

---

# *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENCE ARTS AND COMMERCE*

---

## **Analyzing EFL Teachers' Oral Instructional Discourse Modification Strategies to Level 104 of the Foundation Year at ELI**

**Maha Sayer AL-Thiyabi**

King Abdul-Aziz University English Language Institute.

---

### **Abstract**

*This study revolves around one feature of classroom discourse which is speech modifications. It focused on analyzing EFL teachers' common oralphonological, syntactic and lexical discourse modification strategies and their impact on students' reaction. The focus was on the common types of phonological, syntactic and lexical speech modifications that include sentence simplification, using simple words, repetition of words and utterances, the speed of speech, Intonation, stress, and raising the voice. The researcher observed and recorded 3 classes to pinpoint these strategies and their effects on students' interaction. The researcher also analyzed the recordings using a checklist she designed. The results showed that ELI teachers of proficiency level 104 students made use of a lot of phonological, syntactic and lexical speech modification strategies. Moreover, students react relatively positively toward it. These strategies entailed promoting interaction in the class.*

**Key Words:** Instructional, oral discourse, modification, ELI, discourse analysis, teachers, 104 students, phonological modification , syntactic modification , lexical modification .

## **1. Topic Introduction and Problem**

### **1.1 The Background of the Study**

Oral Instructional discourse refers to teacher talk which is the form of discourse that teacher's use when instructing their Students (Giouroukakis, Honigsfeld, Endres and et al ,2008). Chaudron " described teacher talk as a particular form of speech used by teachers to instruct their students through language that is clear and explicit " (Chaudron (1999) as cited in Giouroukakis ,

Honigsfeld, Endres and et al ,2008, p.9). The oral instructional discourse is the speech that has a concept, idea and relevance for students. Teachers usually tend to modify their oral discourse or speech to help students have a fine-grained understanding of the classes. As it is stated by Chaudron “It appears that the adjustments in teacher speech to nonnative speaking learners Serve the temporary purpose of maintaining communication – clarifying information and eliciting learners’ responses – and do not identify the interaction as an entirely Different social situation (Chaudron (1999) as cited in Giouroukakis, Honigsfeld, Endres and et al, 2008, p. 9)

Speech modification signifies the process of adjusting teachers’ speech in an endeavor to make it more comprehensible to the second language listeners (Chiang and Dunke, 1992) . It is one of the classroom features that teachers often employ to facilitate students’ learning (Walsh , 2013). However , these changes do not necessarily entail positive impact on students .

“Research indicates that teacher talk (TT) directed to L2 learners is characterized by Discourse, syntactic, lexical, and phonological modifications. However, only a few Studies provide evidence about the effects of TT phonetic/phonological adjustments on the nonnative comprehension” ( Ivanova ,2011 , p. 8 )

In the same vein, Ivanova asserted that some speech modification do not affect the students’ interaction positively since this may entail low interaction .Similarly , It is discernable that teachers in ELI use different strategies to modify oral discourse . However; it is not always effective due to the variety of strategies and the variety of students’ needs. Therefore; the researcher will examine teachers’ oral discourse modification strategies and how 104 students react toward them. The researcher aims to pinpoint 104 students’ type of reaction toward teachers’ use of modified oral discourse and whether it is negative or positive .This Study analyzes EFL teachers’ common phonological, syntactic and lexical oral instructional discourse modification strategies to level 104 of the foundation year at ELI. It has been noticed that teachers’ speech modification strategies are not useful for both teachers and students.

## **1.2 The Statement of the Problem**

As an experienced teacher , I have found that teachers’ strategies to modify syntactic , phonological and lexical features of their oral discourse are sometimes not useful for both teachers and learners in the way that students may receive an input that is below their linguistic level .This may result in not perceiving the input as an intake .In other words, If teachers kept using basic vocabulary such as important instead of essential or any other equivalents , students would not have the opportunity to be exposed to more advanced vocabularies. This study focuses on the common syntactic, phonological and lexical speech modification strategies which are sentence simplification , using simple basic words . repetition of words , the rate of speech , Intonation, stress and raising the voice.Hence this study analyzes these strategies teachers use to help learners and how learners react toward them .In other words , this study investigates positive and negative effects of these strategies on learners’ interaction .

### **1.3 The Rationale of the Study**

This study is important because it sheds light on the modified strategies teacher use at ELI to elevate learners' comprehension .It focuses on the common types of syntactic , phonological and lexical speech modifications that include sentence simplification , using simple basic words, repetition of words and utterances , the speed of speech , Intonation, stress and raising the voice. This study also helps teachers to be aware of the modification strategies they use and whether they are useful or not in promoting students' interaction .Moreover ; it helps programmers to design the language program in a way that enhances students' language proficiency .

### **1.4 The Research Objectives**

The objectives of this research are:

- To analyze teachers' syntactic, phonological and lexical speech modification strategies of oral discourse.
- To survey students' interactions to the use of modified oral discourse.

### **1.5 The Research Questions**

1. What are common phonological, syntactic and lexical oral instructional discourse modification strategies used for level 104 students?
2. How do level 104 students react to the use of oral modified discourse strategies?

### **1.6 The Research Hypotheses**

- The teachers use modified oral discourse.
- Students react positively towards the modified oral instructional strategies.

### **1.7 Methodology**

This research adopts the descriptive method. The tools were recordings and observations. The researcher recorded 3 ( 3 hours ) lectures of 3 sections of the proficiency level 104 at ELI at KAU . The participants were proficiency level 104 students. Two classes are from the female section and one is from the male section .These three classes have three different teachers as well as different students . Moreover, the researcher designed a checklist of common phonological, syntactic and lexical oral instructional modification strategies to analyze the recorded and observed data. In addition, the researcher conducts an observation to the students to collect data with regard to how they react with the use of oral modified discourse strategies .The data was analyzed qualitatively

### **1.8 Delimitations of the Study**

This study is limited to oral instruction modified discourse. In addition, It is delimited to proficiency level 104 students at ELI at KAU .Moreover; it is limited to three sections in module 4, 2014.It is also delimited to common syntactical, phonological and lexical speech modification

## 1.9 Definition of Terms

Discourse; it refers to texts whether written or spoken that have been produced in a specific context for a definite purpose (Walsh, 2013) Discourse analysis: it refers to examining spoken or written text as a tool of assimilating their internal and external structure or rationality.

Oral discourse modification or speech modification: it refers to one of the classroom features that teachers use to facilitate her input to be comprehensible by their students. Syntactic modification strategies :According to Ivanova , the syntactic modification of oral discourse refers to using simple , short , direct structures and using less marked linguistic forms and more contextually embedded in the “now and here” when addressing nonnative learners .

Lexical modification strategies refer to : “using a set of high frequency or more basic vocabulary items in their discourse when talking to nonnative speaker “(Ivanova , 2011 , p. 23).

The phonological modification strategies refer to: modifying the rate of speech and pauses, pitch, intonation, and stress, and articulation of segments (1990; Hakansson, p.107).

## 2. Theoretical Framework

### 2.1 Literature review

#### 2.1.1 Oral Instructional Discourse

Generally, Discourse is a means of talking and writing about the world .It is language and meaning in a social-cultural context asCreeze (2005) stated

“Discourse both reflects and constitutes a social context. Because discourse is language-in-use it not only reflects the social and political context but also plays its part in shaping that context.

The effect and the importance of discourse are clearly manifested in this quote. Discourse mirrors the society. It both affects and gets affected by the social milieus. It embodies the way human beings communicate in . It is the motor of life that triggers the development of all life aspects .It is dynamo of commercial transaction , social issue , and education .So discourse is the heart of life. Consequently , It is the heart of education and especially learning languages . The focus here is oral instructional discourse which addresses one aspect of discourse which is the spoken one. It refers to teacher talk in classroom since a lesson as described by Bullock

“is a verbal encounter through which the teacher draws information from the class, elaborates and generalizes it, and produces a synthesis. His skill is in selecting, prompting, improving, and generally orchestrating the exchange (Bullock (1975) as cited in Edwards &Westgate,2005).

Oral discourse is one form of instruction and a very important form (Edwards Westgate,2005). There is a lot of research about how teachers can evolve their talk to maximize their students learning and how they can facilitates this (Walsh , 2002).For example , at ELI (English Language Institutes ) at ( King Abdul-Aziz University )KAU , there are a lot of workshops that has been conducted to improve the teachers" spoken instruction in a way that ensure students" benefits .For example in one of the workshops entitled "Shaping the Way we Teach " , it is asserted that teachers should minimize their talking time to allow more space to students to talk .

### 2.1.2 Speech Modification Strategies

Modifying spoken language to learners is considered to be one of classroom discourse features(Walsh 2013). Teachers use a plethora of modification strategies to facilitate their students" learning . In the same vein , Tardif labels five modification strategies that include"self-repetition, , linguistic modelling, providing information, expanding an utterance and using extensive elicitation, where questions are graded and adjusted ."(Tardif, (1994) as cited in Walsh, 2006)

Moreover, teachers employ a lot of pausing and emphasis . They talk to their students in a louder and slower way which is similar to talking to children (Walsh ,2013) .They employ a lot of gestures and facial expressions. Ivanova (2011) categorize louder slower rate of speech , emphasis , pauses and intonation as phonological modifications of oral discourse. For example in ELI , In a workshop entitled " Improving Teaching Techniques for Listening and Speaking", it is advised not to use difficult vocabularies that hinder students" comprehension. The importance of using simple vocabulary that suits our students levelis clarified and asserted. Stenius demonstrated the significance of vocabulary in understanding by stating that "The depth and breadth of vocabulary knowledge were highly correlated with listening comprehension" (Stenius 2009,p.596).This manifests that ELI teachers employ a lot of speech modifications. Ivanova (2011) classified using simple and basic vocabulary under lexical modification of oral discourse .Usually teachers tend to implement these strategies because of a number of reasons . Walsh (2013) mentions three paramount reasons: first, speech modification enable the learners to comprehend what teachers say and they consequently learn . In the same vein , Krashen (1985) proposed the comprehensible input theory which states that students must be exposed to a comprehensible input to acquire the language .This theory refers to language input that can be understood by listeners albeit that they do not understand all the words and structures in it .It is asserted that the input should be one level above that of the learners . It is defined as "i+1" in which i represent the current knowledge of a learner and 1 represents the next level. This theory is at the heart of speech modification strategies since teachers use these strategies to simplify the input to be perceived by the students .Second, they use such strategies to model language for their students to give them the opportunity to be exposed to native language . Third, teachers use such strategies to make sure that the class is following and in the flaw, no one of the students loses her/his attention or do not understand. Teachers use a lot of modified speech since they deem that this will help to evolve and mange interaction. However , Indeed, it is possible that

over- simplification may have a negative impact on acquisition since negotiation will become terminated (Musumeci,(1996), as cited in Walsh ,2006).

Based on my observation, ELI teachers use a lot of speech modification strategies having the same purposes mentioned above. Therefore, this study aims to explore ELI teachers' common syntactic, lexical and phonological speech modification strategies. This is important as Walsh (2013) asserted saying "An understanding of the ways in which second language teachers modify their speech to learners is clearly important to gaining greater insights into the interactional organization of the second language classroom and to helping teachers make better use of the strategies open to them."

So studying and analyzing these modification strategies is significant to deepen our understanding of what can accelerate students 'acquisition of linguistic competence and if these strategies promote interaction or not.

### **2.1.3 Common Phonological , Syntactic and Lexical Speech Modification Strategies:**

According to Walsh (2013) the most common and obvious speech modification strategies are : using simple vocabularies that students are familiar with , simple and shorter structure, using slower rate of speech , and stressing some words . Ivanova (2011) codified these strategies into three main categories: syntactic that includes using simple , short structure and repetition of utterances lexical modification that includes employing high frequency of simple and basic vocabulary and phonological modifications that include using louder and slower rate of speech and stressing some words. Studies proved that teachers modify the syntactic, lexical, and phonological features of their speech to L2 learners a (Ivanova, 2011). Teachers' syntactic changes made to facilitate learners' comprehension and linguistic processing of information are considered one of the most common features of teacher talk to non-native speakers (Ivanova , 2011). .These syntactic modifications have an impact on teachers length of utterances, distribution of sentence types etc. (Ivanova , 2011). Moreover, there are studies that have studied the lexical features of teachers' speech directed to nonnative speakers and pinpointed that teachers tend to use a set of high frequency or more basic vocabulary items in their discourse (Chaudr on, 1982). It is observed that lexical items chosen by teachers encompass fewer idioms, more proper and concrete nouns, and fewer indefinite pronouns (Ivanova , 2011).The phonological modifications are found to comprise : rate of speech and pauses, pitch, intonation, and stress, and articulation of segments.

### **2.1.4 The Impact of Speech Modification :**

Most of teachers assume that modifying oral input or speech to learners would entail successful learning . Nevertheless , It is indicated that " pre modified input sometimes fails to improve learner's comprehension. A possible reason explaining this fact is that elaboration or simplification of input may not be helpful but detrimental in some occasions."( Loschky, (1994),as cited in Filologia ,2012). Xiaohui (2010) divided the modified input into three

categories which are elaboration input ,enhancement input and interaction ally modified input . The elaboration one means to keep the complex vocabulary and structures that are beyond learners“ level but provides them with clarification and interpretation (Xiaohui ,2010) . This kind of modification is claimed to be more effective As it is stated by Kim (2003) “ that input modification in the direction of elaboration is preferred in SLA on the grounds that elaborated input retains the material that L2 learners need for developing their inter language and provides with natural discourse model.” The second type is more relevant to the written texts in which techniques such as bolding and underlining are used to draw learners“ attention to the target item .The third type is interaction ally modified input which refers to “ the changes to the target structures in a conversation to accommodate potential or actual problems of understanding.” (Xiaohui ,2010,p.4) .It is pinpointed that “ learners demonstrate considerably higher scores on comprehension tests with the opportunity to discuss the meaning of unknown words” (Van den Branden ,2000). Similarly, Baleghizadeh and Borzabadi (2007) found that interactional modifications enhanced reading comprehension more than pre-modifications did. Based on these studies , there is a controversy over whether modification is helpful or not .In this paper, ELI teachers „common syntactic , lexical and phonological modificationstrategies would be spotted .Moreover , The study will pinpoint proficiency level 104 students attitudes toward these modification strategies whether negative or positive .

## 2.2 Previous Studies

Khatib ,Mohammad and Khodabakhsh , , Mohammad conducted a study under the title “The Effect of Modified Speech on Listening to Authentic Speech”. Krashen“s comprehensible input is the theoretical base for their research .The participants were Iranian students majoring in English .They were 80 students divided equally into two homogenous groups. It aims to explore the effect of controlling speech rate on listening comprehension. The experimental group enjoyed the possibility of modified speech through Ulead software version while the control group exposed only to authentic American English spoken by native speakers in programs such as “Opera” and “Dr.Phill”.The research attempts to answer this question :”1) Does slowing down the speech rate facilitate perception of words and listening comprehension of Iranian EFL listeners listening to authentic American speech compared to mere repetition?”.At the end two reliable and valid M.C. listening comprehension and cloze tests were made from the covered materials and administered to the students. The findings showed that slowing down the speech has a positive impact on listening for the identification of words to some extent. However; some words still remained vague albeit reducing the rate to the possible maximum level.

Moreover; Malki, Zainat has conducted a study submitted for MA in TEFL under the title “The Effects of Pre Modified Input, Interaction ally Modified Input, and Modified Output on EFL Learners“ Comprehension of New Vocabularyes”. The research was submitted in 2012 . It aims to study the effects of premodified input, interaction ally modified input and modified output on 80 EFL learners“ comprehension of new words .She relied on Krashen“s comprehensible input as a theoretical base for her research .The first question this study aims to answer was “does

premodified input have any effects on EFL learners' comprehension of new words?. The results of the study answer this question stating that premodified input has positive but low impact on EFL learners' understanding of words. This study also is based on Krashen's input theory as it is its theoretical base. However, it would be different since it aims to investigate the most common phonological, syntactical, and morphological instructional speech modification teachers employed at ELI at KAU. Moreover, the study aims to explore proficiency level 104 students' interactions to the use of these modifications whether these modifications impact their interaction positively or negatively. Moreover, the instruments of the study were observation, recording analysis, and checklist.

### **3. Methods and Procedures**

#### **3.1 Method**

This study adopts an inductive approach. It is a qualitative study in which the findings rely on the results of analyzing 3(9 hours) recorded lectures of 3 different classes. It is a descriptive study since it aims to analyze teachers' common syntactic, lexical, and phonological oral discourse modification strategies. Moreover, the study aims to survey 104 students' interactions to the use of these modifications whether these modifications impact their interaction positively or negatively.

#### **3.2 Research Design:**

The researcher found that the most appropriate design for the study was qualitative design, which involved recording lectures and observing classes to collect data and analyzing the data qualitatively using a checklist. This study follows the inductive approach. It is a descriptive study since it is used to gain information regarding the current position of the phenomena and to describe "what exists" with regard to variables or conditions in a situation (Fred & Perry, 2005).

#### **3.3 Tools and Data Collection Procedures:**

In this study, the researcher observed and recorded two different classes of female students for 6 hours and one class for male students for proficiency level 104 students. The researcher analyzed these recordings to collect data about teachers' common syntactic, lexical, and phonological oral discourse modification strategies including sentence simplification, using simple words, repetition of words and utterances, the speed of speech, intonation, stress, and raising the voice. Moreover, the researcher designed a checklist that is used during observations to help in analyzing the recordings. The researcher observed the classes to investigate students' interactions to the use of these modifications. The purpose of the observation is to pinpoint whether these modifications impact students' interaction positively or negatively. The checklists of the observations were analyzed qualitatively and verified using some of the recordings extracts.

### 3.4 Participants and Setting:

The participants were only limited to proficiency level 104 students .The strategy that is used for choosing the participants was convenience sampling since my sample was the proficiency level 104 students and it is impossible to have access to all of them . Convenience sampling refers to having participants from available population since the access to all members of the entire population is impossible (Fred&Perry,2005).The sample was from ELI at KAU.

## 4. Data Analysis and Results

### 4.1 Data analysis and Results

Using a checklist the researcher designed , the recordings and observations of the three classes were analyzed. The researcher transcribed five extracts to demonstrate the common types of syntactic, lexical and phonological speech modification strategies that have been employed by ELI teachers. The following extracts are taken from a female class .The teacher works with proficiency level 104 students and the focus is grammar and using “will” to indicate future in sentence. She employs several speech modification strategies to help learners to understand the lesson.

As shown in line 4, she repeats sentences because she perhaps wants to draw their attention to this example and accelerate their processing of the information .This strategy belongs to the syntactic modification. Moreover , she uses rising intonation as shown line 9.In line 9-10, she also uses slower rate of speech and stress on the word . This is feasibly to draw students“ attention to her speech and enable them process the utterance .The above strategies are identified as phonological speech modification strategies. Moreover, she simplifies the vocabulary and sentence structure. Throughout the extract, she just uses simple and short sentences and vocabulary. For example, she uses not knowing the time” instead of “indefinite time in line2-3 and uses because rather than since in line 10. This is may be to allow students assimilate her explanation of the rule to accelerate the learning process .These modifications belong to lexical and syntactic types. Moreover , the teacher tends to lower the rate of her speech and to raise her voices in some instances .She also stresses some words such as the word “present perfect” in line5 . She emphasizes this word possibly because it lays at the heart of the lesson .She employs all these speech modification strategies plausibly to draw students“ attention to her speech and enable them process it . These strategies belong to the phonological type of oral modifications. Actually the interaction is not high at the beginning . The teachers just explain and the students gaze at her. Some of them play with their hair. Some of them seems to have daydream. However, the teacher raises her voice to draw their attention. Students start interacting after long explanation and clarification. Suddenly most of them provide examples spontaneously in continuous turns. The following extracts are taken from a male class .The teacher works with proficiency level 104 students and the focus is popular dishes around the world .He employs several speech modification strategies to help learners to understand the lesson .

As shown in the previous extract , it is lucid that the teacher uses more than one kind of speech modification strategy . For example, in line1 , he uses rising intonation when he asks them to think about popular dish of some countries possibly to focus students“ attention on the question . This strategy belongs to phonological oral modification .Moreover, he uses the word “popular” immediately after “famous” to simplify the sentence to students. He tends to use basic vocabulary and the ones students are familiar with to help them assimilate the meaning. This strategy is a lexical oral modification. In line 3, The teacher emphasizes the word “in pair plausibly to draw their attention to that they should work in pair. In line7- 8, he raises his voice saying mansaf perhaps to draw students“ attention to this word and provide them with its pronunciation clearly .He also slows down his speech rate when mentioning the ingredients of this dish probably to help students grasp them. Again in line 17 , he repeats the instruction with rising intonation may be to focus their attention to his instruction and enable them to process it .All the above strategies belong to the phonological type of oral modification. Actually students interact with him fully by providing short answers to his questions. However, he tries to extend their answers by elicitation techniques. In line 10-16 , the teacher tries to get longer answers by asking more questions . The students interact with him providing longer answers. Moreover, all of them get engaged in the task he asks them to do since they make pairs and start discussing with each other immediately and looks concentrated.

This is another extract from the same class . The teacher also makes use of a lot of phonological , syntactic and lexical speech modification strategies possibly to accelerate students comprehension of the lesson .

Similarly the teacher here uses a plethora of speech modification strategies such as rising intonation in saying Taco in line 3 . This is probably because it is a new word for the students so the teacher uses the rising intonation and louder voice to say it clearly to enable them pronounce it correctly .This is a phonological type of modification . In addition, he uses simple sentences and repeats the same structure, questions and vocabulary on purpose such as “what is its popular dish” .This is possibly to help students understand his explanations and instructions .These modifications belong to the syntactic one .Moreover , he uses a slower rate of speech and raising voice in line 13 perhaps to draw their attention to his speech and control them . This belongs to phonological type of speech .Generally he tends to all these strategies to make his explanation understood by his students .Students are highly interactive since they answer his questions immediately without pausing to think . Moreover , all of them are paying attention to him. No one of them seems to be distracted or lost since they all look at him and answer his questions spontaneously. The following extract is taken from a different female class with different teacher. The teacher works with proficiency level 104 students and the focus is reading passages. She employs a myriad of phonological, syntactic and lexical speech modification strategies to help learners to grasp the passages. The extract opens with teacher asking about DNA. She asks LL “the DNA can tell us about what”. Following a long pause that lasts for 3 seconds , she

repeats the utterance with a slower rate possibly to give them a chance to process it and assimilate it. This belongs to the syntactic type of modification. It is apparent that the extract includes several speech modification strategies. As shown in line 1, the teacher stresses the word DNA possibly because it is the core of the passage. So she wants to draw students' attention to this word. This is a phonological modification. There is also much overlapping between teachers' and students' talk.

#### 4.2 Discussion

Drawing from the data of the above analysis, it is apparent that teachers of proficiency level 104 employ a plethora of phonological, syntactic and lexical speech modification strategies. The focus of the study is the common ones that include sentence simplification, using simple words, repetition of words and utterances, the speed of speech, intonation, stress and raising the voice. These strategies recur in all the three classes.

The discussion will be organized in accordance with research questions and hypothesis.

1. What are oral phonological, syntactic and phonological instructional discourse modification strategies used for level 104 students?

The most common ones are sentence simplification, using simple words, repetition of words and utterances, the speed of speech, intonation, stress and raising the voice. Teachers tend to use simple utterance that contains no more than subject, verb and object such as "We move to Mexico". In addition the questions are very simple such as "do you know yoghurt", "why did you use will", and "Do you know Mansaf". As it is shown from the previous example, the questions are very simple and they encompass no more than helping verb, main verb and complement. The three teachers of the three classes tend to use such simple utterance possibly to accelerate students' understanding of the linguistic input and avoid distracting them. Moreover, they tend to use basic vocabulary that their students are familiar with such as "popular" instead of "famous", "not planned" instead of "spontaneous" and "because" rather than "since". In addition, the repetition technique is employed greatly by the teachers such as "What is the popular dish" and "give me example of present perfect tense".

This possibly to preclude ambiguity and distraction resulted from using new vocabularies. They use the same questions and sentences throughout the classes. They do not try to change the word order or the vocabulary of their utterance possibly to focus the students' attention on them and not to distract them. Furthermore, all the teachers in the different classes lower their rate of speech possibly to enable the students to process the linguistic input and assimilate it. For example, in one of the classes the teacher tells the students about the ingredients of Mansaf, he says ">the ingredients of Mansaf are, rice, meat and yogurt <". He mentions them slowly perhaps to allow his students process the information. In addition all teachers use rising intonation and stressing some words plausibly to focus their students on what they are saying. For example, in the male class the teacher asks his students, to "think about the most famous dish" using rising

intonation possibly to focus their attention on the instruction . Moreover, he emphasizes the word “in pair “possibly to draw their attention to that they should work in pair .Furthermore , all the teachers make use of raising their voice strategy possibly to keep control of the class and enable the students to process the information . For example; in one of the classes the teacher raises her voice when she provides an example of the present perfect tens saying “ I HAVE WRITTEN 6 BOOKS “ . This is may be to draw students” attention to the example and enable them hear it clearly. These strategies exist in all the three classes and the teachers employ most of them to clarify their speech to their students to facilitate their processing of the linguistic input.

Based on the data above , the first hypothesis which is that teachers use modified oral discourse is confirmed .

## 2. How do level 104 students react to the use of oral modified discourse strategies?

In the first class, there are attempts to interact while in the second and third there are noticeable interaction. In the first class students remain silent for a long time. However , after long explanation and clarification using different methods of speech modification , they react to the teacher and start answering her questions .In the second and third class students were hyper and interacting greatly with teachers .Drawing upon the above data, the second hypothesis which is students react positively towards the modified oral instructional strategies is also confirmed. The finding of this study reinforces the results of Malki, Khatib and Khodabakhsh that state that lowering the rate of speech and premodified input have a positive impact on students” comprehension .

The results also support the findings of the previous studies that speech modifications have also positive impact on students” interaction. Moreover, this study proves Walsh statement (2013) that sentence simplification , using simple words, repetition of words and utterances , the speed of speech , Intonation and stress are the common types of speech modification . This is because all these types recur significantly in all the three classes. Furthermore , The findings of this study proves that phonological ,syntactic and lexical oral discourse modification strategies promote interaction since it allows students to feel safe and included in the class.

This study is important for EFL teachers and especially ELI teachers since it will raise their awareness of the phonological, syntactic and lexical modification that they use with their students and when it is necessary to employ them. Moreover , a lot of other speech modification strategies that are not the focus of this study have been used in the three different classes such as comprehension checks , confirmation checks , clarification requests , turn completion , finishing a learner contribution , and rephrasing a learners” utterance . Therefore , further studies on such kinds are recommended to pinpoint their effect on students” interaction at ELI at KAU . It is necessary to pin down if they are promoting or decreasing learners” interaction.

Furthermore, interactional modification were employed greatly in all the classes such as using discourse markers. Consequently, further studies are recommended to investigate such

modifications strategies at ELI at KAU and spot their impact on students' interaction since this study is limited to common types of phonological, syntactic and lexical speech modification strategies. During observation, it is found that teachers gave their students some reading passages with some kinds of modification such as bolding and underlining some words. Therefore, it is recommended to conduct more studies about written discourse modification strategies with the same level and investigate students' reaction toward them. Since this study is limited to only proficiency level 104, it is recommended to conduct the same study with the rest of levels with regard to both spoken and written discourse. This is to give more evidence about the effectiveness of speech modification strategies and the positive reaction of students toward them. It is also found that teachers' support play an effective role along with speech modifications to promote interactions. Teachers often provide students with positive feedback when the students supply the correct answers such as "great", "Excellent", and "very good". Moreover, they use some facial expressions and body gestures to encourage them to speak. For example, Teachers tend to smile and look at the students when they answer and clap when they provide correct answers.

## 5. Conclusion

In effect, this study investigates teachers' common phonological, syntactic and lexical speech modification strategies and their impact on students' reaction. It focuses on proficiency level 104 students. Three recordings of three different classes and teachers were analyzed to explore the common speech modification strategies. The analysis shows that the most common speech modification strategies that are caught in the three classes are: sentence simplification, using simple words, avoiding synonyms, repetition of words, the speed of speech, intonation, stress and raising the voice. Moreover, it is discernable that students react in a positive way toward these strategies. Therefore, this manifests that using speech modification strategies are effective in facilitating and accelerating students' learning. This reinforces the findings of the previous studies. This study proves that the phonological, syntactic and lexical oral discourse modification strategies that ELI teachers employ have an effective impact on students since it promotes interaction in the class and prevent distraction.

## References

- 1- Chiang and Dunkel .(1992).The Effect of Speech Modification, Prior Knowledge, and Listening Proficiency on EFL Lecture Learning. TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 345-374
- 2- Giouroukakis, Honigsfeld, Endres & Peluso .(2008). Pre-service ESL Teachers' Instructional Discourse During One-on-One Tutoring. ELTED Vol. 11, ,p.9-14

- 3- Creese, Angela.(2005).Teacher Collaboration and Talk in Multilingual Classrooms. London : the Cromwell Press Ltd.
- 4- Fred, L., & Perry, J. (2005). Research in applied Linguistics. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 5- Ivanova , Jenia.(2011). The Effects of Teacher Talk on L2 Llearners'' Ccomprehension. Utah : The University of Utah
- 6- Khatib, M., &Khodabakhsh, M. R. (2010). The Effect of Modified Speech on Listening to Authentic Speech. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1(5), 685–693.
- 7- Maleki, Z., &Pazhakh, A. (2012). The Effects of Pre Modified Input, Interactionally Modified Input, and Modified Output on EFL Learners'' Comprehension of New Vocabularies. International Journal of Higher Education, 1(1), 128–137.
- 8- Salazar, P. (2009). Comprehensible input and learning .
- 9- Tabatabaei, O., &Yakhabi, M. (2011). The Relationship between Morphological Awareness and Vocabulary Size of EFL Learners. English Language Teaching, 4(4), 262–274.
- 10- Walsh, S. (2013) Classroom Discourse and Teacher Development. : Edinburgh University Press 11- Walsh, S. (2006) Investigating classroom discourse . New York: Routledge .
- 11- Xiaohui , HAN ,(2010). An Empirical Study on the Effects of Comprehensible Input on Incidental English vocabulary Recognition. Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Bimonthly) Vol. 33 No. 6.p. 91-109.