when he said: “ I’m never hearing of it, I am having enough worries learning the English”. As a comment, the teacher replied: “ It means the final stroke! It’s French, It’s a phrase that’s in common usage. Ten p. Please” which included

personal deixis (it), spatial deixis (that), existential presupposition (the) and directive speech act by saying: “Ten p. Please”. When Ali gave the teacher 10 p., the teacher replied: “Thank you” that included expressive speech act.

The teacher talked to Japanese student: “Taro, decline the verb to jump”. This expression contained directive speech act by using (decline) and existential presupposition (the). Taro’s respond involved personal deixis by using (I, you, he, she, we, they) when he said: “I jumpo, you jumpo, he jumpso, she jumpso, we jumpo, they jumpo”. The teacher replied by using implicature (but) and personal deixis (you) in his speech: “ but you must try not to end every word on O.”

The teacher also talked to another student (Jamila). The teacher’s question contained personal deixis and the student’s answer included personal deixis (I,

it, they) and implicature by using (but).

The teacher addressed his student (Max): “ Max, give me an example of a principal clause”. This sentence included directive speech act by using (give me) and personal deixis (me). Because of the answer of Max: “ Santa Claus” , other students laughed, therefore the teacher ordered them to be quiet: “ Quiet. Just for that Max you can write out 20 times. A clause is as sentence which is a part of a longer sentence”. This command consisted of directive speech act by using (be quiet), personal deixis (you) and existential presupposition by using a definite article (a). Max wanted to write the assignment, but the teacher told him: “Not now, and you can give me 10 p”. This sentence involved directive speech act by using (not now, give me), and personal deixis (me), and temporal deixis (now). After giving him 10 p.,

the teacher said: “Thank you”, which included expressive speech act.

The teacher talked to Anna: “Anna give me two different meanings of the word blow”. The teacher’s speech contained directive speech act by using (give me), personal deixis (me), and existential presupposition (the). The student’s answer involved using personal deixis (you) when he said: “You can blow like so, or you can give somebody a blow”. Because of Anna’s respond was correct, the teacher said: “Thank you Anna” that included expressive speech act.

Finally, the teacher talked to the last student: “ Zoltan, Can you give me the past tense of the verb to see”. This sentence contained directive speech act by using (Can you give me), personal deixis (me), and existential presupposition (the). When he recognized that Zoltan did not know the answer, the teacher told the student the answer by

saying: “See, saw”. Zoltan thought that (see and saw) one word, so he said: “Ah, seesaw, seesaw”. The teacher replied: "No, Zoltan. Today I see, yesterday I saw". The teacher’s comment included personal deixis (I) and certain words which refer to temporal deixis (today and yesterday).

c.The Final Stage:

This stage finalizes the analysis when the teacher talked to all students: “ 80 p. in 3 minutes. At this rate, we'll soon have a small fortune”. The teacher’s speech involved spatial deixis (this), personal deixis (we), commissive speech act (will), and existential presupposition by using a definite article (a). After taking all what students had read, the teacher said: “You can all learn English much more quickly if you began by reading a better class of literature. As you're obviously so keen to learn English. I'll give you extra

homework tonight”. These sentences included certain pragmatic strategies as personal deixis (you, I), implicature by using (all), and counterfactual presupposition by using (if). Because of the additional assignments, students seemed not to accept the teacher's opinion. So, the teacher said: “Quiet! It's time you took these lessons seriously”. The teacher's comment involved directive speech act by using (be quiet), personal deixis (you, it), and spatial deixis (these).

7. Conclusions

1. There are certain pragmatic strategies used more than others in teacher-student interactions, such as deixis, presupposition, speech act, and implicature. There are certain devices used more than others in any pragmatic strategy. For example: personal deixis used more than other types of deixis, existential presupposition used more than other

kinds of presupposition, and expressive/ directive speech acts used more than other types of speech acts.

2. Classroom discourse is a talk in a classroom interaction in the form of critical discourse as means of comprehension the educational process. the analysis of classroom talk is an essential way in the teaching and learning uses .

3. Academic discourse means the techniques of thinking by using language in the academic organization to educate students to complete academic mission by using lectures; textbooks; essays; and articles which are crucial to the education and knowledge construction.

4. Classroom talk is extremely structured and routinized in which the teacher starts the interaction by asking questions, and waiting the student to comment on or to answers them.

5. Interaction is a practice that utilized to identify the way of speech in direct communication which involves patterns of behavior and facial expressions among the interlocutors during a lesson in order to estimate the processes of teaching by a teacher and learning by a student.

6. There is a need to integrate between discourse analysis and pragmatics in an unified field that is discourse pragmatics which deals with speech and social acts that occur in conversations during the communication to create an advanced form of functions and applications of pragmatics and discourse in ways of communication.

7. The eclectic model adopted in the present research exhibits the practical guide of applied pragmatic analysis of teacher-student interactions as it includes successful pragmatic strategies distributed to three stages.

8. It is important to define the pedagogical process and identify its scope to achieve the aims of the teaching as the students' communicative competence, and to accomplish more experimental attempts during investigate the pragmatic concepts to assess whether the students comprehend their assignments during the performance or not.

References

- Barron, A. & Schneider, K. (2014), *Discourse Pragmatics*: Signposting a vast field. In Bublitz, W, Jucker, A. & Schneider, K. (Eds.), *Pragmatics of Discourse*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983), *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cruse, A. (2006), *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Crystal, D. (2008), *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (6th ed.)*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Fetzer, A. (2014), *Conceptualizing Discourse*. In Bublitz, W, Jucker, A. & Schneider, K. (Eds.) *Pragmatics of Discourse*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Grice, P. (1975), *Logic and Conversation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Horn, L. and Kecskes, I. (2013), *Pragmatics, Discourse, and cognition*. Yale University.
- Hyland, K. & Paltridge, B. (2011) , *Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis* Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Ishihara, N. & Cohen, A.(2010), *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Leech, G. (1983), *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group.
- Levinson, S.(1983), *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, Cambridge university press.
- Martin-Jones, M., De Mejia, A. M. & Hornberger, N. (eds) (2008), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, vol.3: *Discourse and Education* (2nd ed.). NewYork: Springer Science and Business Media LLC.
- McCarthy, M. (2000), *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press .
- Mey, J. (2009), *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics* (2nd ed.). Elsevier Ltd.
- Meyer, C. (2009), *Introducing English Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Morón, R. et al. (2009), *Pragmatics Applied to Language Teaching and Learning* Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

An Applied Pragmatic Research of The Teacher–Student conversations in TV Series:

Richards J. C. & Schmidt R. (2010),
*Longman Dictionary of Language
Teaching and Applied Linguistics*.
(4th ed.). Pearson Education
Limited.

Verschueren, J. (1999), *Understanding
Pragmatics*. London: Edward
Arnold.

Watson-Gegeo K. A. (1997), *Classroom
ethnography*, in N. H. Hornberger
and D. Corson (eds), *Encyclopedia
of Language and Education*:

*Research Methods in Language
and Education*, vol. 8. Norwell,
MA and Dordrecht, the
Netherlands: Kluwer Academic
Publishers, pp. 135–45.

Yule, G. (1985), *The study of language*.
New York. Oxford
university press.

-----, (1996), *Pragmatics*(2nd ed.).
Oxford: Oxford University Press.