

ANALYZING CHILDREN’S ORAL LANGUAGE IN AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS CLASSROOM

Tran Thi Thuy Hang

Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology and Education, Vietnam

✉hangttt@hcmute.edu.vn

(Received: 16/08/2023; Revised: 10/11/2023; Accepted: 01/12/2023)

Abstract: Grounded on theories of language (Blair, 2000; Britton, 1970; Halliday, 1991; Vygotsky, 1978), this research aims at analyzing and understanding children’s oral language in an English Language Arts classroom at an elementary public school in western Canada. The study was conducted with four Grade 4 students coming from different cultures within 13 consecutive weeks of the semester. Class observations and audio recordings were employed for data collection to grasp holistic and ethical understandings of their oral language. Data was analyzed based on color-coded themes, which results in four significant findings: (1), the diversity of children’s oral language functions; (2), the Participant and Spectator roles of language in connection to embedded speech and displaced speech; (3), the interaction of Girl Talk and Boy Talk; and (4), the children’s peer support through Zone of Proximal Development. This research also showcased that respectfulness for cultural diversity in classrooms and teacher’s pedagogies and support are beneficial for children’s language development.

Keywords: children’s oral language, English Language Arts, language function, Zone of Proximal Development

1. Introduction

Language is always and everywhere with us. It pervades every area of our waking lives – our family relationships, our friendships, our working relationships, and even our aloneness. And those of us who carry on lively conversations or write great poetry in our dreams would argue that language pervades our hours of sleep as well as our hours of waking. With a phenomenon so vast and complex, so pervasive in human experience, it is no wonder that people the world over, throughout the centuries, have been asking questions about language – What is it? How does it work? How did it begin? How does it change? How do we learn it? No wonder, too, that the searching questions have focused on various dimensions of this complex and often elusive and unwieldy “beast.” (Lindfors, 1985)

This research is located within the Theory in Language Arts course as a compulsory project that all doctoral students have to conduct within a semester. As usual, there are 15 weeks during a semester at Canadian elementary schools, with the first week for orientation and the last week for the final exams. My cohorts and I entered our fieldwork in the second week and completed our data collection in the fourteenth week. We were assigned to study the oral language of children in their English Language Arts classes. I conducted my study with a group of four Grade 4 students in a multicultural classroom at a public school in Alberta, Canada. With a total of 16 students, their class was divided into four groups (four students each) by the teacher during the first week of semester, before I started meeting them. Together with me, there were the other three cohorts being in charge of the remaining three groups. Each of us ran our own individual study on a certain assigned group throughout the semester. Playing and conversations were shared at

recess time to strengthen the relationship between researchers and the participants. Significantly, my research aims to respond to these three following questions:

1. How are the language functions used by elementary students during their English Language Arts (ELA) classes?
2. What are the roles of language seen in the elementary students' ELA class activities?
3. Are there any other features of language that also contribute to improving language learning of children?

While there has been little research on deep understandings towards the diversity and complexity of multicultural children's oral language (Cameron, 2001), as this study seeks to answering these research questions, it hopes to contribute to shortening that gap and thus, supporting children language teaching and learning in diverse landscapes locally and globally.

2. Theoretical framework

This research is grounded in theories of language arts related to elementary-aged children. Goodman (2003) asserted that "language is a powerful tool with which to think, to communicate with others, and to explore the universe" (p. 9). Therefore, it is essential to build a strong foundation for this research on functions of language (Halliday, 1991), roles of language (Britton, 1970), genderlects-Girl Talk and Boy Talk (Blair, 2000), and Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978).

2.1 Functions of language

According to Halliday (1991), it is identified that language has seven typical functions including Instrumental language, Regulatory language, Interactional language, Personal language, Heuristic language, Imaginative language, and Information language (p. 36). Instrumental language is the language that a child uses as a means of getting things done. Regulatory language is the one that is used to regulate the behavior of others. Interactional language refers to the use of language in the interaction between the self and others. Personal language denotes the child's intuitive awareness of language as a form of his or her own individuality. On the other side of personal language is the one called Heuristic model of language, derived from the child's knowledge of how language has enabled him or her to explore their environment. Also relating to the environment but in a different way, the Imaginative model provides further elements of metalanguage for the child to create his or her own environment with their feeling of being inclined. The final model is Information language which is also known as the Representational model. In this language function, "the child is aware that he can convey a message in language, a message which has specific reference to the processes, persons, objects, abstractions, qualities, states, and relations of the real world around him (Halliday, p. 39).

2.2 Roles of language

It has not been denied that language has complex roles across all forms of discourse, but in order to differentiate literary and nonliterary approaches to reading and writing, Britton (1970) created a great divide of language's roles into participant role and spectator role. In the participant role, language is used to get things done such as to purchase or sell items, to persuade or inform someone on something, or to theorize knowledge. In the spectator role, language is used to grasp

experiences and feelings through a ‘verbal object’ or work of literature. With children in classrooms, their spectator role is seen as having an active role in creating meaning, rather than functioning merely as a passive viewer.

2.3 Genderlects: Girl Talk and Boy Talk

Blair (2000) believes that in the field of sociolinguistics, gender is seen to be “an arrangement of co-construction created through a complex set of routinized interactions; at the same time, gender determines and structures the interaction” (p. 2). In her research project with children at a middle school in Canada, Blair (2000) found that Boy Talk established and reinforced the power relations when “the boys spoke to each other in loud voices from as far as three or four rows apart” (p.3). The Boy Talk carries a wide range of purposes from making the others laugh, getting the others’ attention, to controlling and gaining power. These kinds of gendered interactions optimize power and solidarity for boys.

On the other side of the coin is Girl Talk, which functions differently from boy talk. In the language arts classroom, the girls talked about both their activities at hand and also their personal lives. When there was flexibility in class with pair and group talk, the girls tended to move around the classroom and talk quietly to each other and were busier than the boys (Blair, 2000). When the girls reported disagreement, they did not use powerful language like the boys; instead, the girls used a particular stylistic device to present their argument such as “he-said-she-said” because using a third person’s opinion to elaborate their thoughts could contribute to easing down any possible conflicting ideas. With all of these important findings, Blair (2000) emphasizes that understanding boy talk and girl talk is beneficial for language arts teachers “to address issues of equity in classrooms through language, literacy, and literature” (p. 8).

2.4 Zone of Proximal Development

In 1978, Vygotsky, in his passion to discover the actual relations of the children’s developmental process to their learning capabilities, found out a very significant implication called the zone of proximal development. He defines it as “the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86). Vygotsky also reinforces that “what is in the zone of proximal development today will be the actual development level tomorrow” (p. 87), which means what a child can do with assistance at the present, he or she will be able to by themselves in the near future. Vygotsky’s (1978) theory of the zone of proximal development has always been an anchor for teachers, parents and those who are working with children to help them reach their optimal development.

3. Research methodology

3.1 Participants

In this study, the author worked with a group of four Grade 4 children who come from diverse cultures: two Asian children, one Canadian child, and one European child. The teacher and all children were well informed of our study, and we obtained their consent prior to the beginning of the project. The author also helped four children in my group select their favorite pseudonyms so that their identity was anonymous, and their confidentiality was protected. Of all

the children, there were three girls named Yuri, Miya, and Michelle while the only boy was named Jackson.

The children in this group studied English Language Arts during their everyday lessons and with diverse topics and activities. But in order to understand their oral language more deeply but not broadly, the author chose to continuously and consistently follow them every Thursday afternoon when they were assigned to work on the project called “Building Your Dream Neighborhood”. Throughout the 13 weeks, they had to collaborate with each other to go from brainstorming the ideas to making the plan, testing the model, building the neighborhood, and finally writing about their whole journey. The teacher requested them to follow the procedure and fill out their handouts from the beginning to the end, but these children had the freedom in curating their ideas and using different materials for their work such as Legos, craft items, crayons, wooden sticks, and colored clay. All of these supporting items were always available in a basket at their group’s workstation.

3.2 Procedure of data collection and analysis

This study employed qualitative approach to the data analysis. Data was collected from transcripts of audio recordings of 13 weeks during the Fall semester, with 45 mins class of English Language Arts each week, where the project-based learning was key for classroom activities. Data was also gathered from class observation in which the author observed the class and took notes of the children’s interactions during their group work activities.

During their English Language Arts classes, the author sat at the corner table near the group’s space. Each space consisted of four individual tables grouped together to make a big square with each student on each side. The four children were well aware of the author’s presence and activities in their class. There was no other interaction between the author and the children during the class time.

The audio recordings were transcribed after every week on the field. Transcripts were then analyzed with color coding method, in which seven rainbow colors were used for seven language functions (Halliday, 1991): red for *Instrumental Language*, orange for *Regulatory Language*, yellow for *Interactional Language*, green for *Personal Language*, blue for *Heuristic Language*, indigo for *Imaginative Language*, and violet for *Information Language*. For Britton’s (1970) roles of language, black was used for the Participant role and white for the Spectator role. With Blair’s (2000) genderlects, brown was chosen for Boy Talk and gray for Girl Talk.

Data were processed using an excel worksheet to help organize the color-coded themes, calculated them and sorted them in the descending order. In addition, the observation notes were used to add more information onto the transcripts to ensure a holistic and ethical understanding of the children’s oral language.

4. Findings and discussion

4.1 The diversity in children’s oral language functions

Throughout the duration of 13 weeks learning the English Language Arts, *Personal Language* was used the most among the four children in my group. In particular, three girls and a boy used their language to express their personal opinions when doing the task of building something collaboratively. Interestingly, the way they give their opinions can be both direct and

indirect. For example, when the group started to brainstorm about building a castle, Jackson (the only boy) directly opposed: *I don't like princess castles really* or *I don't want to make this*. Similarly, Yuri expressed her idea straightly: *I don't think we should build a fairy*. It is also found in the findings that there are many tokens of “Yes” and “No” followed by reasons or explanations during the excerpt when the children expressed their individuality and personality.

Besides, the children applied the art of language when giving indirect perspectives. Miya, for instance, did not support building a fairy so she indirectly spoke out a beautiful disagreement: *That would be really hard*. Her choice of language is nice and polite, which can help in persuading the others to try another one but not the giant fairy. Personal language is also presented in the form of a question, which can be seen clearly when Miya asked: *Does it really need a tiara?* In this question, the phrase “really need” supported by a strong voice of emphasis could totally cover the doubtful opinion of this girl about making the tiara.

Another interesting point is that opposing ideas are also expressed using unlovely images as seen in Jackson's statement: *Fairies are lame*. In this scene, the boy continued to not support building the fairy and he said that the fairies were lame when the legs were broken. Usually, the fairies are beautiful and perfect in the eyes of children but when the boy did not find it favorite, he used the word “lame”, which normally goes with the ugly witches. I also felt pleasant to observe his saying and realized that at this age, children can connect something they do not like with unattractive images.

As observed and recognized from the transcripts, the second most common function of language in this children group was *Information Language*, which is a useful tool in conversations. Working with this group across the semester, I could see that their information language aimed to report facts. Taking the example of the group task of planting trees in a garden. In this activity, Jackson thought out loud the name of the bush that the girls were still arguing: *They are called apple trees*. It happened in the same way when they explained the reason why they should worry when building a staffroom near their imaginative classroom: because they loved parties and they could not have more party time if a teacher immediately came and told them to stop.

Coming as the third most common function was the children's *Interactional Language*, which they used to maintain their relationship with friends through a variety of ways such as calling proper names or making connections between the speaker and the listener. This was seen when Yuri and Michelle, for example, made an interaction by calling their friend: *Miya, we have to build something together*, or when Miya responded in a humming voice: *K- Michelle would you please shut up?* Also, Miya called Jackson many times: “Jackson, Jackson” to get his attention and support. Significantly, their language emphasizes that they are always members of the group as in “together we make”, or “we have to be building together”.

Besides, *Regulatory Language* was noticed throughout the project when the children controlled the behavior of others (Halliday, 1991) and this language function stands as the fourth most common one. In detail, the most popularly used expression was “let's” as in *Let's build ...*, *Let's try ...* and *Let's make ...*. Furthermore, the children gave directions to their peers when using imperative structures such as *Use the yellow ones* or *Follow the yellow brick road*.

Heuristic Language was the fifth most common among these children's oral language, although it was considered the most important function by Halliday's research (1991). In this class of English Language Arts, the children used Heuristic language to seek information and find out about things that they felt concerned about. Further considering this function, it is found that the children's most prevalent tool was the question such as *What shall we build?*, *What would you want?*, *Why do you want to?* It shows that heuristic language supports the children as the door to their new knowledge in learning.

Furthermore, the sixth most common function was *Imaginative Language*. During the project-based activities, the boy and three girls sometimes used Imaginative language in their imagination to figure out the way of solving their problems of writing the plan, sketching the design, building the castle, and so on. This language function appeared a number of times through tokens such as "like this", "it's like", "like a haunted forest" throughout their conversations. Finally, the least common one was *Instrumental Language*, which the children employed to satisfy their needs and get things that they love to do. Simply, they used expressions such as *I need*, and *I want to*. It is noticed that very little instrumental language occurred within the group work during the 13 weeks of observation. It was observed that the student group had a sense of equality among friends at the same age, so they always tried to manage themselves first before reaching out to their peers and just asked for help when really necessary. In brief, my children group participants embraced all the seven functions of oral language throughout the course of 13 weeks in their English Language Arts, and their language functions had a diverse frequency of use depending on their certain purposes when doing task-based activities.

4.2 Participant and Spectator roles in connection to embedded speech and displaced speech in children's oral language

During the time being on the field with the children, I had witnessed their both Participant and Spectator roles closely connecting with embedded speech and displaced speech. At first, as Participants, this children group used embedded speech in their oral language for many purposes including informing people, instructing, persuading, arguing, explaining, planning, setting forth the pros and cons and coming to a conclusion (Britton, 1970). As seen through observation and from recordings' transcripts, embedded speech was used the most when the children wanted to inform the others of what each was doing. One example for this was while Miya told her friends that she was building a chair, Jackson and Yuri also announced that they were making the tiara. In order to talk about "here and now", all members of this group used various expressions with the present continuous tense as in *we're building*, *I am filling*, *I am making*, *are you putting?* Employing these structures, they also wanted to persuade, explain, instruct, and plan the activities in harmony with their peers.

Secondly, as *Spectators*, the children used displaced speech as a useful tool to refer to their past experiences. Britton (1970) emphasizes that "for young children, as we have seen, going back over experiences in the role of spectator typically takes the form of make-believe play - a representation in action with words as appropriate" (p. 119). Yuri and Michelle, for example, said two times to other members: *but we already did so much of this whatever* to persuade her friends not to make a big block but a new and more creative thing. Besides, *Displaced Speech* was also in use when the children shared their future commitments in solving the problems of their task. A number of future structures appear in their oral communication such as *We'll just do*, *I'll make*,

I'll do, and Me and Miya will make. Naturally, every time doing the tasks, the children were always connected with their past memories. They first recalled their favorite movie *The Wizard of Oz* when making the bush and then together they sang out loudly: *Follow the yellow brick road, follow the yellow brick road.* Also, when they made the trees and thought about the party, Jackson and Miya raised their voices in the song: *party rockin' through the house tonight ... everybody uhm ...mm ... lose tonight.* These pieces of singing already created a cheerful and exciting atmosphere for the group.

Definitely, displaced speech contributes a lot in making the language of Spectator more plentiful and diversified in this children group. More fascinatingly, there is a transition from embedded speech to displaced speech, from the role of Participant to Spectator, happening in conversations of the children. This can be seen in the example of the task in November called *The Wizard of Oz*. Here the image of the wizard of Oz is embedded as the current solution for the students on how to make the path into the bush of trees. At the same time, this image brings them back to the movie that they had seen before, which then opens the door for a variety of songs, scenes, and characters around the movie. Generally speaking, we can see both Embedded and Displaced speech as well as the transition between the two when observing the oral language of these children.

4.3 The interaction of Girl Talk and Boy Talk

The findings also showed that genderlects of both Girl Talk and Boy Talk were present in the children's conversations during their processes of problem-solving tasks, but Girl Talk took more amount than the Boy Talk. As Blair (2000) describes a language arts classroom in the project at a Harbor View school that "[t]here were plenty of opportunities for talk [...], and the girls talked about both the activities at hand and their personal lives" (p. 317), the three girls in this group talked a lot and were busier than the only boy. Taking an example of the group's building a community garden. When seeing Miya building a chair, Michelle and Yuri asserted: *No, Miya, we have to build something together.* Obviously, Michelle and Yuri mentioned that because they wanted to stress on the current activity that the teacher asked them to work collaboratively. With a similar purpose, Yuri opposed Jackson's idea of building a machine gun for the fairy: *No, but we have to be building together though.* It was noticed that the girls raised a big voice in the group work, which contributed to catching every member's attention to really concentrate and share responsibilities in their assigned tasks.

Regarding Boy Talk, usually male is the stronger gender but in this group the boy seemed to be weaker as he was the only boy compared to the three girls. Therefore, his participation of verbal language during the group work was just minor. However, no matter how little it was, the Boy Talk took many forms and has a variety of purposes (Blair, 2000). When hearing Yuri and Michelle complaining about building a giant fairy, Jackson suggested: *Let's make a big block. Done.* Once saying this, the boy wanted to reinforce his power by calling the others to follow his new idea. Moreover, while the girls were all engaged deeply into the community garden building task, Jackson recognized clearly the presence of the audio recorder, so he reminded Yuri and Michelle, *You're on camera.* Another purpose of Boy Talk that could be seen is giving solutions and explanations as the boy stopped the arguments among the girls by saying: *They are called*

apple trees. Obviously, although the Boy Talk was less often than the Girl Talk, its meanings played a very important role in the group's conversations.

One more significant point in the children's Girl Talk and Boy Talk is that they used a lot of poetic language in communication. This kind of language has remarkably brought to me as an observer an exciting feeling when hearing their English expressions such as "my gosh" instead of "my God", "tada!" instead of "amazing!", and "oopsy daisy" when a group member accidentally erased some parts of their plan. Also, the children made their activities fun by repeating their friends' words like *I will make the bush. I will make the bush* or playing a word saying game as in *What....What.... I say what...?* Alongside the funny gestures and expressiveness in speaking, these pieces of language help create an active, informal, and comfortable platform that can strongly facilitate the development of oral language of children in a language arts classroom like this.

4.4 Children's peer support through Zone of Proximal Development

So far, as an emerging researcher I have learned a lot about the effectiveness of teacher's support on students' development through their Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978). However, very little attention has been paid in research to see how this development framework is employed by children in language arts classrooms to facilitate scaffolding to their peers' development. Taking this point in mind, I am grateful that my ears, my eyes, and my heart told me that my participants were not only responsible for completing their own duties, but they also shared ideas to instruct and navigate their group members.

Yuri, for instance, as the leader of the group, she always observed her peers and jumped in to help when in need. The ways she initiated everyone to get through their tough steps during the works include:

How about this?

What if we write about the garden first?

Okay, let's draw our plan.

Miya, you should not worry because....,

Hm...mm, I think we may...

Jackson, despite being the only boy in the group, also acknowledged he was of the stronger gender to undertake the 'heavy and challenging' missions. This could be seen in his utterances:

Let me build the bridge while you all plant the flowers.

How about me writing the action plan?

Michelle, let me think...hum...mm, you could start to write the introductory part.

It is interesting to learn the ways the children cared for each other and helped their peers get through the troubles as they all wished to make their collaboration complete in a good way. This is also evidence of the strong learner's autonomy in this elementary classroom.

In addition, the observed children's talks had progressed gently throughout the semester as a path without stones. In order to achieve this, it requires a lot of coordination to keep things going

smoothly among the speakers (Scollon & Scollon, 1996). These four children formed a mixed-level group when Yuri volunteered to be the group leader and did a lot of coaching for her friends, Miya, Michelle and Jackson. Although sometimes arguments occurred, they all understood that they needed to collaborate with each other because they only had 13 weeks to work through their challenging but meaningful project, from brainstorming the ideas to designing and finally writing about the whole journey. Well (1989) states:

Where one of the participants has greater expertise than the other, he or she can engage in interaction with the learner with the deliberate intention of enabling the learner to acquire some procedure, knowledge or skill that will be useful in other situations beyond that in which he or she is currently engaged” (p.259).

Obviously, this kind of collaborative task-based project helps curate the opportunities for language learners to help their peers optimize their knowledge through their Zone of Proximal Development.

5. Conclusions and implications

It is clear that transcribing and analyzing the children’s language functions seriously takes time and effort, but this kind of work is worth doing as it provides a deeper and richer understanding of the children’s oral language in an English Language Arts classroom. This experience is very precious for the author’s knowledge in elementary education as it paves the way for hopes in promoting current and future students’ flourishing in their language classrooms. In particular, knowing the children’s language functions is helpful for content knowledge when building the curriculum. Moreover, understanding the roles of language in children’s conversations can be beneficial for teaching pedagogies. Seeing the genderlects (Girl Talk and Boy Talk) in language classes is useful for organizing lesson activities to best fit every single student’s need. The final but not least important implication is that the impacts of Zone of Proximal Development are obviously seen not only in the teacher-learner interactions, but also in the learner-learner interactions. This recognition definitely expands the learning opportunities for language learners, especially for those at lower levels than their peers in the same class.

One more thing that plays a key role in the children’s language learning is the classroom culture. As observed, the teacher’s great commitments in sustaining cultural diversity through her individual conversations with every student about their cultural traditions, through her meetings with the parents after school, and through modeling culturally relevant communication for her students. All of these contributed to nurturing the classroom as a common home for 16 children from different cultural backgrounds. This class was strong in inter-ethnicity but there were no cultural conflicts among the children during the time of my observation. In my group, for example, four students of three different cultures engaged in their talks naturally and even socialized together with a lot of funny poetic language. Cultural language barriers had no place in their everyday conversations, and respectfulness for the classroom’s cultural diversity has paved more doors to promote young learners’ identity and dignity.

It seems that the image of the teacher in this Grade 4 English Language Arts classroom has not been prominent, but all of the powerful knowledge in this research cannot come into life without the teacher. It is in the ways the teacher curated the task-based project, problem-solving

areas, mixed-level groups of learners, and diverse forms of activities that facilitated these excellent learning opportunities for the children in this class. When the fieldwork was over, the author came to extend the gratitude to the teachers and also express the admiration of her ways of managing the class effectively. She responded that the key for all was her learning in theories in children's language and that she did challenge herself in integrating such theories into her teaching practices with many ups and downs, but in the end, it proved that the marriage of theory and practice has maximized her students' learning capabilities. This implies that there should be more professional development for elementary English language teachers in both traditional methods and non-traditional approaches such as the micro-credential programs to better support the teachers' ongoing development in their career

All in all, this research only worked with four elementary students but with the observation and audio recordings of their oral language within a semester. The results have showcased deep understandings towards these children's English oral language. Significantly, these understandings are impactfully informing the future ways of supporting children's language development at elementary schools and even in their home places. Analyzing and understanding children's oral language functions, roles of language, genderlects, and their Zone of Proximal Development can also definitely support the (English) language teachers, speech-language pathologists, and those practitioners in children language areas. Finally, this research informs the needs for future potential studies on analyzing children's oral language with a bigger number of participants, in more diverse geographic and educational landscapes to better understand and support children language learning and teaching in the national and global contexts.

References

- Blair, H. A. (2000). Genderlects: Girl talk and boy talk in a middle-years classroom. *Language Arts*, 77(4), 315-323. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41483071>
- Britton, J. (1970). *Language and learning*. London: Penguin Books.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodman, Y. M. (2003). *Valuing Language Study: Inquiry into Language for Elementary and Middle Schools*. National Council of Teachers of English. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED473960.pdf>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1991). Relevant Models of Language. In B. M. Power, & R. S. Hubbard (Eds.), *Literacy in Process* (pp. 36-41). New Hampshire: The Heinemann Reader.
- Lindfors, J. W. (1985). Understanding the development of language structure. In A. Jaggard, & M. T. Smith-Burke (Eds.), *Observing the language learner* (pp. 41-56). National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Rd., Urbana, IL 61801
- Scollon R., & Scollon, S. (1996). Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication. In R. S. Hubbard, & B. M. Power (Eds.), *Language development: A reader for teachers* (pp. 189-192). London: Pearson Education.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Cole, V. John Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes* (pp. 79-91). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wells, G. (1989). Language in the classroom: Literacy and collaborative talk. *Language and Education*, 3(4), 251-273. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09500788909541266>

PHÂN TÍCH NGÔN NGỮ NÓI CỦA TRẺ EM TRONG LỚP HỌC NGỮ VĂN ANH

Tóm tắt: Dựa trên các lý thuyết về ngôn ngữ (Halliday, 1991; Britton, 1970; Blair, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978), nghiên cứu này hướng đến phân tích và hiểu được ngôn ngữ nói của trẻ em trong lớp học Ngữ văn Anh tại một trường tiểu học công lập ở miền tây Canada. Nghiên cứu được thực hiện với 4 học sinh lớp 4 đến từ các nền văn hoá khác nhau trong vòng 13 tuần liên tiếp của một học kỳ. Phương thức quan sát lớp học và ghi âm được sử dụng để thu thập dữ liệu nhằm đem lại sự hiểu biết toàn diện và đạo đức về ngôn ngữ nói của những học sinh này. Dữ liệu được phân tích dựa trên các chủ đề đã được mã hoá theo các bảng màu khác nhau, và đưa đến bốn kết quả quan trọng: (1), sự đa dạng trong các chức năng ngôn ngữ nói của trẻ em; (2), vai trò của Người tham gia và Khán giả của ngôn ngữ trẻ em trong mối liên quan đến bài phát biểu được nhúng và bài phát biểu bị dịch chuyển; (3), sự tương tác giữa Phần nói chuyện của học sinh Nữ và Phần nói chuyện của học sinh Nam; và (4), sự hỗ trợ lẫn nhau giữa các học sinh trong nhóm thông qua Vùng Phát triển Tiệm cận. Nghiên cứu này cũng cho thấy sự tôn trọng đối với sự đa dạng văn hóa trong lớp học cũng như phương pháp sư phạm và hỗ trợ của giáo viên giúp ích cho sự phát triển ngôn ngữ của trẻ em.

Từ khoá: ngôn ngữ nói của trẻ em, Ngữ văn Anh, chức năng ngôn ngữ, Vùng Phát triển Tiệm cận