



The Teacher as a Public Speaker in the Classroom

Tomaž Petek^{[a],*}

^[a]Department of Primary School Teaching, Department of Preschool Education, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia.
*Corresponding author.

Received 15 April 2014; accepted 26 June 2014
Publish online 27 August 2014

Abstract

For classroom communication to be effective, the teacher needs to observe the principles of successful public speaking while also paying attention to rhetorical and linguistic knowledge. Since the role of the speaker in pedagogical speech alternates between the teacher and the student, the characteristics of the teacher’s speech in the classroom were described by comparing them to those of the student. In practice, the teacher’s share of speaking remains substantially higher than that of the students. The teacher must remain aware of how his role in pedagogical speech serves to organise and steer the learning process. As the teacher’s public speaking is mostly linked to what is known as “instructional speech”, special attention is paid to the characteristics of this. Instructional speech is a component of pedagogical speech with which the teacher communicates field-specific knowledge (by explaining, illustrating, posing instructional questions etc.), and through which students acquire new knowledge. The teacher’s instructional (specialised) speech is distinguished from everyday practical communication, a fact to be taken into account by the teacher when speaking publicly.

Key words: Teacher; Classroom; Pedagogical speech; Classroom interaction; The principles of successful public speaking

Petek, T. (2014). The Teacher as a Public Speaker in the Classroom. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 9(1), 124-133. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/5214> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/5214>

INTRODUCTION

The ability to communicate effectively is one of the teacher’s basic competences; here, public speaking plays an important role. Professional competence of the teacher in this regard is a precondition for personal and professional success (Petek, 2012a, 2012b, 2013). The article discusses the teacher’s public speaking in the classroom by first assuming a general point of view, then moving on to a more focused vantage point. The article opens by discussing spoken texts in general and the principles of successful public speaking, first from a rhetorical and linguistic standpoint. This is followed by presenting the teacher’s role in classroom interaction and the tools used to observe it. Since the role of the speaker in classroom communication alternates between the teacher and the student, the characteristics of the teacher’s speech in the classroom are also described by comparing them to those of the student. Because the primary interest of the paper is the teacher’s public speaking in the classroom, pedagogical speech by the teacher—with its two components, instructional and relational discourse—is covered in more detail. The teacher uses pedagogical speech to organise and direct the learning process; it is therefore crucial to realise the importance of appropriate pedagogical speech. The teacher’s public speaking is for the most part connected to instructional speech and its characteristics are highlighted specifically, as it is the part of pedagogical speech employed by the teacher to communicate field-specific knowledge (by explaining, illustrating, posing instructional questions etc.) and through which students acquire new knowledge. The distinction between the teachers’ instructional (specialised) speech and everyday practical communication as well as the need to observe this distinction when speaking in public are also highlighted.

The paper is designed as a theoretical discussion; analytical-descriptive and analytical-interpretative

methods of educational research were used (Sagadin, 1993; Mužić, 1994a, 1994b).

1. SPOKEN TEXTS AND PUBLIC SPEAKING

Spoken texts have been somewhat neglected throughout the history of linguistic research. The reason behind this lies in the nature of the medium and the late development of technology enabling the collection of such material, with the characteristics of spoken texts posing an additional challenge. As text is being spoken, it becomes immediately available to the listener, affording no chance for corrections or reformulation; this, however, does not apply to all spoken texts. Speech frequently features repetitions, distracting pauses, fillers, false starts, self-repairs. These phenomena are all indicators of the cognitive process at multiple levels spanning from developing a topic to word choice and forming utterances. Fluency of speech has frequently been the subject of research as a dimension of pragmatic behaviour, evaluated as either appropriate or inappropriate.

Leaps and pauses are also context—dependent phenomena (Kranjc, 1998, pp.109–112). According to Havránek's definition of functional differentiation¹, spoken texts belong to the first category and perform what is known as a communicative function². They are characterised by the fact that their “semantic plane

¹ Bohuslav Havránek is one of the founders of the Prague School of linguistics and of Prague functional linguistics. His general theory of standard language is of particular significance. His theory is based on the functional designation of the language system and a dynamic understanding of linguistic synchrony. By dealing with the issue of scientifically determined functions of linguistic means in spoken and written discourse, Havránek was part of an era of complex public communication (Lipovec, 1978, p.104). The classification of functional varieties is one of the core issues of the Prague structuralist functional theory. Havránek's classic functional categorisation distinguishes between: (a) conversational (communicative function); (b) workaday (workaday technical function); (c) scientific (theoretical technical function); and (d) poetic (aesthetic function) functional dialects. Havránek also refers to other functional dialects such as journalistic language; however, he seems to consider them secondary as they are absent from his fourfold scheme (Skubic, 1995, p.155).

² S. Kranjc (2004, p.396) cites Urbančič (1965, pp.221–227), who speaks of the conversational style, which forms a bridge between literary and colloquial language, being less learned than the former and more cultivated than the latter. The vocabulary is simple and the sentences relatively short with coordination being more common than subordination. This style is typical of the spoken word relating to everyday matters among the educated, of spontaneous broad public discussions and of plays and films. Individual elements of colloquial language make the conversational style seem familiar and genuine. S. Kranjc (ibid.) also states that modern research into spoken texts (e.g. Hribar, 2000) has demonstrated that they may also be complex, both structurally and in terms of content. This complexity (or lack thereof) may in large part depend on the capabilities of individuals and the context in which the text was formulated (Hribar, 2000).

is uniform, the relationship of lexical elements to the message is arbitrary, the text is open, and its coherence is determined by the situation and conversational routine expressions” (Pogorelec, 1986, p.13). The intrinsic difference between written and spoken language also needs to be kept in mind (Pogorelec, 1965, p.132), although the spoken word is not immediately apparent as the intended medium with all texts. Carefully choosing what best fits our purpose is vital for any text. These means of expression do not, however, encompass all means of expression of the spoken word (Kranjc, 2004, p.396).

All characteristics of spoken text presented thus far are important and crucial factors for differentiation from written texts; it should be noted, however, that not all of them also apply to public speaking, which should not be equated with spontaneous spoken communication in dialogue. Vitez and A. Zwitter Vitez (2004, p.7) state that spontaneous speech is “the most common manifestation of speech in the most common (typical) speech situations”. They go on to say that the setting of spontaneous utterances is generally a spoken exchange between two participants alternating between both roles and modifying the structure of the expressed meaning with alternate utterances. It is a speech with no pre-existing draft regarding the content or the form in which the projection of the speaker through the utterances is the most pronounced (2004, p.7).

Public speaking as defined in this article is a spoken text in monologue which is (fully) prepared in advance and is therefore to contain no repetitions, distracting pauses, fillers, false starts, self—repairs etc.; the speaker must use formal language, speech is to contain no language or pronunciation errors, and is to be fluent, natural, unaided and clear.

The modern understanding of language varieties highlights the basic function of the text—influencing the recipient—for the fulfilment of which the senders choose from the means available in their own textual worlds and made possible by the language in which the text is formed (Kranjc, 2004, p.397). Public speaking is considered to be the production of monologic spoken texts intended for a select or wider audience.

1.1 The Principles of Successful Public Speaking According to Rhetoric

The principles of successful public speaking are extensively defined by rhetoric and linguistics; however, rhetoric talks about modes of persuasion, which derive from the original rhetorical definitions involving verbal persuasion and capturing the audience's attention regarding an idea or a cause. Zidar Gale et al. (2006, p.42) state that, in order to hold a successful public speech, speakers must observe the three basic modes of persuasion tied directly to rhetoric—logos, ethos and pathos. These modes continue to be studied by a number of theorists to this day.

Žmavc (2008, p.29) states that classical rhetorical theory considers ethos (i.e. an effective demonstration of character) and pathos (i.e. an appeal to emotions) to be techniques of persuasion used by the speaker to achieve one's basic aim, i.e. influencing the minds and actions of the listeners. Persuasion as a strategy for influencing minds and actions was a cornerstone of rhetoric in Ancient Greece from the very start, with ethos and pathos always being present as its primary components. The standard and likely the most systematic definition of ethos and pathos was developed by Aristotle, who distinguished between three distinct modes of persuasion connected by the fact that they result from the speaker's rational action and which the speaker uses to shape and alter the audience's opinion. Aristotle calls them the internal modes of persuasion, or modes furnished by the spoken word. He categorises them as follows: (a) that of the personal character of the speaker; (b) that of putting the audience into a certain frame of mind; (c) that of proof, or apparent proof, in the speech itself (2008, p.29).

Žmavc (2008, p.30) stresses that the character of the speaker, invoking emotions in the audience, and logical argumentation existed in traditional oratory training as components of various importance and under different names even before Aristotle's definition of internal modes of persuasion. It was subsequent theory of rhetoric, however, that used the same terms to denote both the traditional concepts of character and emotions and Aristotle's modes of persuasion: *logos*³ (logical argumentation), *ethos*⁴ (the speaker's expressed character) and *pathos*⁵ (the speaker's influence on the emotions of the audience and outward expression of them).

The expressions remain in use to denote modes of persuasion in modern theory of rhetoric to this day. These rhetorical modes of persuasion can be linked to the teacher's public speaking. The teacher may use *logos* in the classroom as a means of persuasion with evidence, as arguments stated by the teacher must be illustrated logically. Barthes (1990, p.62) states that this is possible in two ways – by inductive and deductive reasoning. Inductive reasoning involves drawing generalised conclusions from specific examples while deduction

means applying general findings to specific examples (1990, p.62). By generalising, that is, using inductive reasoning, the teacher appears persuasive. The student listens to what is being said and is then able to adopt a wider point of view on the basis of a specific example. *Logos* thus mainly serves as an argumentation aid. As information is relayed to the students, the teacher is able to substantiate it with his or her own arguments.

Implementing elements of ethos may be of use to the teacher in influencing the audience's image of the teacher's persuasive skills as a public speaker. The teacher should have a defined image as a speaker as this is the sole way to appear persuasive to the audience, i.e. the students. Teachers may also want to appeal to the students' emotions, which can be achieved by using *pathos*. Žagar and Domajnko (2006, p.14) state that the speaker uses *pathos* to express needs, create desires and appeal to various emotional states such as excitement and anger.

1.2 The Principles of Successful Public Speaking According to Linguistics

According to Potočnik (2010), various principles of successful and effective communication—and consequently, public speaking—are to be found in modern teaching resources in Slovenia which are derived from and formulated on the basis of Gricean maxims⁶ and the findings of language pragmatics (principles of applied stylistics).

Modern educational materials list the principles of successful and effective communication and of public speaking in this context. Vogel et al. (2007, pp.91–92) have found that in order for the text to be effective and successful, the following communication factors must be considered and the following questions must be posed during text production: (a) Whether the communication setting is taken into account so that the text is in accordance with the time and place, the event and the recipient as well as being interesting and understandable for the listener (i.e. setting); (b) whether the text is adapted to the visual/sound communication medium (i.e. medium); (c) whether the text observes the rules of the language, and whether the language used is sufficiently close to the standard (i.e. language); (d) whether our knowledge about the topic suffices for us to select the elements important to the recipient with regard to the theme and purpose; whether the text is precise (whether all required information is relayed and whether it is factually correct) and concise enough (whether the text

³ Žagar and Domajnko (2006, p.13, 66, 68) describe *logos* as the only mode of persuasion unambiguously designated as rational.

⁴ Barthes (1990, pp.66–67) states that this mode of persuasion presents the features of the speaker, i.e., personality traits the speaker reveals to the audience to make a good impression. Žagar and Domajnko (2006, p.13) continue to say these is the evidence, or way of persuasion used by the speaker to present and shape personal character traits; an image of self shown to the listeners.

⁵ Žagar and Domajnko (2006, p.14) define *pathos* as the other side of *ethos*, i.e., the activities with which the speaker purposefully (and without *logos*) influences the emotions of the listeners. *Pathos* is, as the authors continue, a mode of persuasion which involves the speaker directly influencing the emotional states of the audience in which it is at its most susceptible to adopting the speaker's point of view.

⁶ Within the framework of pragmalinguistics, Grice formulated cooperative principles, defining the course of action required to communicate as effectively as possible. He claimed that in order to be successful, communication had always to observe the basic principle of cooperation, which expects the contributions of the participants (i.e. the speakers) to correspond to the required level in accordance with the purpose and direction of the conversation (Zadravec Pešec, 1994, p.37; Vogel, 2002, p.60).

is succinct and contains any distractions); whether the sequence of information is appropriate; whether the text is clear and illustrative; whether the structure of the given text type is observed; whether the degree of persuasion is sufficient to achieve the desired effect; whether the text is stimulating enough (i.e., topic, purpose, text type).

Križaj Ortar et al. (2009, p.46) encapsulated the principles of successful communication in six 'rules', i.e.:

- (a) communicate with a clear purpose; (b) only communicate about subjects of which you have sufficient knowledge; (c) take the communication setting into account; (d) observe the elements and rules of the given language system; (e) follow the expected structure of the given text type; (f) account for the advantages and disadvantages of the given medium.

2. THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION

As the teacher's public speaking in the classroom is the subject of the present paper, the concept of classroom interaction must first be defined and the tools used to observe it listed. This is followed by a discussion about the speech of the teacher and the students, and it must be emphasised that the teacher's share of speaking remains substantially higher than that of the students. The teacher's public speaking continues to be very frequent and thus of high importance.

The concept of classroom interaction in school, or the communication process in the classroom, was defined by several researchers. Tomić (1997, p.48) states that the teacher in a school is responsible for the initiation, reception and effect of his messages. If the act of communication is to be professional and complete, the teacher must be able to control it, as well as recognise how it is being received and what effect it has on the listeners. The teacher should speak in way that the students accept and that influences them in accordance with the intent of the message. The role of the teacher is to encourage and direct the communicative act (1997, p.48). Since the primary subject of this paper is public speaking, the teacher's responsibility for effective/successful communication is also worth mentioning. Classroom interaction has also been defined by Bratanić (1991, p.121), who perceives it as being broader than Tomić and states that it is a form of social interaction manifesting itself as an interaction of people mutually choosing their behaviour, partly on the basis of opinions shaped about each other. Razdevšek Pučko (1990, p.116; 1993, pp.1-12) states that classroom interaction takes place on various levels, i.e. teacher—all students, teacher—single student, students among one another etc. and according to various rules, such as semi-formal, semi-informal rules. The author stresses that classroom interaction involves both verbal and non-verbal communication between the teacher and the students. She goes on to say

that verbal communication (owing to its length, among other things) has a more significant effect on the students and their learning process. The teacher's interaction and communication patterns act as a model on one hand (learning by imitation) and affect a range of emotional, motivational and cognitive processes with its form and content on the other. Kunst Gnamuš (1989, p.257) also begins with the premise that the type of communication in the classroom is an important factor in the student's language, cognitive and social development; for this reason, she presses for more awareness among teachers about rules, laws and principles enabling the desired communication to take place, together with specific additions to teacher training which would provide the aspiring teacher with more knowledge about the structure of classroom communication (ibid.). This knowledge may also be obtained by observing the interaction in class; for this reason, one must be familiar with the tools used to observe it.

2.1 Tools for Observing Classroom Interaction

There are a number of tools used for observing classroom interaction. Marentič-Požarnik (1987, p.41) lists the Flanders system of classroom interaction analysis⁷ as one of the most common. It derives from the basic dimension of initiative—response of the teacher and the students and is limited to verbal interaction, which is divided into seven main categories for the teacher's initiative and response⁸, and two categories for the response and initiative of the students⁹.

⁷ Flanders (1970) interprets classroom interaction as the mutual contact between the teacher and the students. It is supposed to denote the chain of events occurring in an educational setting. Razdevšek Pučko (1990, p.119) states that Flanders referred to his observation system as interaction analysis and defined its purpose as the quantitative determination of qualitative aspects of verbal communication. The system is designed around the premise that most communication in the classroom is verbal. All non-verbal communication, as well as the content of information and some aspects of class organisation, is ignored. The essence of the system is the categorisation of verbal communication into five segments as summed up in Marentič-Požarnik (2000, p.228): (a) the teacher's initiative – the teacher responds to the students' emotions, praises or encourages, accepts or implements a student's idea; (b) the teacher's response – the teacher asks questions, explains, instructs, gives critique, appeals to authority; (c) student response – the students respond to questions; (d) student initiative – students comment independently, contribute their own ideas; (e) silence, confusion and independent work (ibid.).

⁸ The main categories dedicated to the teacher's initiative or response: (a) receiving the feelings of the student; (b) praising or encouraging the student's actions or behaviour; (c) accepting or implementing a student's idea, developing and clarifying or amending it; (d) posing content-based or process-based questions to elicit a response; (e) explaining, communicating facts or personal opinions about the content of processes, expressing personal ideas, asking rhetorical questions; (f) giving instructions; (g) giving critique or appealing to authority (Marentič-Požarnik, 1987).

⁹ The categories dedicated to student response and initiative: (a) student verbal reactions, responses to the teacher's questions, the teacher acts as the initiator; (b) silence and confusion (Marentič-Požarnik, 1987).

In Slovenian linguistics, empirical analysis of classroom communication/interaction was first introduced by Kunst Gnamuš (1990, p.102–103), who holds that descriptive categories must be determined for an empirical analysis of speech in the classroom¹⁰, which are—as hypotheses—the condition of the analysis on the one hand and its result on the other. The categories would need to fulfil two premises, i.e. being (a) capable of being objectively determined and (b) relevant to education studies. The author goes on to say that speech in class can be quantified and described using the following categories: (a) the scope of the teacher's and the students' speech is expressed by the number of utterances, words, sentences and the type of sentences. This allows us to determine the most frequent speaker in the classroom and the type of texts, sentences and clauses used; (b) the number and type of turn-taking—this is basic turn-taking in an interaction, which consists of a verbal initiative and a verbal response. The teacher may, for example, ask a question which a student then answers. The direction of the turn plays an important role in turn-taking. Two types are distinguished: Monodirectional speech (the teacher initiates the speech of the student, who only responds to these initiatives) and bidirectional speech (the speech of the teacher and the student consists of responses and initiations); (c) the functional structure of pedagogical speech—the premise is the multifunctionality of speech in the classroom. This differs from specialised speech (which is mostly tied to the instructional function) as well as practical communication, which consists of the expressive and interpersonal or social function. The function is assigned to the sentence as the basic communication unit. The scope of individual functions is determined by the number of words.

Pirih Svetina (1997, p.33) discusses the purpose of observation, which may vary. According to her, observation is frequently used as the basis for purposefully modifying interaction and communication as observation allows us to determine the basic elements of interaction and to identify connections, relations and dependence between them. The author goes on to say that observing classroom interaction generally aids the training of aspiring teachers (as observation systems help identify, describe and categorise events in the classroom); the teacher and trainee obtain a list of professional categories to describe their actions in the classroom; the teacher may use the analysis as feedback to improve performance in the classroom; purposeful observation

¹⁰ Tomić (1990, p.53) and Razdevšek Pučko (1990, p.52) state that classroom interaction may be observed unsystematically/randomly or systematically/purposefully. According to this categorisation, Kunst Gnamuš used systematic/purposeful observation, which the authors state is characterised by objectivity and verifiability, with the object or aspects to be observed determined in advance, and the content delimited and diligently recorded. Categories directing and limiting the observation are set.

may be used to control how specific tools, textbooks and methods function in practice (1997, p.33). The author also discusses the purpose of interaction analysis¹¹, i.e., to identify the events occurring during a lesson; to aid the teacher in developing and controlling teaching skills; to offer insight into understanding the chain of events (by helping with interpreting the relationship between teaching and interaction on the one hand and student performance on the other (Zabukovec, 1995, p.32).

2.2 The Teacher and Students as Speakers

It is the observation of classroom interaction discussed in the previous section that allows us to examine the teacher and students as speakers. In a classroom setting, the teacher and students alternate in the role of the speaker. This fact allows us to describe speech characteristics of the teacher by comparing them to those of the students.

Kunst Gnamuš (1992) claims that the situation and the purpose of speech determine the choice of means of expression; in general, the teacher uses standard language in school. The author goes on to say that this task is connected to a number of issues, as the use of standard pronunciation reinforces the formality of the situation and widens the social gap between the teacher and the student. The use of standard language can, however, pose numerous emotional, grammatical and pronunciation difficulties to the students, which hinders their spontaneity and authenticity in using language. The student must, according to the author, recognise the interdependence of the speech situation and the dialectal variety; the required use of standard language will then be accepted more readily. Kunst Gnamuš (1992, pp.12–13) states that the general perception of pedagogical speech is that it predominately serves as a referential or metalingual means, i.e., to explain the subject matter, to describe actual states and facts, to prove and explain concepts and terms. According to the author, however, a detailed analysis shows that pedagogical speech is functionally versatile and contains all functions; the conative function is especially common, but the expressive, poetic and phatic functions are also present. The author also concludes that—unfortunately—substantial functional gaps exist between the speech of the teacher and that of the students—teachers express themselves more fully, all functions are present in their speech, while the speech of the students is functionally poor and limited to the referential and metalingual functions (1992, pp.12–13).

Many classroom interaction analyses have been carried out. Marentič Požarnik (2000, pp.228–229) summarises

¹¹ Pirih Svetina (1997, p.34) cites the aims of classroom interaction analysis, i.e., feedback for the teacher (the analysis helps teachers to alter their behaviour as well as quality of teaching); a study of teacher behaviour in a classroom and its relationship to other variables (a theory of classroom behaviour may be developed, the connection between teacher behaviour and student performance may be studied).

Flanders, who revealed in 1967 that in a typical lesson, the teacher would speak two thirds of the time, while the students would speak one third of the time overall, a phenomenon known as the “two-thirds rule”.¹² Pirih Svetina (1997, pp.34–35) also presents multiple findings of select classroom interaction analyses. The characteristic they all share is the substantially high teacher-to-student speech ratio and a general tendency of the students to only respond to the teachers’ questions and initiatives. Kunst Gnamuš (1992, pp.32–33) reached a similar conclusion. Three hours of lessons were analysed, and it was found the teacher spoke more than the students in terms of the number of words and sentences. In the first case, the teacher uttered 70% of all words, 89% in the second, and 96% in the third. Given that the majority of presented findings originated in the 90s, more recent data was acquired. In a classroom interaction analysis in Year 2 of secondary school in 2009, Kolar (2009, pp.64–66) found that the teacher’s speech accounted for 62% of the lesson, the students spoke 18% of the time, while silence accounted for 20% of the time. An analysis in Year 2 of a secondary school specialising in economics revealed a similar situation: the teacher spoke for 63% of the lesson, all students accounted for 19% of the communication, while silence accounted for 18% of the time. This demonstrates that the speech of the teacher still dominates and that the teacher acts as a public speaker for a substantial proportion of the time and must therefore be familiar with the principles of pedagogical speech.

As the primary interest of this paper lies in the teacher as a public speaker in the classroom, the teacher’s pedagogical speech is the primary focus of the unfolding discussion.

3. PEDAGOGICAL SPEECH BY THE TEACHER

According to Podbevšek (1996, p.19), speech is the basic means of communication between the teacher and the students, and the teacher’s speech acts in the classroom are referred to as the teacher’s pedagogical speech.

The difficulties with defining and describing pedagogical speech stem from its complexity, as it assumes two basic forms, i.e., the speaker revealing or not revealing themselves; at the same time, depending on its purpose, pedagogical speech consists of instructional speech (used by the teacher to educate) and relational speech (used by the teacher to instil moral values); finally, the roles of text producer and recipient alternate between

the teacher and the students; both use language in various text types and use different language varieties depending on the speech situation.

3.1 Relational and Instructional Speech

Kunst Gnamuš (1992, pp.25–26) found that the setting of classroom communication could be illustrated with two basic relations – instructional and relational, or social. The instructional relation connects theoretical theses belonging to metalanguage with observables or illustrative examples. Relational or social relation, on the other hand, connects the context of the teacher with that of the student. This is the location for differences in knowledge, abilities, wishes, expectations and wants. Communication is only possible if the teacher accounts for the context of the student by turning the student’s existing knowledge into the starting point of knowledge acquisition, contextualising it within the pragmatic circumstances of the student’s wishes and wants and adapting it to the developmental and individual psychological traits of the student. According to the author, instructional and relational speech are readily distinguishable as they appear as two components of complex sentences, where instructional speech is subordinate to relational speech, or as separate sentences (1992, pp.25–26).

3.1.1 Relational Speech

According to Kunst Gnamuš (1992, p.27), relational speech as used in pragmatics may be understood as a form of contextualisation, that is, the linking of field-specific instructional speech with the speech situation in the classroom. Relational speech forms the social instructional frame – it connects the participants in the conversation and their thoughts, sensory and speech acts, creates closeness or distance, equal or unequal relationships, competitiveness or cooperation; the teacher and students use it to identify with other participants or express a difference. The basic intent of relational speech is to control the trail of thoughts, exchange ideas and reach consensus according to the veracity, accuracy (explorative conversation) or acceptability (negotiation) of the ideas and achieve the desired behaviour in the students. The idea behind relational speech is based on the findings of Vigotsky (1977), who claims that every psychological trait manifests itself twice in a person’s life, that is to say, on two levels, first at the social and then on the psychological level—first in the relationship between people and later on an as internalised psychological trait (Gnamuš, 1992, pp.26–27). With relational speech, the teacher makes contact with the students, forms and maintains an interpersonal relationship with them – speaks to them, encourages them, asks “non-instructional” questions, etc. (Vogel, 2008, pp.118–119; Gnamuš, 1992). Kunst Gnamuš lists appeal, inquiry and evaluation as its core communication purposes, which can be expressed

¹² The article also speaks of directive and non-directive teachers. The former are initiators most of the time, ask more specific questions and offer more critique; the latter offer more praise, take the students’ feelings and ideas into consideration to a greater degree. The students in their classrooms also come up with a greater number of more creative ideas (Požarnik, 2000, pp.228–229).

directly or indirectly in the classroom¹³. The choice of mode is first and foremost affected by the cost-benefit analysis: in everyday communication between equal participants, the illocutionary act is usually expressed immediately if it benefits the addressee (*offer, invitation, congratulations, greeting*), and indirectly if it is to the benefit of the speaker (*request, prohibition, inquiry...*). With hierarchical relationships, in which the social status more significantly affects the choice of means, the superordinate speaker can directly express requests and prohibitions, thereby verbalising/expressing his superior social status. By choosing an indirect means of expression, the teacher seemingly lets the students decide freely (not) to perform a task they would not otherwise do without encouragement (e.g. wipe the board, read an exercise or express their opinions, feelings, talk about personal experiences). This does not violate the students' integrity and contributes to a healthy self-image. A typical hierarchical relationship of this kind is that of teacher and student, as the teacher assumes higher social status (Vogel, 2008, pp.118–119; Gnamuš, 1992). Therefore, as Kunst Gnamuš warns, it is all the more important for the teacher to be aware of the role language plays in creating a constructive, positive classroom atmosphere, in encouraging students to participate in discussions more often and in using relational speech (Vogel, 2008, pp.118–119; Gnamuš, 1992).

3.1.2 Instructional Speech

Instructional speech is a component of pedagogical speech utilised by the teacher for presenting the knowledge of his field (by explaining, illustrating, asking instructional questions etc.) and through which students gain new knowledge. The teacher makes use of instructional speech to steer the instructional process (Vogel, 2008, p.118, Gnamuš, 1992). Seeing that the teacher's public speaking is predominately linked to instructional speech, special attention is paid to the characteristics of this in the discussion.

Kunst Gnamuš (1992, p.43) derived the role and principles of instructional speech from the difference between everyday communication and professional and scientific discourse. While everyday communication is steered by the law of aim and effect, the comfort principle, the cost-benefit principle and the maxim of pragmatic importance, causing a discrepancy between intended and

communicated meaning, scientific discourse is dedicated to producing knowledge and to argumentation proving the veracity of claims. Scientific discourse replaces variable terms with defined terminology; the veracity of the claims is not presupposed, but is based rather the consequence of logical proof and probability-based generalisations (ibid.).

Kunst Gnamuš illustrated the difference between natural speech and scientific metalanguage by breaking down a simple field-specific claim *The word Peter is a noun*. Saying *Peter is a noun* renders the claim untrue¹⁴. The reference and the meaning of the word are confused with its grammatical, form-related properties (adapted from Kunst Gnamuš, 1992, p.43). The attention of the linguist and that of a native speaker diverge. In natural language, words exist as transparent stimuli directing our attention to the meaning and reference while the words themselves appear to be of little importance; linguistics, however, directs the attention to the word itself. This creates the most prominent difference between words as components of natural language, where they are considered translucent and of little informational value, and linguistics, which studies precisely words as signifiers (as sound or in writing) and draws attention to this fact in metalanguage (Gnamuš, 1992, p.44).

According to Kunst Gnamuš (1992, pp.25–26, pp.43–48), the instructional dimension of a message is realised by the means in the language instructional function, such as reasoning, argumentation, explanation and discussion. All of this enables for the assigning of characteristics in instructional discourse to occur on the basis of logical reasoning. The author continues to say that the use of so-called metalanguage and observables is typical of instructional speech, as the instructional relation is connected to theoretical theses belonging to metalanguage with observables belonging to natural language. Metalanguage is used by individual sciences to put their findings into words. Metalanguage consists of: (a) claims in the form of postulations, presuppositions, definitions, laws and (b) concepts and terms (terminology). Linguistic concepts usually consist of three components: (a) meaning – expressing uncertainty or lack of clarity; (b) semantic components realised as signifiers – the indicative mode, interrogative pronouns or particles, word order, intonation or final punctuation marks; (c) a pragmatic role in usage, e.g. an interrogative sentence directly expresses a question, but may also indirectly express a polite request (1992, pp.25–26, pp.43–48).

In connection with instructional speech, Ivšek (2008, p.278) notes that the teacher correctly utilising standard

¹³ Requests can be expressed directly or indirectly. They are expressed directly using (a) the so-called performative verbs (*I demand, I ask, I forbid*); (b) grammatical means – the imperative denoting the content of a desired or forbidden act (*open, bring, write*); (c) modal verbs of obligation (*you must, you mustn't*). There is a wide array of means available for expressing indirect requests, with the most common being: (a) inquiries (*can you, could you/ would you ...*); (b) implicit performative verbs (e.g. as a request *I was going to ask you if ...*); (c) and indirect hints of various intensity (*Do you have any money?, The room is not clean.*) (Gnamuš, 1992; Vogel, 2008).

¹⁴ According to Kunst Gnamuš (1992, p.43) the direct connection of natural language phenomena with field-specific grammar terminology is impossible because two mutually exclusive words belonging to different types of discourse enter the same predicative relationship. By saying *Peter*, the word points to an entity, a person named Peter. This becomes the subject of linguistic study if attention is directed at the signifier and we say, the word *Peter*.

language forms the concept of the scientific discipline of his school subject as well as the concept of teaching and learning about this discipline. Vollmer (2006; Ivšek, 2008) links the use of instructional speech in pedagogical speech to the language of instruction, and this language to field-specific language. Because the teacher uses field-specific language in instructional pedagogical speech, it seems sensible to present some of its general features. Ivšek (2008; Sajovic, 2007) states that field-specific language operates under certain rules which are linked not only to terminology but also to grammar, correct and appropriate word choice and word, clause and sentence formation strategies. She continues by saying that field-specific language poses a great challenge to students, in particular due to the use of nominal structures, nominalisation of certain finite clauses, transformation of subordinate clauses into parts of speech or of multi-verb sentences into a single clause (2008; Sajovic, 2007).

On the basis of these findings, it must be stressed that the teacher's instructional (field-specific) speech differs from the speech of everyday practical communication and that the teacher must observe these differences when speaking in public.

3.2 The Significance of Appropriate Pedagogical Speech

Kyriacou (1997, p.9) discusses the fact that the essence of successful teaching seems relatively simple: the teacher needs to be aware of techniques for encouraging students to learn and must also be able to implement them. He continues by saying that teaching is considered successful when the students learn exactly what the teacher intended in class activities. The teaching process is often connected to decision-making and implementing decisions, which means, according to Kyriacou, that developing teaching skills is closely linked to developing decision-making skills about personal teaching strategies as well as to successful implementation of these decisions. According to Tomić (2002, p.26), the teacher organises and steers the learning process in class with pedagogical speech; the psychological atmosphere therefore also largely depends on the teacher.

In order for to organise and steer the learning process with pedagogical speech, according to Marentič Požarnik (2000, pp.232–234) the teacher must be able to communicate on several levels:

A. The teacher as information mediator: this is one of the basic communication skills, applicable in short explanations as well as longer lectures. The following aspects are especially important: (a) clarity, comprehensibility (it can be increased by an initial framework or goal statement and introducing the structure, i.e., introduction, body, conclusion; referring to pre-existing knowledge and experience, quality examples, visualisation—schemes, sketches, appropriate timing); (b) emotional honesty (personal engagement, lively metaphors, referring to pre-existing interests); (c) engaging

the minds of the participants (issue-driven mediation, thought-provoking questions during the speech); (d) coordinated verbal and non-verbal communication;

B. the teacher as interrogator: asking questions is one of the main communication skills in the teaching profession; the teacher as discipline manager. To prevent conflict and unruliness, it is of vital importance to have an agreement regarding classroom rules from the very beginning; the rules need to be clear, acceptable to everyone and therefore followed by everyone;

C. the teacher as conciliator: teachers need to be trained to use accepting language, which helps students to come forward with their problems (2000, pp.232–234). The teacher must also have a command of all the oratory skills mentioned for public speaking.

CONCLUSION

The teacher's communication in the classroom must be effective. To succeed in this task, the teacher must observe the principles of successful public speaking while also considering rhetorical and linguistic knowledge. Pedagogical speech, with which the teacher organises and steers the learning process, is complex; for this reason, this paper points out the issues in defining and describing pedagogical speech. This type of discourse occurs in two basic forms, i.e., by the speakers revealing or not revealing themselves; at the same time, pedagogical speech consists of instructional (used to educate) and relational (used to instil moral values) discourse, depending on its prevailing purpose; and finally, the teacher and students alternate between the roles of text producers and recipients; both use language in various text types and use different language varieties in different situations. Pedagogical communication sees the teacher and the students alternate in the role of the speaker, although practice shows that the teacher's proportion of speaking remains substantially higher than that of the students. The situation unambiguously points to the importance of the teacher's public speaking in the classroom.

REFERENCES

- Barthes, R. (1990). *Retorika starih/elementi semiologije* [Ancient rhetoric/elements of Semiology]. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.
- Bratanič, M. (1991). *Mikropedagogija: Interakcijsko-komunikacijski aspekt odgoja* [Micropedagogy: Interactional and communicational aspect of education]. Zagreb: Šolska knjiga
- Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behavior*. Boston: Addison-Wesley.
- Hribar, N. (2000). *Govorjeni jezik politikov: Razčlenjenost besedil z vidika skladenjske strukture in koreferenčnosti* [Spoken language of politicians: Text segmentation in terms of syntax and coreference]. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.

- Ivšek, M. (2008). Kompetence – da ali ne [Competences – For and against]. V: *Ivšek, M. (ur.), AASE, Laila. Jeziki v izobraževanju* [Languages in Education] (pp.273–282). Ljubljana: Zavod RS za šolstvo.
- Kolar, I. (2009). Odnosni govor in njegova vloga pri pouku slovenskega jezika v srednji šoli [Relational speech and its role in teaching slovene in secondary schools]. *Diplomsko delo*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Kranjc, S. (1998). *Govorjena besedila in korpus slovenskega jezika* [Spoken texts and the corpus of the slovene language]. Jezikoslovne tehnologije za slovenski jezik: zbornik konference.
- Kranjc, S. (2004). *Jezikovna zvrstnost v sodobnih medijih* [Language varieties in modern media]. Aktualizacija jezikovnozvrstne teorije na Slovenskem: členitev jezikovne resničnosti.
- Martina, K. O., Bešter Turk, M., Končina, M., Bavdek, M., Poznanovič, M., Ambrož, D., & Stanislava, Z. (2009). *Na pragu besedila 1. Učbenik za slovenski jezik v 1. letniku gimnazij, strokovnih in tehničnih šol* [On the doorstep of text. textbook for year 1 of grammar, vocational and technical schools]. Ljubljana: Založba Rokus.
- Kunst-Gnamuš, O. (1989). Jezikovna komunikacija v razredu [Language communication in the classroom]. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 40 (5–6), 257–269.
- Kunst-Gnamuš, O. (1990). Govor v razredu – poskus določiti nekatere opisne kategorije [Speech in the classroom – An attempt at defining select descriptive categories]. In V Žagar, & F. Komunikacija, *jezikovna kultura v šoli* (zbornik). Ljubljana: Pleško.
- Kunst-Gnamuš, O. (1992). *Sporazumevanje in spoznavanje jezika* [Communication and Familiarisation with Language]. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Kyriacou, C. (1997). *Vse učiteljeve spretnosti* [Essential teaching skills]. Radovljica: Regionalni izobraževalni center.
- Lipovec, A. (1978). Bohuslav Havranek (1893–1978). *JiS*, 24 (3–4), 103–105.
- Marentič-Požarnik, B. (1987). *Nova pota v izobraževanju učiteljev* [New Trends in teacher training]. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Marentič-Požarnik, B. (2000). *Psihologija učenja in pouka* [Psychology of learning and teaching]. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Mužič, V. (1994). Atributi kvalitativne in kvantitativne paradigme pedagoškega raziskovanja [Attributes of qualitative and quantitative paradigm of education research]. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 1(2), 39–51.
- Mužič, V. (1994). Sinteza paradigem pedagoškega raziskovanja – zakaj in kako? [A synthesis of education research paradigms – Why and how?]. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 3(4), 162–173.
- Petek, T. (2012). Criteria for public speech planning: characteristics of language learning. *Linguistica*, 52, 381–392.
- Petek, T. (2012). Ozaveščenost o javnem govornem nastopanju – priložnost za profesionalni razvoj učitelja [A responsible attitude towards public speaking – An opportunity for the professional development of the teacher]. *Jezik in slovstvo*, 57, 115–129.
- Petek, T. (2013). Kritični prerez besedilnih vrst v povezavi z učiteljevim oz. vzgojiteljevim govornim nastopanjem [Critical Breakdown of discourse categories in relation to (preschool) teachers' oral performance], *Revija za elementarno izobraževanje*, 6(4), 21–36.
- Podbevšek, K. (1996). Glasno interpretativno branje Kettejeve pesmi Na trgu (učiteljeva priprava). *JiS*, 44 (1–2), 19–28.
- Pogorelec, B., (1965). Vprašanja govornega jezika [Questions of Spoken Language]. *Jezikovni pogovori*, 132–156.
- Pogorelec, B. (1986). Znanstveno besedilo, njegove jezikoslovne prvine in slog [Scientific text, its linguistic elements and style]. *Slovenski jezik v znanosti* (pp.11–22). Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.
- Potočnik, N. (2010). Učinek udejanjanja faz v procesu nastajanja neumetnostnih besedil [Effec of phase realisation in the process of non-literary text production]. *Doktorska disertacija*. Ljubljana: Pedagoška fakulteta.
- Razdevšek-Pučko, C. (1990). Uporaba Flandersove analize razredne interakcije za ugotavljanje komunikacije med učiteljem in učencem pri pouku različnih predmetov od 2. do 5. razreda osnovne šole [Using the flanders classroom interaction analysis for determining communication between teacher and student in various subjects from year 2 to 5 of primary school]. In V Žagar, F. Komunikacij, *jezikovna kultura v šoli* (zbornik)(pp.116–128). Ljubljana: Pleško.
- Razdevšek-Pučko, C. (1993). *Razredna interakcija* [Classroom interaction]. Ljubljana: Pedagoška fakulteta.
- Sagadin, J. (1993). *Poglavja iz metodologije pedagoškega raziskovanja* [Chapters from education research methodology]. Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo.
- Sajovic, T. (2007). Paradoksnost kvantnega sveta in jezik [Paradoxes of the quantum world and language]. *Proteus*, 69(5), 213–220.
- Skubic, A. (1995). Klasifikacija funkcijske zvrstnosti in pragmatična definicija funkcije [Classification of functional text types and a pragmatic definition of the function]. *JiS*, 40 (5), 155–168.
- Svetina, N. P. (1997). *Govorno izražanje pri interpretaciji literarnih del v osnovni šoli. Magistrsko delo* [Oral expression in literary interpretation in primary school]. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Tomič, A. (1990). *Teorija in praksa spremljanja pouka*. Ljubljana: Zavod RS za šolstvo.

- Tomić, A. (1997). *Izbrana poglavja iz didaktike* [Selected didactics chapters]. Ljubljana: Center Filozofske fakultete za pedagoško izobraževanje.
- Tomić, A. (2002). *Spremljanje pouka* [Observing class]. Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo.
- Toporišič, J. (1992). *Enciklopedija slovenskega jezika* [Encyclopaedia of the slovene language]. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Urbančič, B. (1965). O jezikovnih stilih [On language styles]. *Jezikovni pogovori* (pp.221–227). Ljubljana.
- Vigotski, L. (1977). *Mišljenje i govor* [Thought Processes and Speech]. Beograd: Nolit.
- Vitez, P. (2004). In Zwitter-Vitez, A. (Ed.). Problem prozodične analize spontanega govora [The issue of prosodic analysis of spontaneous speech]. *JiS*, 49(6), 3–24.
- Vogel, J. (2002). Neposredno razvijanje poslušanja z razumevanjem in vrednotenjem pri pouku slovenskega jezika v prvem letniku gimnazije [Direct listening development with comprehension and evaluation in a slovene language class in year 1 of grammar school]. *Doktorska disertacija*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Vogel, J. (2007). Nestrokovnost v jeziku poljudnoznanstvenih besedil (pragmatično-funkcijski vidik) [Unprofessionalism in Pop-Science Discourse “from the Aspect of Pragmatic Functions”]. *Razvoj slovenskega strokovnega jezika* (pp.125–142). Ljubljana: Center za slovenščino kot drugi/tuji jezik pri Oddelku za slovenistiko Filozofske fakultete
- Vogel, J. (2008). Slovenščina kot učni jezik in učni predmet v šolah s slovenskim učnim jezikom v RS [Slovene as the Language of Instruction and School Subject in Slovene-Language Schools in Slovenia]. V: *Ivšek, M. (ur.), AASE, Laila. Jeziki v izobraževanju* (pp.117–128). Ljubljana: Zavod RS za šolstvo.
- Helmut, J. V. (2006). *Towards a Common European Instrument for Language(s) of Education*. Strasbourg: Intergovernmental Conference.
- Zabukovec, V. (1995). Modeli komunikacije v vrtcu in na razredni stopnji osnovne šole ter oblikovanje optimalnih modelov [Communication Models in Daycare and Lower Classes of Primary School and the Creation of Optimal Models]. *Doktorska disertacija*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Zadravec-Pešec, R. (1994). *Pragmatično jezikoslovje: Temeljni pojmi* [Pragmalinguistics: Essential Concepts]. Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut.
- Žagar-Žnidaršič, I. (2006). In D. Barbara (Ed.) *Argumentiranost kot model uspešne komunikacije* [Argumentation as a Model of Successful Communication]. Domžale: Izolit.
- Zidar, G., & Tatjana, idr. (2006). *Retorika. Uvod v govorniško veščino* [Rhetoric. An Introduction to the Art of Oratory]. Ljubljana: I 2.
- Žmavc, J. (2008). Sofisti in retorična sredstva prepričevanja [Sophists and rhetorical modes of persuasion]. *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo*, 233(36), 22–37.