

Significance of Linguistic Competence over Communicative Competence enlightened through the devices of Discourse Analysis

¹Eshita Awal, ²Homayra Binte Bahar
^{1,2}Lecturer, Southeast University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Abstract: *In the arena of language teaching, discourse analysis provides both the teachers and learners with adequate and practical knowledge, as well as, makes learners linguistically efficient. In this paper achievement of language competence is highlighted over the efficiency of communicative competence. We aim at focusing on majoring learner's level of competence in using language by showing command over four skills of target language. From the perspective of linguistic competence only achieving the communicative competence should not be the goal of SLA classroom. In this research paper it is depicted how the teachers adopt the techniques of discourse analysis to propel the students' motivation in using the target language as a conceptual whole. This paper confidently argues in favor of teaching language as a linguistic phenomenon which is the primal proof of communicative competence. Functional and notional usage of target language can guarantee a rate of success that is manageable at an optimum better to say minimum level. As language is absolutely a social and psychological phenomenon, so the ultimate reach of learning a language should be authentically justified from the point of view of gaining soul command over structural ,as well as, conceptual meaning of the target language.*

Keywords: *Acquisitional Device in ESL classroom, Communicative Competence, Discourse Analysis, Interactional Discourse, Linguistic Competence.*

Discourse analysis employs both the methodology and the kinds of theoretical principles and basic concepts of linguistics (Van Dijk, 1972: Labov and Franshel, 1977:72). Discourse analysis is used with a wide range of meaning which entangles a spectrum of activities in social life. From the narrative point of view, discourse analysis is the examination of language use by the members of a speech community. Discourse analysis overcasts studies of meticulous linguistic parts of language analysis. It involves analyzing both form and language function and includes both spoken interaction and written text. Discourse can be treated as a single sentence in isolation by regarding sentence boundaries as sentential connectives (Katz and Fodor, 1964: 490). We make discourse analysis to attain a proper pedagogic, as well as, a paradigmatic study of language. So, discourse analysis sometimes defined as the analysis of language "beyond the sentence". It penetrates the linguistic features that characterize different genres of language use like social, psychological, scientific etc. It also aims at focusing on cultural and ethnic factors that aid in our interpretation and understanding of different texts and types of talk.

The pedagogical approach of discourse analysis sharply contrasts with types of analysis where smallest grammatical analysis gets entire attraction. Discourse analysts idealize language as a whole conceptual piece of linguistic, as well as, communicative reproduction. Since the study of discourse opens up uncircumcised area interpenetrating with other disciplines, our primordial emphasis in this paper is to examine how humans use language to communicate and their diverse ways of constructing language function both in producing and receiving forms.

Formalist like Chomsky tends to regard language primarily as a mental phenomenon. He aims at explaining linguistic universal as deriving from common genetic linguistic inheritance of human species. Moreover, formalists are motivated to justify acquisition of language in terms of built in human capacity to learn language. So language acquisition, as well as, learning a language has been endowed with ultimate status of a mental procedure where according to (Stebbs 1983; 1) discourse is a language above the sentence. It is crystal clear that discourse works with the mental functioning of language use. Chomsky gives more emphasis on the acquisition, resulted subconsciously, and upon learning that is resulted deliberately. Based on innate hypothesis, Chomsky developed the terms "competence" and "performance" which was at first, introduced "Langue" and "Parole" consecutively by Ferdinand de Saussure. Chomsky describes 'competence' as an idealized capacity that is located as a psychological or mental property or function and 'performance' as the production of actual utterances. Competence is the knowledge of a particular language whereas performance is the way that language is used, more specifically, competence is "knowing" a language and performance is "doing" something with that

language and discourse analysis explains both stages like competence and performance as major features of language use. According to Chomsky, competence of a language is innate and comes naturally. After having the competence over that language a person acts accordingly. However, according to socio-linguist, Dell Hymes, competence is not innate. Person learns from its surroundings. Social interaction is very significant to develop the competence. It is a skilled work. Again, there is a difference between linguistic competence and the communicative competence. Every language possesses a certain structure which involves phonology, morphology; syntax etc. and every structure have some rules to construct that structure. Those rules are the specialized grammatical rules which encode a sentence (syntax) and decode the meaning (semantic). To have knowledge in a language involves the knowledge over all the aspects of a language, which is called linguistics competence. It is not only the ability to implement the rules in order to form a correct sentence but also ability to use it in a proper discourse. Thus, linguistic competence involves knowing the grammatical rules, as well as, implementation. On the contrary, using the language only in the semantic level is the communicative competence which is done only to convey the message. Conveying the message does not require the language usage grammatically correct. For example, for "it is against law that no one can sit here" can be said "this place, cannot sit."

Therefore, it deals with language use like both the competence level and the performance level. According to Widdowson, if linguistic competence is an abstraction of grammatical knowledge, communicative competence is an abstraction of social behavior. So, the eventual function of discourse analysis lies in explaining, narrating and evaluating the whole piece of language production.

Discourse is socially and culturally organized system which is in terms of pedagogical perspective in a collection of interactional procedure of language in use. Interactional sociolinguistics, one of the streams of discourse, deals with linguistic and cultural diversity in communication. It actually focuses the impacts on the relationships between different groups in society that is how people from different cultures share grammatical knowledge of a language which is differently contextualized from what is said to what is received. It is one of the approaches to discourse analysis which attempts to 'bridge the gap' between 'top-down' theoretical approaches which privilege 'macro-societal conditions' in accounting for communicative practices (Gumperz, 1999: 453-4).

Again, Roberts et al. (1992) suggest that interactional sociolinguistic provides a useful tool for the critical analysis of discourse in certain typical 'strategic' research sites. These are situations of 'public negotiation' such as interviews, meetings, and encounters at work, which are characterized by status and power differentials between the participants.

A massive attempt has been undertaken to focus on the interaction of the language on use through Chomsky's competence theory. Noam Chomsky puts the light on the communicative competence. The extent of competence reflects on the performance. Even though language has different functions its' primary role is to communicate and convey message. However, if it is just to communicate then people can do it without using the language. For instance, if someone asks "Where is the bank?" "It's right", could be the reply. However, the answer can use hand as well to the right direction in reply. In both cases communication is done competently. However, would it be called a real competence in the latter case? Communication can be done in different ways-verbal and non-verbal. Gesture, posture or using sign language is the non-verbal behaviors through which communication can be done. Furthermore, people can also paraphrase certain words in order to convey message such as handkerchief can be described by the "cloth for nose" or burger can be described by "two big breads." However, this sort of communication cannot ensure the fact that both speaker and hearer have the knowledge (competent) over the language. Again, in a Chinese native situation if the speaker and hearer are not native users then communication cannot take place only by kinesics. In this case one of the persons must have the proper knowledge (linguistic competence) of the using language. To survive in all sorts of situations one has to have linguistic competence. In linguistics field, which deals with the scientific study of the language, defines competence as a detailed knowledge over one particular language. So, communication should take place syntactically rather semantically.

Again, performance is the resultant of the competence. It varies with the extent of the competence. Performance level rises only with the linguistics competence. The concept of the linguistic competence is unreal and will not progress if it is not used accurately. It means person has to study forms of a language along with the ways they are used. According to Hymes, the concept of linguistic competence is that it is an abstraction without any relevance to actual use. Linguists define language ability accordance with four skills-reading, writing, speaking and listening. If one of the skills lacks behind than others, could be defined incomplete ability. To grasp an in-depth knowledge in the four skills one has to study all the elements of that particular language such as phonetics (the sound system), morphology (words), and syntax (sentence) along with its meaningful usages.

In the broadest sense the concept of "being communicative" has to do with what a language has the potential to mean, as well as, with its formal grammatical properties. According to Chomskyan point of view communicative competence lays down the foundation of development throughout SLA procedures. Since 1970s revolutionary boon took place through the coomunicative approach of language learning as well as performance. The concept of communicative takes us beyond the level of sentence but pedagogically the "communicative"

takes us to the intangled complex relation between semantic, four skills like speaking, listening, reading and writing and accuracy of language proficiency in terms of form and function. For instance, British English and Australian English are very much different from their phonetics perspective. Australian person utters “today” - /tudaɪ/ whereas British utters it /tudeɪ/. So a person with no knowledge in Australian English sound system is going to receive the sentence “Have you come to-die (today)?” So the relative importance of communicational ability to communicative competence fundamentally depends on four skills along with its other features.

It is possible for most teachers to think of classroom situations where grammar practice takes place with very little reference to everyday reality where learners rehearse patterns simply in order to get them right rather than to express meaning. For instance, learners can be given list of a dialogue to learn how to order a food by seeing the menu to the waiter in a restaurant. This is only an imaginative situation. However, in a classroom learners will not be able to comprehend the real scenario because by only memorizing dialogues learners can not apply it in real life situation. A conversation, made for two people, a waiter and a customer, done by role play in a classroom might be inapplicable where in real life learners might not face the same situation. It is because in reality there might be some other people involved or other consequences might occur during that conversation. Equally it unfortunately is just as possible for a list of language function to be practiced grammar a ritualistically as grammar with a few structured items for “giving advice” applied in turn to imaginary people and situations. So there is no reason why practice of grammar should not be placed in communicative context. For accomplishing only communicative competence a person can be successful in communicating without uttering a single word of the particular language. For instance, someone is on the phone can be described simply by using single hand pointed to the ear. In this case, speaker needs not to say any single word but to use body movement. So in the ELT classroom the particular teaching situation, as well as, objectives of learners development should allow the broader phenomenon of linguistic competency (both grammatical and communication) as a major teaching module in for the learners. When the mastery of grammar is given acquaintance to the mastery of language then the evaluation of learners’ proficiency on the basis of accuracy can be evaluated. For example, if someone asks, “comment tu’appelle? (What is your name?)” In reply one can say, “Richard or Je m’appelle Richard. (My name is Richard)”. In latter case, one has to know the grammar of French to produce the complete sentence.

It is undoubtedly desirable that learners’ language production should be as “correct” as possible. The implication is that we should concern ourselves not only with accuracy of form, but also with appropriacy in relation to the context. Linguistic variations occur in different discourses such as “Hi” or “It is nice to meet you.” Based on the social context and status of persons these variations take place. Again, this derives in part from Hyme’s view of language as including “what a speaker needs to know in order to be communicatively competent in a speech community”. For example, every language has its colloquial forms. Any learner learning a second language should be acquainted with its colloquial form of that target language. So a learner should attain the target language’s form, as well as, function which ultimately leads to the performance of the learner according to the linguistic competency. In fact, it is logically possible to make an error at any of these levels. It is even possible-though this can only be mentioned in passing-to make cultural errors: an English person’s way of thanking someone for a present is to say “you really shouldn’t have done that” readily interpretable as a reprimand by a giver who is not familiar with the normal response.

Being “Communicative” refers to all four skills which can be described in two ways-productive and receptive. Speaking and writing falls under productive whereas listening and reading are included in receptive stage. Linguistic competence is the compilation of the four skills which cannot be defined considering the skills discretely. These skills are inseparable. Receptive skill, helps learners to learn the language, enables learners’ productive skill. In an ESL classroom, productive skill is very significant alongside receptive skill. Speaking is communicating information which involves number of elements-selection of correct vocabularies in a correct word order for particular situation with its correct pronunciation along with facial expression, tone and body language. Now, in an ESL classroom where English is the non-native language for the learners has to have linguistic competency to grasp all the elements in speaking. Number of activities are involved to improve learners speaking skill such as role plays, drills etc. Furthermore, writing skill stimulates learners to produce knowledge of the language through paper. Speaking and writing are the active skills where learners are directly drilled to produce the language correctly with its both form and function. Meanwhile, receptive skill plays simultaneous significant role in the context. Reading and listening help learners to accelerate understanding of the language through the development of the lexical range, appropriate facial expressions, as well as, stylistics in an appropriate situation. Building of successful decode in a particular context depends on the integration of four skills. At the beginning level, learners might communicate using words separately without any proper order. However, it results only the half or less than half decoding in a situation. To get full and complete decode in a situation, there is no other alternative except proper integration of four skills.

John Gumperz, founder of interactional sociolinguistics, characterizes the interaction using four skills in a particular context in the following way:

“We must turn to a speaker-oriented perspective and ask what it is speakers and listeners must know or do in order to be able to take part in a conversation or to create and sustain conversational involvement. By formulating the basic issues in this way, the focus shifts from the analysis of conversational forms or sequential patterns as such to the necessarily goal-oriented interpretive processes that underlie their production”(Gumperz, 1992: 306).

According to Gumperz, “goal-oriented interpretive processes” can be accomplished by contextualization cues. Contextualization cues relate to contextual presuppositions (tacit awareness of meaningfulness) which in turn allow participants to make situated inferences about the most likely interpretation of an utterance. Speakers can make choices between features including: (i) code, dialector style; (ii) prosodic features;

(iii) lexical and syntactic options, formulaic expressions; and (iv) conversational openings, closings and sequencing strategies (Gumperz, 1982: 131).

Discourse analysis takes different theoretical perspectives and analytic approaches: speech act theory, interactional socio linguistics, and ethnography of communication, pragmatics, conversation analysis, and variation analysis (Schiffrin, 1994). Although each approach emphasizes different aspects of language use, they view language as social interaction. It is important for the aims of this paper to understand that communicative competence should not only justify the instinct ability to accomplish communicative success (making signs or gesture or posture or any other non-verbal activities), but also to gain an optimum level of linguistic (structural) competence and to perform accordingly. This paper highlights on the application of discourse analysis in attaining communicative efficiency in the SLA teaching and learning context. It provides examples of how learners, as well as, teachers can improve their skill both in learning and teaching practices by investigating actual language use both in and out of the classroom. It is also a prolonged idea about how students learn language through exposure to versatile types of discourse. We find that students become able to use language in a full verbal competence. We aim at making learners competent in using language efficiently and contextually perfect. Here communicative competence does not necessarily identify its meaning only with the concept of ‘anyhow’ communicative performance which ultimately means the end of communication between the interlocutor and the listener who do not have the same language to go through. In this paper, we want to make sure the achieving of language efficiency in any type of tougher situation.

Even with the most communicative approaches the second language classroom is limited in its ability to develop learners’ communicative competence in the target language. This is mainly because of the restricted hours of contact with the foreign language, minimal opportunities for teaching practices as most of the cases the teaching items appear to the learners vague and culture shocking and real life disoriented. They have least chances to have communicative interaction with the native speakers, limited exposure to the variety of language function, genres, speech events, and discourse types that occur outside the classroom. As the students are given very limited time available to practise the target language, teachers should maximize opportunities for student participation. SLA is the only left out way for the teachers to monitor both the quality and quantity of the learners in acquiring the target language proficiency.

The teacher should undergo certain procedures to study the learning, as well as, the performance and behavior of the learners.

Step one: Videotape a complete lesson to be sure to capture all of your questions and the students’ responses. It means how far the learners are blessed with the opportunity to use the target language.

Step two: The teacher should watch the video tape to make a comparative analysis among the questions asked to the learners and the rating of possible recurrence in questioning and its ultimate effect on the learners’ response.

Step three: In this step its better to make a transcript only to identify questions in data and to focus on specific questions and student responses.

Step four: Analyze each type of questions: The reason for asking , the motivation level of the learners while answering, the required feedback of the learners, how far those were effective in reaching goal of communicative competence, can the learners feel affiliated with the asked questions etc.

Step five: The major linguistic and communicational problems that the learners face in answering the question must be studied carefully with a view to find pedagogical support for them.

Step six: The teacher’s way of handling the tough situation should be monitored as well. It should also be monitored how well they provide students with the positive feedback in time of crisis.

Teachers can also use these processes to study communication patterns in different classroom activities such as student to student interactions during a paired role play task and during a small group cooperative learning activity. Communicative activities are expected to promote authentic interaction and to provide the students with ample opportunities to be engaged to talk. Teachers are likely to discover the productive capabilities of the learners in different speech patterns which might be slightly ahead of their present state of competence. It should also be observed by the teacher that what initiative is adopted by the learners in case of a really hard communicative context.

For example, a map activity is likely to elicit a series of questions and answers among participants, whereas a picture narration task calls for less initiative from the learners. Any type of descriptive discursive activity requires actually a monologue developed around a narrative format. From the perspectives of evaluating students' proficiency in using communicative task, a better understanding of the influence of specific activities on learner discourse will likely lead teachers to go for using a greater variety of tasks in order to gain a more comprehensive and picture of students' abilities. By recording, transcribing, and analyzing students' discourse, teachers can gain insight into the effect of specific tasks on students' language production and over time, on their language development. A proper discourse analysis of SLA classroom interactions can also shed light on the cross-cultural linguistic patterns that may be leading to communication difficulties. It may focus on the ethnic factors and common gender distinction as well. Some speakers may engage in overlap, speaking while someone else is taking a turn-at-talk. For some group of linguists this kind of change in interaction may be viewed as a signal of engagement and involvement. However some may interpret it as interruption and imposition on their rights. Teachers should record and monitor afterwards all these types of cross-interactive communication to troubleshoot exactly the right kind of linguistic impediment that learners are facing. In this way they can help learners to find out different communication strategies and their potential chances of miscommunication.

In the spectrum of second language teaching and learning there are some variables that are beyond the control of teachers, and discourse analysis can infiltrate as an analytical tool for bringing some rectified and synchronized changes in interactional practices. The teachers involved in mainstream process of teaching can observe and invent their own techniques to study the classroom interaction procedures in order to focus on the learning opportunities available to the students who are bound by limited language proficiency. 'In fact discourse analysis can be an integral part of a program of professional development for all teachers that can include classroom-based research, with the aim of overall improving teaching (Johnson, 1992).

Language learners face a monumental task of pressure in acquiring second language where they have to announce integrity with the difficulties of learning procedure and undergo a huge lengthy process of acquisitional skill adaptation. They cannot remain satisfied by only attaining skill in vocabulary, syntactic patterns, and phonology but also gaining strategic and interactional competence. They need opportunities to investigate the systematicity of language at all linguistic levels, especially at the highest levels (Riggenbach, 1999; Young and He, 1998). Without having knowledge in the sociocultural factors and experiencing with the real life contextual scenarios, the variable in language functions are well understood. Second language learners are likely to rely on the strategic and expectations acquired as part of their first language development, which may be inappropriate for the second language setting and make the communication difficult. It creates a conflict between the fossilization of mother language and target one.

In all kind of second language learning situation the most common factor is limited experience with a variety of interactive practices in the target language. So it is truly reasonably complicated to make learners competent in linguistically to use language flawlessly. One way that teachers can include the study of discourse in the classroom is to allow the learners to study language by themselves that is to make discourse analysis (Celec-Murcia and Olshtain, 2000; McCarthy and Carter, 1994; Riggenbach, 1999). By exploring language in authentic environments, learners gain a greater affiliation and incorporation with of the discourse patterns associated with a given genre or speech event, as well as, sociolinguistic factors that contribute to linguistic variations across settings and contexts.

In communicative competence one very popular non linguistic feature is backchannels. They are the brief verbal responses that an interlocutor uses while engaged in talking with someone like mm-hmm, ok, yeah, oh no, but..., wow, no, aaaa, ah yes, sorry, etc. and in between communication may be successful using these backchannels along with gesture, posture, and kinesics. But we simply cannot justify it as communicative competence. There are some factors that make speaking and listening difficult for non-natives such as clustering, reduced forms, redundancy etc. For instance, school can be pronounced as sakool. Again, dijeeyet (did you eat yet?) is the example of reduced forms that create difficulty in understanding both for non-native speakers and listeners. Furthermore, someone asks, "How are you?" "aaa.... well..... you know..... work load. In this case to get the proper meaning of the reply one has to have linguistic competence with its proper analysis of discourse. It is true that the purpose of communication may be at its success but if this be called communicative competence then why not the communication among deaf and dumb persons can be identified as communicational or why arguments have encompassed during these recent days regarding ELT development procedures only to transform the ESL learners into efficient second language users. So GTM method failed to incorporate with the multiple demands of the target language functions and notions.

Traditional CLT approaches have been failed which involve practices from textbook only or sometimes from teacher oriented given contexts. Actually in this paper we are not discussing about the language learning approaches but the scope of using language in classroom irrespective of CLT OR EFL OR ESL OR GTM classroom. When the learners are well acquainted with the form of discourse of the particular target language they are exposed to be efficient in. Both the teachers and the learners can use discourse analysis not only as a research method for investigating their own practice skill and knowledge but also as a tool for studying interactions among language learners. Learners can be benefited from using discourse analysis to explore what

language is and how it is used to achieve communicative goals in different contexts. Thus, discourse analysis can help to create a second language learning environment that reflects more accurately how language is used linguistically and learners are motivated.

In this paper we aimed to highlight the acquisitional competence of learners which does not explain about communicational competence. In the examples given it is well focused that a learner can somehow manage a situation either textual or contextual, by using both notional and functional strategies. However, it does not account for the learners linguistic capabilities because the term “communicative competence” is defined as the way to express the meaning in a second or foreign language, by the learners who have a “limited command” of the language. In the process of communication a learner may have to make up for a lack of knowledge of grammar or vocabulary and the inability to apply the grammatical rules in order to perform communicative competence and this does not endow students with proper “linguistic knowledge.” In the beginning stage of learning this type of omitting strategies can be applied in an ESL classroom for motivating students, but further communicational development cannot take place unless learners have the linguistic competence because eventually proper communicative competence means learners should have accomplished his capabilities in functioning all the aspects of the language as a whole.

Next, we also aimed to highlight the discourse analysis in this paper because it is inseparably related with the learners’ competence over the language. This paper essentially attempts to exemplified the techniques of discourse analysis (textual, contextual and interpretive) in ESL classroom to make sure the students attain language competence. The primordial purpose of teaching language through discourse analysis is to give the students a proper idea of the target language as a conceptual whole. So, when in the ESL classroom all the real life discourses scenarios of language presented before the students and they are engaged in using language according to all the positive and negative parameters, teacher and the student, can both judge the level of competence gained at the end of the class. Communicative competence prefers foreign talk, gestures, posture, paraphrasing, mime, chunk, omission of grammar, sign language, baby talk in a difficult context of language used. It is true that using all these strategies is convenient for the performance of the communicative competence but the question still remains how much this communication is done and the learner’s true competence over the language. Here we are defining “linguistic competence” as the implicit and internalized knowledge of the rules of a language which requires proper usage of those rules in a proper discourse. Competence is divided into two levels-communicative and linguistic. At the beginning stage learners are given materials to grasp the ability to communicate with the target language. In this stage their grammatical errors are not marked, given feedback from the teachers to attain the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. However, at the next stage target language is presented with its all levels-phonetic, syntactic, semantic etc. Here, learners’ errors are monitored by the teachers with feedback. At the end of this stage, learners are expected to use the target language properly without any errors with its proper discourse.

Lastly, communicative competence is the compilation of linguistic competence and socio-linguistic pragmatic competence (interactional discourse) where person should know the rules and conventions in a particular context. True “competence” in a language means linguistic knowledge and para- linguistic cues such as verbal and non-verbal elements with proper analysis of proper discourse, interactional skills such as understanding appropriateness of using strategies in interaction and interpretation and cultural knowledge such as norms, values and attitudes of the participants. Thus, authentic communicative competence is made of four skills-linguistic, socio-linguistic, discourses and strategic.

References

- [1] Brown, G & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Avon: Cambridge University press.
- [2] Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Clancy, P., Thompson, S., Suzuki, R., & Tao, H. (1996) The conversational use of reactive tokens in English, Japanese, and Mandarin. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 355-387.
- [4] Ekayati, R. (2007). *Linguistic and Communicative Competence*. Retrieved from <http://ppiindia.wordpress.com/2007/01/09/linguistic-and-communicative-competence/>
- [5] Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Johnson, K. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Levinson, C, Stephen. (1983). *Pragmatics*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] McCarthy, M. (1992). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [10] McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (1994). *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teachers*. New York: Longman.
- [11] Richards, J., Platt, J. & Weber, H. (1985). *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited.
- [12] Riggenbach, H. (1999). *Discourse analysis in the language classroom: Volume 1. The spoken language*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- [13] Samburskiy, D. (2009). *Teacher Talk Discourse Techniques in ESL Classroom*. Retrieved from http://albany.academia.edu/DenisSamburskiy/Papers/520002/Teacher_Talk_Discourse_Techniques_in_ESL_Classroom Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [14] Young, R., & He, A. (1998). *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.