

The Analysis of Authoritative and Persuasive Discourse of Iranian EFL Teachers and Their Roles at Public and Private Schools

Seyede Hamideh Ghasemi

*MA Student, Department of English Language, Faculty of Literature and Humanities,
Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran
Email: hemi_gh@yahoo.com*

Seyyed Mohammad Reza Adel (Corresponding Author)

*Assistant Professor, Department of English Language, Faculty of Literature and Humanities,
Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran
Email: sm.adel@hsu.ac.ir (also, adelzero@yahoo.co.uk)*

Gholamreza Zareian

*Assistant Professor, Department of English Language, Faculty of Literature and Humanities,
Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran
Email: Zareian22@gmail.com*

Abstract

The present study aimed at figuring out the Iranian EFL teachers' amount of using authoritative and persuasive discourse in regard to their roles in public and private schools, both in teachers' and learners' perception. Participants were 200 teachers and 200 students of public and private schools from different cities of Iran. They were asked to fill out the questionnaires designed by the researcher about teachers' roles. Then 20 teachers and 20 students from public and private schools were interviewed to say their opinion about teachers' roles and discourses.

Results of the analysis of data showed that there is no significant difference between the amount of using authoritative and persuasive discourse among Iranian EFL teachers in public and private schools. It is also indicated that, according to teachers' idea, regardless of the contexts, they believe themselves as having more persuasive discourse while in students' perception their teachers use more authoritative discourse.

Keywords: Authoritative discourse, Internally persuasive discourse, Dialogism, Monologic discourse

1. Introduction

Education as one of the vital parts of any society has strong impact on everybody's lives. In school as a small society children become ready to fulfil their needs and then get ready for the larger outside society. Thus understanding what happen there requires an important consideration done by the scholars of this field. And the actions of the most effective figure in educational setting, teacher, should be taken in to account.

In the light of the theories cited in the review of related literature and studies, specially the insights from Bakhtin (1981, 1986), Matusov (2007, 2009), among the others, the researcher of this study aims to work on two important approaches, namely authoritative and persuasive, which are used by teachers and also the different roles which are applied by them in the educational context of Iran. Therefore, at the end of this study the following research questions will be answered:

1. Is there any significant difference between EFL teachers' amount of using authoritative and persuasive discourse in regard to their roles in public schools and private institutes?
2. Is there any significant difference between the perception of public schools and private institutes' students about their EFL teachers' amount of using authoritative and persuasive discourse in regard to their roles?

2. Literature Review

As it was mentioned, preparing students for living in the society needs an approach to make them ready to be able to make interaction with different people and also to make them able to remove the feeling of shyness and try to say their ideas and their own points of views. One of the effective approaches is the one which was introduced by Mortimer and Scott (2003); communicative approach. This approach contains different classes based on various natures of discourse namely interactive that is opposite of non-interactive and dialogic which is counter-pose to authoritative.

The first classification of communicative approach is whether it is interactive or non-interactive; by interactive it means allowing the participation of more than one person and on the other side the non-interactive refers to excluding the participation of others (Scott, Mortimer, & Aguiar, 2006). The other dichotomous division of communicative approach is to be dialogic or authoritative. Dialogic discourse, in general term, is the one which is open to different perspectives that tries to acknowledge the views of others. But in contrast to dialogic discourse, *authoritative* discourse does not allow the bringing together and exploration of ideas (Scott et al., 2006).

2.1 Dialogism Theory

According to Bakhtin, the one that characterizes the entire social world is dialogism. He believes that authentic human life is an open-ended dialogue. Bakhtin (1981) introduced two different discourses in his dialogism theory: *authoritative* and *internally persuasive discourse*. In his idea, the fundamental property of dialogic discourse is the inter-animation, exploring and working on different ideas. So it can provide the opportunity for the students to express their everyday ideas (Scott et al., 2006).

Dialogic discourse allows people to become aware of different point of views because it is open to different perspective (Mortimer, 2005). In this discourse, participants try to accept and understand the perspective of others and there is a tendency toward allowing the space for different ideas to be represented (Scott et al., 2006). In the educational setting which applies this kind of discourse, the teacher recognizes and attempts to take into account a range of students' and others' ideas. Landay (2004) mentioned some situation in classroom in which students can put the internal dialogue in to use by keeping journals, revising their own writings, and making portfolios. By using such activities teachers can apply internally persuasive discourse in their class.

2.2 Internally Persuasive Discourse

Internally Persuasive Discourse (IPD) is the discourse of our personal beliefs and the idea that helps us to create ourselves and our stories about the world (Bakhtin, 1981). In his article, White (2009) defined IPD as those voices without authority, characterized by dialogues of exchange or challenge and authorial discourses as an embodiment of monologism.

In educational setting, IPD is so important because learning is primarily social and it is in a situation of tension and conflict that it happens best (Ball & Freedman, 2004). Therefore, to come up with learning, the teacher should go for IPD. Because when there is no IPD in the classroom and/or when the students do not have their own voice in the discourse, the education fails (Matusov & von Duyke, 2010).

2.3 Authoritative Discourse

In the world of monologism (the one which has authoritative discourse), just the dominant perspective has value and all the other participants are reduced to the status of objects. They don't have any right because they are not considered as "another consciousness" (Bakhtin, 1984[1961], p. 292-3). Thus their ability to produce autonomous meaning is denied. In such a world, the "death" of others can be seen (Bakhtin 1984, p. 32).

Robinson (2013), based on Bakhtin's idea, noted some of the features of monologism. It is a single thought discourse which is the characteristic of traditional writing and thought. "In monologism, one transcendental perspective or consciousness integrates the entire field, and thus integrates all the signifying practices, ideologies, values and desires that are deemed significant. Anything irrelevant to this perspective is deemed superfluous or irrelevant in general" (para. 10). To confirm the single thought nature of monologism Holquist (1981b) asserts that "undialogized language is *authoritative* or absolute" (p. 426-7). As examples of authoritative discourse, Bakhtin (1991) usually used examples of forceful impositions by institutions, authoritative texts, teachers, political power, and church. In authoritative discourse which is in dire contrast to the very first situation which Bakhtin presupposes for a suitable situation for learning, there is no room for struggling for the truth and new understanding since everything must be accepted blindly.

Finally it should be stated that it is the teacher who has the central role in controlling the class whether to make it as an internally persuasive situation or as an authoritative one and it is directly related to different roles which are taken by them in classroom contexts.

2.4 Teachers' Roles

As an extremely important figure of society, teachers have a vital role in representing the future and also the direction that a society will take, because they directly influence the lives of their students who want to be the leader of the next generation. Zlatković & petrović (2011) confirm this fact by asserting that as the successful performance of teachers can improve the quality of educational process and thus contribute to the quality of human resources of society so there is a real need for studying teachers' roles. As they have noted the importance of studying teachers' role, therefore this study aimed to examine different significant teachers' roles in educational setting for figuring out the teachers' discourse. After examining the different scholars' perspectives on the roles of teachers, the researcher of this study has found Nunan's model of language teachers' roles more comprehensive than the others.

A summary of what Nunan (1998b) believes as the major roles of a language teacher are demonstrated in the table 1:

Table 1

Nunan's (1988b) Classification of Teacher's Role in the Language Classroom

Need analyst	identifying learners' communicative, personal, cultural needs
Course developer	selecting and grading syllabus content
Organizer	1. grouping learners into different classes or learning arrangements 2. conducting and orchestrating the class
Material developer	selecting creating materials and learning activities
Assessor	monitoring and assessing learner progress
Course evaluator	course evaluation
Counsellor	attending the learners' learning, cultural, personal problems

Having in mind the review of literature, the next part explains about the methodology that the researcher have used to accomplish the goal of the study.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

To conduct the current study, two groups of participants, both from male and female teachers and students were randomly selected to take part in the data collection. In the first phase, 200 Iranian students (100 from public school and 100 from private institutes) participated in the research. The private institute students enjoyed different levels of proficiency including the elementary, intermediate, and advanced levels. Their age ranged from 11 to 48. The other group was 200 EFL Iranian teachers (100 from public schools and 100 from private institutes). The range of teachers' age was 20 to 55. The group of teachers enjoyed a variety of educational degree from Bachelor of Art to Master of Art and PHD of related major to EFL teaching. And some of them enjoyed international language certificate such as TOEFL, IELTS, CAE and GRE. These participants were asked to fill out the questionnaires provided by the researcher. Phase two of the study was done by 20 EFL teachers (10 from public schools and 10 from private institutes) and also by 20 students (10 from public schools and 10 from private institutes). They were asked six questions orally with a time limit of 10-15 minutes for each interview. To be able to generalize the result of the study to more population in Iran the questionnaires were administered in variety of cities such as Mashhad and Sabzevar, Ghouchan, Neyshabour, Shahroud, Fouman, Rasht, Torbat Heydariye, and Khaaf in public and private schools.

3.2 Research Design

The present study employed a mixed-method design that was composed of both quantitative and qualitative research methods.

3.3 Instruments

3.3.1 Questionnaires

For ensuring the construct validity of the questionnaires, their questions extracted from several related studies on teachers' roles, (e.g. Shawer, 2010; Graves, 1996; Rodriguez, Manner, & Darcy, 2010; Brindly, 1989; Stojilković et al., 2012; Nunan, 1988b; Wan, Low, & Li, 2011 ...). Two questionnaires (one specifically for teachers and one for students) were prepared by the researcher of the current study. As the purpose was not concerned on the proficiency levels of the subjects, questions were translated into Persian. To ensure the accuracy of translations, a back translation process was done by the experts in this field of study using 3 applied linguists and an experienced translator. Then to pay for the content validity of the questionnaire the questionnaires were piloted with 30 EFL teachers and 30 students in public schools and private institutes. The Cronbach's Alpha .86 showed the reliability of the questionnaire.

And finally, a likert-type questionnaire with 48 and 52 questions were given to the students and teachers respectively. Participants were asked to answer the questions based on the level of implementation of different teachers' roles by choosing among the choices which were ranged from "always" to "never".

3.3.2 Interview

The second phase of the research was done through the use of semi-structured interview which uses 6 oral open-ended questions which conducted in Persian. Five of them were designed specifically about the teachers' roles, and one question regards authoritative and internally persuasive discourse, for the better understanding of which some short explanations were submitted to the participants. The questions of the interview were designed by the researcher by using the constructs which were

drawn from different related studies (e.g Davison, 2004; Tatar & Bekerman, 2009; Lau & Lemahieu, 1997; Shower, 2010; Putney & Broughton, 2011).

3.4 Procedures

For doing the quantitative part of the study, specific scores were allocated to each choice as follow; always scored 5, usually 4, sometimes 3, seldom 2, and never 1. Then the questions of questionnaire were categorized based on the nature of the questions (authoritativeness and persuasiveness). After that, the total scores of all question types were summed up. As the number of questions relating to authoritative discourse was not the same as the persuasive one, so the mean was computed for each one. Then to see whether the difference between the obtained means is significant “paired-sample t-test” was conducted by the use of the recent version of SPSS software (IBM SPSS Statistics 21).

For the qualitative part of the study, six questions were asked orally from the randomly selected participants. Then their important ideas were transcribed as different codes. After that, their codes were categorized based on the recognized constructs of their responses to works as guiding points for the further analysis. To analyse the data obtained from interviews, they were rendered to content analysis and constant comparison method.

4. Discussion

In this part the analysis of gathered data will be shown and both quantitative and qualitative results will be used for discussing answers of research questions.

4.1 Results of the Study

Is there any significant difference between EFL teachers’ amount of using authoritative and persuasive discourse in regard to their roles in public schools and private institutes?

To compare these two different contexts, firstly the information gathered thorough the public school teachers’ questionnaires and then those of private institutes’ teachers will be examined. And finally, by the help of information obtained by the interview, the answer to the question will be discussed.

Table 2

Public School Teachers’ Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	authoritative discourse	3.7006	100	.45758	.04576
	persuasive discourse	3.8875	100	.37525	.03752

Table 3

Public School Teachers' Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Authoritative discourse – persuasive discourse	-.18688	.44182	.04418	-.27454	-.09921	-4.230	99	.000

Considering public school teachers, the difference of means was found to be significant; with the mean of authoritative discourse (M= 3.70, SD=.45) and persuasive discourse (M=3.88, SD=.37), $t(99) = -4.23$, $p < .0005$.

As the statistic shows, teachers in public schools believe that they use more persuasive discourse than authoritative one.

Table 4

Private Institutes' Teachers' Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Authoritative discourse	3.3075	100	.50858	.05086
	Persuasive discourse	3.8356	100	.37154	.03715

Table 5

Private Institutes' Teachers' Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Authoritative discourse – Persuasive discourse	-.52806	.49563	.04956	-.62640	-.42971	-10.654	99	.000

In regard to private institutes' teachers also, the difference between the means of authoritative discourse (M= 3.30, SD=.50) and persuasive discourse (M=3.83, SD=.37), $t(99) = -10.65$, $p < .0005$ were found to be significantly different.

It can be inferred that, the same as public school teachers, institute teachers also considered persuasive discourse to be more prevalent among them.

According to the interview, these teachers justify their use of persuasive discourse in different ways mentioned below.

As some of the teachers have gotten that giving positive feedback is among the features of dialogic discourse (Scott et al., 2006), some of them become sure of themselves on having IPD due to the use of positive feedbacks to what their students say during the class discussions. Albeit, it is emphasized that to be more dialogic, the feedbacks should be encouraging too (Wells, 1999; Mortimer & Machado, 2000; van Zee, Iwaskyk, Kurose, Simpson & Wild, 2001).

One of the reasons behind teachers' considerations about their discourse may be those situations in which they ask the students to take part in classroom discussions. As Mortimer (2005) mentioned being open to different points of view is a feature of dialogic discourse. Thus teachers assume that by just asking the learners' ideas they are applying such a discourse. But in Scott et al.'s (2006) words, in educational setting, teachers can apply IPD when they recognize and attempts to take into account a range of students' and others' ideas. It can be inferred that just asking the learners' ideas without putting them into use does not guarantee the application of dialogic discourse. O'Connor and Michaels (2007) also noted that, by considering multiple ideas and voices, although classroom interactions can be ideologically dialogic, it can be discursively monologic, in terms of teacher control. They believe that both teachers and students should share power and positioning. It is clear that to apply IPD in class it is necessary for the students to have their own voice. To emphasize on the importance of dialogic discourse Matusov and von Duyke (2010) noted that the lack of IPD and/or engagement of the students' voice in class lead to fail of education. One of the teacher who assumes that she is using persuasive discourse due to asking her students' point of views stated that, "*Sometimes, when we have extra time, I ask my students to say their ideas to the class, those points which are related to the subject that has been taught that session*". The analysis of her talking can show that although she thinks of having persuasive discourse, indeed the one which is applied is the authoritative one. For instance she said that "sometimes" and also "when we have extra time" she asks the learners' ideas. The use of these two phrases and also her limitation of idea scope to just those which related to subject matter have been taught that session, confirms the application of authoritative discourse in her class.

Another reason of teachers to justify their claim of having dialogic discourse was their use of questioning techniques in classroom. It is supported by some scholars (Farahian & Rezaee, 2012; Brock, 1986; Gall, 1970) that questioning is a valuable activity in teaching context as it can make students to take part in lesson and also facilitate student participation. But according to the responses gathered through the interview from the students, unfortunately teachers' use of the questioning techniques is not equal to that of dialogic discourse. The questions in dialogic discourse should be in a form that prompts students to articulate their ideas and responses freely, without any stress and fear and even embarrassment of being wrong (Barnes, 2008; Alexander, 2004). But students believed that in answering to teachers' questions they are not feeling comfortable as their negative ideas to that of teachers' sometimes lead to a negative feedback.

In making a dialogic classroom it is the teacher who should provide the opportunities for the students to have participation. Rouse (2008) stated some of the barriers to participation of students, one among them was an inflexible curricula. One of the teachers, in the interview, to explain his role as an organizer asserts that "*In my teaching I try to use a method that usually has worked for me. During these years of my teaching experience most of my students seemed agree to my method*". It is clear in his talking that by the use of a fix method every year he is implementing an authoritative discourse. Another teacher also to explain her role as a material and course developer said that "*I make a lesson plan for each of my classes and determine all the things that I have do and the parts that I have to teach in each session of my class up to the end of term*". Here again the

use inflexible lesson plan confirms her authoritative discourse. Her use of predetermined curriculum is the one which is considered as inapplicable in learner-centred dialogic contexts. Nevalainen & Kimonen (2013) rejected the use of fix curriculum by emphasizing on reformation process of curriculum. They define it as “a dynamic process continually reacting to the physical, material, human, and economic changes in the environment” (p. 134).

Some of the teacher mentioned that they have to just teach course book and workbook. They stated that due to lack of facilities they cannot use any new technologies in their class, so they have to use limited materials in their class. Although they are right in criticizing about the lack of facilities, it is not completely justifiable; because they can compensate by using supplementary materials, the ones which Remillard, (1999) mentioned as the materials that can complete the core ones. Besides using supplementary materials, teacher can get help of adaptation in providing the needed materials for their class (Graves, 1996; Clandinin & Connelly, 1992; Craig, 2006; Tomlinson, 1998). One of the participants stated that *“I try to teach all the parts of course book and cover all the activities of workbook. It makes me to be sure that my students learned everything”*. Such an idea reveals his authoritative discourse. To move further toward the dialogic discourse he can adapt and modify the existing materials in a way that suits with the students’ needs abilities and interest and also as something that motivates them and moves them beyond the constraint of the text (Graves, 1996).

Another problem about material teaching, which is mentioned by some students, is the only use of course book due to time limitation. One of the students asserted that: *“My teacher just teaches the book that the school specified for us and she tries to finish it up to the last session. She doesn’t use other books because she believes that we don’t have enough time to cover all of them”*. Having a look at her assertion, it can be seen that beside the matter of time limitation she refers to another concept of authoritative discourse which is the forces of schools and institutes (*“the book that the school specified for us”*). Unfortunately in most of the public and private schools, the educational organizations specify the source materials, and neither the teachers nor the students have role in choosing them. Such an issue is mentioned in one of the participants’ talk that said: *“Our teacher doesn’t consider our ideas in material development and we have to study the subjects even if we are not interested in it. I think in this new era, the educational system should change in a way that we, as students, have a higher level in class to choose, ourselves, the things that we want to learn and even the method of learning”*. Similar to the idea of these students is that of Solomadin and Kurganov (Kurganov, 2009; Solomadin & Kurganov, 2009) that consider the students’ authorship of their own work as the goal of education.

After analysing the results of teachers’ perception, it is the time to consider the learners’ ideas too. So, the next research question which takes into account the students’ perception will be answered by the use of data gathered through the public and private schools students’ questionnaires and it will be discussed by helping of their responses in the interview.

Is there any significant difference between the perception of public and private schools’ students about their EFL teachers’ amount of using authoritative and persuasive discourse in regard to their roles?

Table 6

Public School Students' Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Authoritative discourse	3.5343	100	.49210	.04921
	Persuasive discourse	3.2926	100	.61424	.06142

Table 7

Public School Students' Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
1	Authoritative discourse – Persuasive discourse	.24164	.62843	.06284	.11694	.36633	3.845	99	.000

Accordingly, the result in table 6 and 7 shows a significant difference between the mean of authoritative discourse (M= 3.53, SD=.49) and persuasive discourse (M=3.29, SD=.61), $t(99) = 3.84$, $p < .0005$.

The results of public students' perception about their teachers' discourse indicates a contrast to that of public school teachers. The data express that, in accordance to public school students' idea, authoritative discourse is more eminent than persuasive one among their teachers.

Table 8

Private Institutes' Students' Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Authoritative discourse	3.7343	100	.46102	.04610
	Persuasive discourse	3.5897	100	.44992	.04499

Table 9

Private Institutes' Students' Paired Samples Test

Pair		Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
1	Authoritative discourse – Persuasive discourse	.14458	.45575	.04557	.05415	.23501	3.172	99	.002

Analysing the data collected from institute students' questionnaires, revealed a significant difference between the mean of authoritative discourse ($M=3.73$, $SD=.46$) and persuasive discourse ($M=3.58$, $SD=.44$), $t(99) = 3.17$, $p < .0005$.

These results suggest that in institute students' perspective, the same as public school students, their teachers' discourse move more toward the authoritative pole of discourse continuum.

Generally in accordance to the findings, unlike teachers' idea, students believe their teachers' discourse as more authoritative than persuasive.

In line with other studies (van Zee & Minstrell, 1997; Matusov, 2007), this study demonstrated that, according to what students both in public and private schools believe, a traditional discourse is applied in classroom context of Iran in which, as van Zee and Minstrell (1997) mentioned, the authority of the teacher is central.

According to the interview, some of the students criticized their teachers due to their use of imperative form of discourse with which they were told exactly what they have to do and in what form. Such a situation is opposite to that of dialogic discourse in which the teacher should use "appropriation" which is defined by Rogoff (1995) as the active participation of learners while acquiring new knowledge or extending their understanding of known concepts. Robinson (2013) also disagree such a situation in dialogic discourse by noting that to apply dialogism in education, the power of the teacher as 'knower' should be deconstructed, instead a multi-voiced education should be created.

Another reason that some of the students believe their teacher as authoritative is that their teachers do not specify a part of class time for their participation in discussion of subject matter being thought. They mentioned that their teachers spend the major of class time to finish the predetermined part of materials specified in their lesson plan. Thus there is not enough time for them have an active role in class. Employing the major portion of class time by teacher was mentioned by Yanfen and Yuqin (2010) as a feature of traditional classroom context. In such a context, as Bakhtin (1984[1961]) noted, just the dominant perspective (here the teacher) has value and all the other participants (here the students) are reduced to the status of objects. This is exactly one of the main features of Bakhtinian monologism in which the ability of the participants to produce autonomous meaning is denied (Robinson, 2013) and "as teachers exert a position of authority in the classroom; their beliefs are likely to dominate" (Barcelos, 2003, p. 171), so they have to accept the views of the dominant ideology unquestionably (Matusov, 2007).

The authoritative discourse of the teachers can be felt in some of the students' response, for example one of them said: "*he [the teacher] asks us to be quiet and read the reading part and then tell him a summary of that. In such situation we should not ask any questions or speak with our*

friend. The negative point is that he says that in an imperative mode". Such an explanation directly depicts an authoritative context in which as Ball and Freedman (2004) noted the dominant figure use violence to force a person to accept certain ideas. Such a discourse is clear in another participant's talking that she said: "mostly she [her teacher] talks in a way that I feel she wants to impose her idea on us. She justifies her own point of view in a way that those of us are incorrect. She believes that she knows everything more than us". It refers to a context in which the "death" of others can be seen (Bakhtin 1984, p. 32) and the dominant figure (here the teacher) try to drive the students' full attention on just *one* meaning (Scott et al., 2006). Such a context, as stated by O'Dwyer (2006), is rejected by education theorists. In these contexts in which teacher act as an authority of class there is little chance for the students to show their creative expression in the classroom. This approach views students as the ones who have little knowledge of their own to contribute to the education process (Zlatković & petrović, 2011).

Some of the learners mentioned that one reason behind the reluctance of their teacher in using IPD is their fear of losing their statue as an authority in classroom. This is one of the features of traditional teachers mentioned by Matusov (2007). He added that the traditional teachers considered that using dialogic discourse will lead to chaos, student violence, and unilateral power of classroom by students.

However, in Forman and Ford's (2011) words, to implement a dialogic discourse in schools the teacher needs to have both authoritative and dialogic discourse because these two discourses are complementary not mutually excludable. They add: "scientifically productive classroom dialogue requires instruction that not only liberates, but also constrains and guides" (p. 4). Thus it is not true to give the right to the students totally. Also, it should be noted that, although the teachers believe themselves as more dialogic, the analysis of findings showed that it does not mean that they do not use the authoritative discourse at all.

5. Conclusion

Finally, by having a look at the obtained result, it can be concluded that firstly, there is no significant difference between the Iranian EFL teachers of public and private schools in terms of their amounts of using authoritative and persuasive discourse in classroom contexts, and secondly, teachers and students percept the same behaviour different due to different point of views and different status in educational contexts. While the teachers believe themselves to have persuasive discourse, regardless of the context of learning namely public or private school, students believe their teachers' discourse to be more authoritative.

Although none of the participants idea is acceptable. In other words as Matusov (2007) noted, the dialogical pedagogy should be based on both internally persuasive discourses and authoritative one. It should start with developing a shared attention in the classroom by using a non-authoritarian authoritative discourse in a way for the students to trust their teacher and then move to internally persuasive discourse which itself can generate more student-teacher trust and therefore facilitate future authoritative discourse. Morson (as cited in Ball & Freedman, 2004), also have the same idea. He criticized Bakhtin's binary opposition between "authoritative" and authority-less "internally persuasive" discourses. He argued that IPD cannot be sustained without authority. He asserts that creating a shared classroom attention solely on the basis of IPD (as it is described by Bakhtin) is impossible. O'Dwyer (2006) also supported it in this way that although it is called student-centred approach but there is a strong justification in believing teachers as an authority due to his role as a source of technical and practical knowledge. Also it should be noted that, choosing the effective discourse (dialogic or authoritative) for opening up or closing down the instruction depends on content matter being taught (Scott et al., 2006).

The results of this study will be helpful for those who are in charge of educational organizations in a way that informs them about the proper context of learning. It also has great advantage for the learners as it prompts the increases in learner-centred methods and policies and also makes clear the importance of teachers' roles and discourses in process of learning. The present study also inspires a high number of pedagogical proposals especially in the field of discourse analysis.

As discourse analysis is a complex issue, it needs more studies especially in different educational contexts by getting use of many quantitative and qualitative methods. So, as a suggestion for further study, the other researcher can work on this issue with more participants and in more different contexts. They can also study about factors other than teachers' roles for investigation of teachers' discourse such as the effect of age, teaching experience, degree, and the like on the kind of discourse they apply.

References

- Alexander, R. (2004). *Towards Dialogic Teaching*. York: Dialogos.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (M. Holquist, Ed. and C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). 'Toward a Reworking of the Dostoevsky Book, 1961' in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (C. Emerson, Ed. & Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 292-93.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres & other late essays* (C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Ed. and V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1991). *Dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Ball, A. F., & Freedman, S. W. (Eds.). (2004). *Bakhtinian Perspectives on Language, Literacy, and Learning*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Barcelos, A. M. F. (2003). Researching beliefs about SLA: a critical review. In: Kalaja, P., Barcelos, A.M.F. (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New Research Approaches*. Kluwer Academic Publisher, Dordrecht, (pp. 7-33).
- Barnes, D. (2008). Exploratory talk for learning. In: N. Mercer & S. Hodgkinson, *Exploring talk in School* (pp. 1-15). London: Sage Publications.
- Brindly, G. (1989). The role of need analysis in adult ESL program design. In R.K. Johnson, (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 63-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brock, C. A. (1986). The effect of referential question on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(1), 46-59.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 363-401). New York: Macmillan.
- Craig, C. J. (2006). Why is dissemination so difficult? The nature of teacher knowledge and the spread of curriculum reform. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(2), 257-293.
- Davison, C. (2004). The contradictory culture of teacher-based assessment: ESL teacher assessment practices in Australian and Hong Kong secondary schools. *Language Testing*, 21, 305-334. doi: 10.1191/0265532204lt2860a
- Farahian, M., & Rezaee, M. (2012). A case study of an EFL teacher's type of questions: an investigation into classroom interaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 161-167. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.631

- Forlin, C. (2004). Promoting inclusivity in Western Australian schools. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 8, 183-200.
- Forman, E. A., & Ford, M. J. (2011). *The role of dialogic discussion in fostering a learning progression for scientific argumentation*. Paper presented at the Triennial International Congress of the International Society for Cultural and Activity Research, Rome, Italy.
- Gall, M. D. (1970). The Use of Questions in Teaching, *Review of Educational Research*, 40, 707-721.
- Graves, K. (1996). *Teachers as course developers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holquist, M. (1981b). Glossary. In M. M. Bakhtin. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kurganov, S. Y. (2009). Reading and literature in the primary and middle Schools of the Dialogue of Cultures. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, 47(2), 30-58.
- Landay, E. (2004). Performance as the foundation for a secondary school literacy program: A Bakhtinian perspective. In Ball, A. F., Freedman, S. W. (2004). eds. *Bakhtinian Perspectives on Language, Literacy, and Learning*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lau, G., & Lemahieu, p. (1997). Changing roles: Evaluator and teacher collaborating in school change. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 20(1), 7-15.
- Matusov, E. (2007). Applying Bakhtin scholarship on discourse in education: A critical review essay. *Educational Theory*, 57, 215-237. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-5446.2007.00253.x
- Matusov, E. (2009). *Journey into Dialogic Pedagogy*, Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- Matusov, E., von Duyke, K. (2010). Bakhtin's notion of the Internally Persuasive Discourse in education: Internal to what? (A case of discussion of issues of foul language in teacher education). In K. Junefelt & P. Nordin (Eds.), Proceedings from the Second International Interdisciplinary Conference on perspectives and limits of dialogism in Mikhail Bakhtin Stockholm University, Sweden June 3-5, 2009 (pp. 174-199). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Mortimer, E. F. (2005). *Dialogic and authoritative discourse: A constitutive tension of science classroom*. Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais
- Mortimer, E. F., & Machado, A. H. (2000). Anomalies and conflicts in classroom discourse. *Science Education*, 84(4), 429-444.
- Mortimer, E. F., & Scott, P. H. (2003). *Meaning making in secondary science classrooms*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Nevalainen, R., & Kimonen, E. (2013). The teacher as an implementer of curriculum change. In E. Kimonen & R. Nevalainen (Eds.). *Transforming teachers' work globally: In search of a better way for schools and their communities*, 111-147. 10.1007/978-94-6209-470-3_5
- Nunan, D. (1988b). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Connor, M. C., & Michaels, S. (2007). When is dialogue dialogic? *Human Development*, 50, 275-285.
- O'Dwyer, S. (2006). The English teacher as facilitator and authority. *TESL-EJ*, 9(4), 1-15.
- Putney, L. G., & Broughton, S. H. (2011). Developing collective classroom efficacy: The teacher's role as community organizer. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62, 93-105. doi: 10.1177/0022487110381760
- Remillard, J. (1999). Curriculum materials in mathematics education reform: a framework for examining teachers' curriculum development. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29, 315-342.
- Robinson, A. (2013). 'In Theory Bakhtin: Dialogism, Polyphony and Heteroglossia.' 2011. ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theorybakhtin-1/

- Rodriguez, D., Manner, J., & Darcy, S. (2010). Evolution of teacher perceptions regarding effective instruction for English language learners. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 9, 130-144. doi: 10.1177/1538192709359423
- Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In Wertsch, J. V., del Rio, P., & Alvarez, A. (Eds.), *Sociocultural studies of mind* (pp. 139-164). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rouse, M. (2008). Developing Inclusive Practice: A Role for Teachers and Teacher Education? *Education in the North*. 16, 6-13.
- Scott, P., Mortimer, E., & Aguiar, O. (2006). The tension between authoritative and dialogic discourse: A fundamental characteristic of meaning making interactions in high school science lessons. *Science Education*, 90(4), 605-631.
- Shawer, S. F. (2010). Classroom-level curriculum development: EFL teachers as curriculum developers, curriculum-makers and curriculum-transmitters. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 26, 173-184.
- Solomadin, I., & Kurganov, S. Y. (2009). The history of World Culture as Dialogue of Cultures middle and high school curricula. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, 47(2), 3-29.
- Stojilković, S., Djigic, G., & Zlatković, B. (2012). Empathy and teachers' roles. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69, 960-966. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.12.021
- Tatar, M., & Bekerman, Z. (2009). School counselors' and teachers' perceptions of their students' problems: Shared and divergent views. *Counseling and Psychotherapy Research: Linking research with practice*, 9(3), 187-192. doi: 10.1080/14733140903031093
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Zee, E., Iwaskyk, M., Kurose, A., Simpson, D., & wild, J. (2001). Student and teacher questioning during conversation about science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 38, 159-190.
- van Zee, E. H., & Minstrell, J. (1997). Reflective discourse: Developing shared understandings in a physics classroom. *International Journal of Science Education*, 19(2), 209-228.
- Wan, W., Low, G. D., & Li, M. (2011). From students' and teachers' perspectives: Metaphor analysis of beliefs about EFL teachers' roles, *System* 39, 403-415. doi:10.1016/j.system.2011.07.012.
- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry. Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- White, E.J. (2009). Bakhtinian dialogism: A philosophical and methodological route to dialogue and difference? Annual Conference of the Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia, 38. (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press) <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~pesaconf/zpdfs/16white.pdf>
- Yanfen, L., & Yuqin, Z. (2010). A study of teacher talk in interactions in English classes. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(2), 76-86.
- Zlatković, B., Petrović, D. (2011). Inicijalno obrazovanju učitelja u Srbiji: analiza kompatibilnosti planova I programa učiteljskih fakulteta (Pre-service teacher training in Serbia: Analysis of the compatibility of teachers faculties curricula), *Nastava i vaspitanje (Journal of Education)*, 60(4), 651-663.