Nigar Shirkhan gizi HAMIDOVA,
orcid.org/0009-0003-5124-0215
Lecturer at the Department of English Language Teaching Methodology
Azerbaijan University of Languages
(Baku, Azerbaijan) ni.hamidova@gmail.com

A COGNITIVE APPROACH TO LESSON DISCOURSE

This article has identified that during academic lectures and tutorial sessions, the pragmatic dimension of communication predominantly concerns the exchange of information between teacher and student. It has been found that during the transmission of information, the interlocutors (i.e. teacher and student) must take turns in transmitting messages and ensuring mutual understanding in order to achieve their communicative goals and facilitate effective discourse. The study has shown that within this interactive structure, interventions by additional participants may sometimes occur. Indeed, it is of utmost importance that other students actively participate in the dialogue during the lesson. It has been found that the choice of interlocutors in such communicative acts should also be given due consideration. It has been concluded that speech acts play a decisive role in determining the type of information – whether it is new or already familiar. The existence of several communication channels between individual participants (namely teachers and students) may result in a complex speech act. In addition, the modality of communication – oral or written – has significant implications. For example, if participants exchange printed or pre-formulated content, the comprehension process may be relatively simpler. In contrast, the comprehension of oral information is generally considered more complex, as it is influenced by the individual physical and psychological characteristics of the learner. The general conclusion is that communication carried out through dialogue between teacher and learner is considered more pedagogically effective. In such conditions, information is learned and retained more effectively. Discourse genres have been found to cover such types of speech as description, persuasion, and advice. In both lecture and seminar discourse, the structural organization should adhere to the hierarchical taxonomic model. The teacher must give priority to the clarity of the information being conveyed. For example, a distinction must be made between presenting information in a descriptive format and delivering it in a narrative form. Empirical observations show that information presented in a narrative form tends to be retained in the learner's memory more effectively and is more easily integrated than information delivered descriptively. It should also be noted that students learn knowledge more effectively when it is relevant to their everyday experiences.

Key words: *teacher's speech activity, linguistic identity, communicative identity, lesson discourse.*

Нігар Ширхан гизи ХАМІДОВА,
orcid.org/0009-0003-5124-0215
викладач кафедри методики викладання англійської мови
Азербайджанського університету мов
(Баку, Азербайджан) ni.hamidova@gmail.com

КОГНІТИВНИЙ ПІДХІД ДО УРОЧНОГО ДИСКУРСУ

У цій статті визначено, що під час академічних лекцій та навчальних сесій прагматичний вимір комунікації переважно стосується обміну інформацією між викладачем та студентом. Виявлено, що в ході передачі інформації співрозмовники (тобто вчитель та учень) повинні по черзі передавати повідомлення та забезпечувати взаємне розуміння для досягнення своїх комунікативних цілей та сприяння ефективному дискурсу. Дослідження показало, що в рамках цієї інтерактивної структури може відбуватися втручання додаткових учасників. Дійсно, дуже важливо, щоб інші студенти брали активну участь у діалозі під час уроку. З'ясовано, що вибір співрозмовників у таких комунікативних актах також має бути розглянуто належним чином. Зроблено висновки про те, що мовні акти відіграють вирішальну роль у визначенні типу інформації, чи вона є новою чи вже знайомою. Існування кількох комунікативних каналів між окремими учасниками (а саме вчителями та студентами) може призвести до складного мовного акту. Крім того, модальність комунікації – усна чи письмова – має значні наслідки. Наприклад, якщо учасники обмінюються друкованим чи заздалегідь сформульованим змістом, процес розуміння може бути більш простим. Навпаки, сприйняття усної інформації зазвичай вважається складнішим, оскільки на нього впливають індивідуальні фізичні та психологічні характеристики учня.

Загальний висновок у тому, що комунікація, здійснювана у вигляді діалогу між учителем і учнем, вважається педагогічно ефективнішою. У таких умовах інформація засвоюється та засвоюється з більшою ефективністю. Виявлено, що жанри дискурсу охоплюють такі типи мови, як опис, переконання та порада. Як у лекційному, так і в семінарському дискурсі структурна організація має дотримуватись ієрархічної таксономічної моделі. Викладач зобов'язаний віддавати пріоритет ясності інформації, що передається. Наприклад, необхідно провес-

ти різницю між поданням інформації в описовому форматі та доставкою її у формі оповідання. Емпіричні спостереження показують, що інформація, подана в оповідальній формі, має тенденцію ефективніше зберігатися в пам'яті учня і легше інтегрується, ніж інформація, передана описово. Слід також зазначити, що студенти засвоюють знання більш ефективно, коли вони відповідають їхньому повсякденному досвіду.

Ключові слова: мовленнєва діяльність вчителя, лінгвістична ідентичність, комунікативна ідентичність, урок-дискурс.

Introduction to the Problem. The exploration of paralinguistic elements in written communication began to garner scholarly attention in the 1970s. These elements play a significant role in articulating the author's communicative intent and underlying objectives. As is well-established in contemporary psychological discourse, communication encompasses three principal dimensions: the communicative (*exchange of information*), the interactive (*reciprocal influence*), and the perceptual (*cognitive processing and understanding*) (Stipek, 2002: 261). The communicative dimension presupposes the transmission of information among interlocutors, during which their intentions, goals, knowledge, and viewpoints are articulated. In this process, interlocutors influence one another to ensure mutual comprehension and facilitate effective communication.

Degree of Problem Elaboration. Empirical investigations indicate that within the classroom environment, the principal burden of discourse is typically borne by instructors. The seminal studies conducted by D. Edwards and N. Mercer demonstrate that teachers account for approximately 76% of the total classroom verbal activity (Edwards, 1987: 93). C. Ramirez, S. Yuen, and others have classified teacher discourse into several key categories: explanatory remarks, interrogatives, directives (*or instructions*), lesson structuring (*i.e., organizing the pedagogical framework*), and evaluative feedback (Enkvist: 1989: 382). According to C. Cummins, teacher discourse in classroom settings functions less as an instrument of dialogue and listening, and more as a mechanism of control and classroom management (Cummins, 1981: 132). Similarly, P. Forestal's research underscores that approximately 60% of teacher speech consists of questions, primarily of an instructive nature (Forestal, 1990: 159).

There are instances wherein questions are posed merely for the sake of maintaining classroom routine. Observational studies reveal that the majority of teachers employ questions predominantly to review previously covered material. Typically, the teacher asks a question, corrects the student's response, and then proceeds to the next instructional stage. In 1998, K. Mohr documented all questions posed by a single teacher over the course of an hour (Mohr, 2007: 440),

concluding that such questions comprised nearly half of the entire lesson. In this context, the critical issue lies not in the quantitative frequency of questions but in their qualitative construction and functional deployment. Direct and indirect questions, along with their respective responses, vary considerably in communicative quality.

When engaging with large audiences, as opposed to small group settings, the teacher's role necessarily becomes more directive, emphasizing their function as a facilitator and regulator of discourse.

R. Weber and T. Longhi-Cirlin contend that questioning and responding to questions constitute the core of classroom interaction and should be systematically practiced in all educational environments (Weber, 2001: 19). H. Mehan characterizes this interactional pattern as *"Initiation–Response–Evaluation"* (IRE) (Mehan, 1979: 127), while R. Tarp and R. Gallimore describe it as a *"recitation–question–answer"* sequence (Mehan, 1979: 130). However, C. Fitzgerald argues that this triadic model is of limited relevance for second-language learners, for whom the process is predominantly convergent and centered more on language acquisition than on inquiry-based engagement (Fitzgerald, 1993: 638). This model is particularly applicable to language clubs, where learners are primarily focused on developing oral fluency. Nevertheless, in higher education settings, the IRE framework may retain its centrality as a pedagogical tool.

According to G. Wells and G. Chang-Wells, the distinctive feature of this model lies not in the evaluative role of the teacher but in the provision of meaningful feedback that facilitates reciprocal interaction (Wells, 1992: 92). This dynamic enhances both teacher–student and peer-to-peer verbal exchanges, thereby enriching the overall discursive environment of the classroom.

K. B. Kazden categorizes the questions posed by educators into two principal groups: traditional and learning-oriented. Traditional questions are typically structured to elicit either specific or consensually accepted responses. In contrast, questions formulated with the aim of fostering inquiry – also referred to as learning-oriented–do not require the student to "defend" themselves; rather, the student's discourse is examined without being

overtly directed or steered (Cazden, 2001: 170). Nevertheless, in the case of traditional (display) questions, the educator may guide or influence the student's response. In the former instance, the student provides an answer aligned with the topic under study; in the latter, the student seeks to showcase their own competencies or knowledge. Kazden asserts that "if the potential of students is of equal significance within classroom discourse, it is imperative to attend to who is speaking and whose responses are acknowledged during instruction" (Cazden, 2001: 5).

C. Goldenberg designates the discourse employed by the teacher as "instructional talk" (Perez, 1996: 316). He characterizes this discursive form as an effective mode of communication, emphasizing its engaging, appealing, relevant, and impactful nature from the perspective of the learners (Perez, 1996: 317). Within this type of discourse, meaningful interaction and the exchange of ideas between teacher and students are facilitated. Furthermore, the roles of teacher and student may undergo shifts, reflecting a dynamic and reciprocal communicative environment.

B. Perez contends that in such communicative contexts, the teacher demonstrates respect for the student's ideas and listens attentively. During this process, both parties offer reciprocal commentary and express their perspectives (Perez, 1996: 173). According to another viewpoint, educators who utilize instructional discourse adopt a philosophy of equitable thinking and speaking, and they operate on the premise that a student's cognitive framework often encompasses more than what is explicitly stated. These educators endeavor to reveal and engage with the deeper layers of student understanding (Reyes, 1999: 202). As expressed in an English adage, "Teachers sometimes learn from their students."

In the context of academic discourse, it is essential to consider the reciprocal interaction between the cognitive and intellectual activities of both teacher and student. Given that communication constitutes the foundation of academic discourse, cognitive processes are realized through linguistic means. Just as discourse is understood to represent verbal ideation that integrates both linguistic and extralinguistic elements, academic discourse is likewise conceptualized as a form of ideational-verbal activity (Backman, 2007: 200). As previously noted, communication occupies a central position within academic discourse.

The objective of this study is to interpret the content and essence of knowledge acquisition through discourse and communication within the instructional process. The methodological approach consists of the analysis and synthesis of extant scholarly frameworks and practical experience within the relevant field.

Main Body

The Intensive Investigation of Language Across Various Disciplines in the Humanities and the Scientific Analysis of Discourse

Cognitive processes are comprehended through linguistic structures, whereas discourse and communication may be interpreted as the mutual transmission of content and meaning between speaker and listener. The abstraction and objectification of knowledge, reasoning, and experiential insights, as well as their manifestation within linguistic forms, are regarded as critical elements in the realization of these processes.

The intensive study of language within diverse domains of the humanities, and the adoption of discourse analysis as a methodological foundation, have enabled scholars to speak of a linguistic or discursive turn. As a result, the object of inquiry and the parameters of description have been redefined: texts have come to be examined in relation to extralinguistic factors, and the mechanisms and processes underlying text production have emerged as central topics of investigation. Consequently, linguistic inquiry now encompasses the analysis of linguistic behavior within communicative acts, verbal interaction across various discourse genres, and the examination of speaker strategies within particular communicative situations.

Within the framework of discourse analysis, the human subject of speech – the speaker – emerges as a conscious agent, a subject of linguistic identity, and a participant in the communicative act, occupying the positions of both addresser and addressee.

Under these conditions, the very notion of communication has undergone substantial transformation. The traditional conception of communication as a mechanism for transmitting information and disseminating knowledge – the transmission model – has given way to a broader understanding of communication as a symbolic process in which the identities of interlocutors are constituted, and their social relationships, emotions, ideas, and experiences are expressed. This reconceptualization foregrounds the pivotal role of communication in the formation of individual identity.

L. Judith and H. Annette identify three levels of linguistic personality:

1. **Verbal-semantic level** – implies the natural mastery of language by its speakers and, for the researcher, the conventional description of formal expressions of specific concepts;

2. **Cognitive-thesaurus level** – comprises the concepts, ideas, and notions that organize linguistic

346

Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук. Вип. 88, том 2, 2025

units into a more or less coherent and systematic linguistic worldview for each individual, establishing a hierarchy of values;

3. **Pragmatic level (motivational level)** – encompasses intention, interest, motivation, and intentionality.

L. Judith and H. Annette propose certain outcomes for the generalization and comprehension of this conceptual framework and present a tripartite structure (core–modification–periphery) of the given conceptual domain:

1. **Linguistic personality**: its place within the subject matter (linguistics); the subject (one who comprehends the world and reflects it in speech); the individual; the author of a text; the speaker; the informant; active informant; passive informant; the speaker; speech portrait;

2. **The linguistic personality of a philologist-expert** (philologist as a personality): character (in literary works); specific historical figures; national linguistic personality;

3. **The "human–language" scientific paradigm**; "language–human" relationship; anthropological linguistics; national culture; AL language model; CL language model; language competence; the linguistic picture of the world; knowledge of the world; thesaurus of the linguistic personality; linguistic consciousness; national consciousness (self-awareness); national mentality; mental (cognitive) space of the language user; combinatory relations; combinatory domain; internal vocabulary; individual vocabulary; the vocabulary of the linguistic personality; psycholinguistic experimental text (Judith L. Pace, 2007: 12).

The subject in question is the linguistic personality of a textbook author and a philologist-teacher engaged in speech activity and possessing a body of knowledge and representations. The concept of the linguistic personality of the scholar-methodologist (the textbook author) refers to the totality of creative and sociolinguistic abilities and characteristics that reflect relevant aspects of the individual's personality and, accordingly, enable the creation and comprehension of speech acts marked by specific cognitive, communicative-pragmatic orientation, and structural linguistic integrity (Judith L. Pace, 2007: 90).

The Developed Linguistic Personality of the Teacher

The developed linguistic personality of a teacher is characterized by the following knowledge and skills:

1. Knowledge of the language system, including its grammatical and lexical norms;

2. Mastery of the speech system at both the text and linguistic levels;

3. Awareness of the social norms governing the use of speech acts in terms of communication, topic, style, and genre;

4. Familiarity with the structural features of complex texts;

5. Understanding of the roles of the speaker and listener, including their social and psychological cooperation in communication;

6. Knowledge of the pragmatic principles of communication in both cooperative and conflictual communicative episodes;

7. Understanding of the ethical and etiquette norms associated with status and role positions.

A. Jane identifies the following functions of the linguistic personality of a philologist-teacher:

– **Instrumental-cultural**: the linguistic personality is expected to know linguistic units and their combinatory relations, the construction of discourses, and the cultural and socio-historical experience of the people as encoded in language;

– **Reproductive**: the expression of linguistic units in speech activity, including their generation and rules of combination;

– **Creative**: the modification of linguistic units in speech and the formation of new expressions and types of utterances for achieving communicative purposes;

– **Adaptive**: the adjustment of linguistic units to the mechanisms of communicative situations for the expression of specific meanings;

– **Pragmatic**: orientation toward the addressee and their social status (Jane, 2007: 11; Jane, 2008).

All these elements constitute the wholeness and competence of language, that is, the sum of knowledge and skills that enable an individual to perform certain activities. Linguistic competence is composed of linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmalinguistic components. Linguistic competence includes phonetic, lexical, and grammatical knowledge and skills, as well as parameters that exist independently of the sociolinguistic meanings of language variants and the pragmatic features of language functioning.

The Teacher as a Discursive Personality

The communicative competence of the teacher as a discursive personality is part of the pedagogical personality. L. Beckman and A. Palmer distinguish three blocks in communicative competence:

1. linguistic knowledge: verbal elements; non-verbal elements; examples, elements of various speech events; the field of possible variants for all elements; the meaning of variants in specific situations;

2. the ability to influence, selection of key elements in communicative situations, choosing forms appropriate to roles, situations, and relationships,

and their interpretation; norms of interaction and interpretation; strategy to achieve the goal;

3. Cultural knowledge: social structure; evaluation; cognitive maps and schemas; the process of cultural integration (transmission of knowledge and skills) (Backman, 1996: 177).

Genre competence can be considered a part of the communicative personality (possession of the norms for the creation and functioning of discursive and speech genres).

The regulative aspect of language personality involves establishing and maintaining contact with the interlocutor in all types of discourse. The informative aspect reveals knowledge (general and specific) and the use of this knowledge in concrete communication. The fascinating aspect reflects the emotional characteristics of the person involved in communication.

Practical mastery of speech genres is an essential aspect of the teacher's professional competence as a discursive personality.

Thus, systematic and functional approaches to the personality of the speaker (here the teacher) exist in scientific literature. The teacher acts as both a language personality and a communicative personality at every moment in their speech activity. Moreover, their individual character should be specially assessed. However, while claiming linguistic and communicative exceptions, people often behave similarly in comparable communicative situations. This is because the speaker consistently exhibits speech behavior characteristic of their group in their speech biography. The language bearer seemingly encompasses multiple language personalities within themselves. For example, they may simultaneously embody the language personality of an urban resident, a student, a twenty-year-old youth, and so forth. The speaking individual becomes a unique, multidimensional research object, defined by unrepeatable, unique socio-psychological characteristics.

In our view, there is a need for a concept capable of reflecting the typical communicative behavior of a personality in a communicative situation. This is the discursive personality – communicants who, as representatives of certain social institutions, possess the ability to create and interpret texts in typical conditions of communicative situations. Within a particular discourse framework, the subject is insignificant; they are subordinate to the discourse and play a role according to its rules, i.e., they are secondary. Thus, if the language personality – communicative personality reflects a person's communicative individuality, then the discursive personality is the integral and differential set of linguistic characteristics of the personality as a representative of a certain social group.

Every social institution has its own rules of operation, norms, and requirements for the functional-discursive activity of its subjects. The essence of a social institution is also manifested in the division of social roles and statuses of the institution's "agents" and "clients".

It is also worth noting that in a particular communicative situation, a personality's role and status may not coincide. Status encompasses many social positions, including age, gender, professional activity, family status, association groups (friends, acquaintances), prestige positions, religious beliefs, and political views of the personality. Role, associated with a particular status, is a set of cultural models combining the following relationships: values and behavior patterns prescribed by society for the personality.

It implies characteristic repertoires of speech activities that the institutional agent must perform in specific situations. The central characteristic of a role is the expectations of others about the role's performer. Primarily, the social role is defined by the personality's professional and social activities. The common field for social status and role is professional activity. Therefore, status reflects the characteristics of the social institution and encompasses the rights and duties of its subjects as well as the institution's general aims and functions.

This, in turn, is reflected in social interactions. In other words, the individual, by integrating status and role characteristics and utilizing the services of social institutions, structures their verbal and non-verbal behaviors in accordance with the expectations of clients (students). From this, it follows that each social institution possesses its own strategic approaches in organizing discourse and discursive behavior. This accounts for the diversity of discourse types and genres.

Conclusion. The teacher's discursive identity embodies a complex structure encompassing a range of integral and differential features. Integral features link the teacher's discursive identity to those of other types (for example, lawyers and teachers often share oratory skills). Differential features distinguish the given discursive identity from others.

The teacher's authority, as the bearer of literary language norms and speech behavior, finds its validation in the unity of culture and education. The high demands placed on the teacher's level of communicative competence are conditioned by their status role. They are required to master language resources and adhere to the lawful norms of communication with

ease. The teacher represents an elite linguistic identity for those around them. However, it is our view that many teachers function as average bearers of speech culture. This accounts for the contradiction between the teacher's discursive and real linguistic identity – the communicative personality.

A teacher capable of exerting a positive influence in interactions with students creates a more favorable educational environment, effectively addressing their emotional and educational needs. A positive teacher–student relationship is crucial for effective teaching and learning. Although the teacher plays the primary role in establishing these relationships and bears the main responsibility, students also have a certain role; thus, both parties contribute to this process.

The interaction between teacher and student is important for many reasons. This relationship significantly influences the student's attendance, academic performance, knowledge acquisition, and ability to establish peer relationships. Teachers who foster positive and reliable relationships with students also engage closely in their extracurricular activities, facilitating greater independence, responsiveness, and more diligent learning.

Furthermore, positive teacher–student relations positively impact classroom management. Under conditions of constructive teacher–student relationships, students are afforded opportunities for cognitive, social, and emotional development, resulting in more productive mental activity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Stipek, D. Good instruction is motivating. Development of achievement motivation. A.Wigfield & J.S.Eccles (eds.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 2002. p. 309-332.

2. Edwards D. Common knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom. / D.Edwards, N.Mercer. New York: Methuen, 1987. 193 p.

3. Enkvist N.E. 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, 1989. p. 369-382.

4. Cummins J. Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada: A reassessment. Applied Linguistics, 1981. No 2, p. 132-149.

5. Forestal P. Talking: Toward classroom action. Perspectives on small groups learning. Theory and Practice. P. Forestal. M. Brubacher, R.Payne, & K. Rickett (Eds.). Oakville, ON: Rubicon, 1990. p. 159-173.

6. Mohr K.A.J., Mohr, E.S. Extending English-Language Learners' Classroom Interactions Using the Response Protocol. The Reading Teacher, 2007. No 60 (5), p. 440-450.

7. Weber R.M., Longhi-Chirlin, T. Beginning in English: The growth of linguistic and literate abilities in Spanish-speaking first graders. Reading Research and Instruction, 2001. No 41 (1), p. 19-50.

8. Mehan H. Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. H.Mehan. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979. 227 p.

9. Fitzgerald J. Literacy and students who are learning English as a second language. The Reading Teacher, 1993. No 46, p.638-647.

10. Wells G., Chang-Wells, G.L. Constructing knowledge together: Classrooms as centers of inquiry and literacy. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1992. 192 p.

11. Cazden C.B. Classroom Discourse: The language of teaching and learning. 2nd edition. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2001. 230 p.

12. Perez B. Instructional conversations as opportunities for English language acquisition for culturally and linguistically diverse students. Language Arts, 1996. No 73, p. 173-181.

13. Reyes P., Scribner J.D., Scribner A.P. Lessons from high-performing Hispanic schools: Creating learning communities. New York: Teachers College Press, 1999. 223 p.

14. Judith L., Annette H., Judith L. Pace. Classroom Authority: Theory, Research, and Practice. Routledge: Education, 2007. 208 p.

15. Jane A.G. K., Beth, R. Differentiated School Leadership: Effective Collaboration, Communication, and Change Through Personality Type. SAGE Publications, 2008. 214 p.

16. Jane, A.G.K. Differentiation through Personality Types: A Framework for Instruction, Assessment, and Classroom Management. Corwin: Corwin Press, 2007. 185 p.

17. Backman, L., Plamer A. Language Testing in Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. 377 p.

18. Backman, L., Plamer A. Language Testing in Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. 377 p.

REFERENCES

1. Stipek, D. (2002) Good instruction is motivating. Development of achievement motivation. A.Wigfield & J.S.Eccles (eds.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, p. 309-332.

2. Edwards D. (1987) Common knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom. / D.Edwards, N.Mercer. New York: Methuen, 193 p.

3. 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.

4. Cummins J. (1981) Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada: A reassessment. Applied Linguistics, No 2, p. 132-149.

5. Forestal P. (1990) Talking: Toward classroom action. Perspectives on small groups learning. Theory and Practice. P. Forestal. M. Brubacher, R.Payne, & K. Rickett (Eds.). Oakville, ON: Rubicon, p. 159-173.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. Mehan H. (1979) Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. H.Mehan. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 227 p.

9. Fitzgerald J. (1993) Literacy and students who are learning English as a second language. The Reading Teacher, No 46, p.638-647.

10. Wells G., Chang-Wells, G.L. (1992) Constructing knowledge together: Classrooms as centers of inquiry and literacy. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 192 p.

11. Cazden C.B. (2001) Classroom Discourse: The language of teaching and learning. 2nd edition. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 230 p.

12. Perez B. (1996) Instructional conversations as opportunities for English language acquisition for culturally and linguistically diverse students. Language Arts, No 73, p. 173-181.

13. Reyes P., Scribner J.D., Scribner A.P. (1999) Lessons from high-performing Hispanic schools: Creating learning communities. New York: Teachers College Press, 223 p.

14. Judith L., Annette H., Judith L. (2007) Pace. Classroom Authority: Theory, Research, and Practice. Routledge: Education, 208 p.

15. Jane A.G. K., Beth, R. (2008) Differentiated School Leadership: Effective Collaboration, Communication, and Change Through Personality Type. SAGE Publications, 214 p.

16. Jane, A.G.K. (2007) Differentiation through Personality Types: A Framework for Instruction, Assessment, and Classroom Management. Corwin: Corwin Press, 185 p.

17. Backman, L., Plamer A. (1996) Language Testing in Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 377 p.

18. Backman, L., Plamer A. (1996) Language Testing in Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 377 p.