

**INTERROGATING THE SOCIO-POLITICAL EQUATION OF  
LECTURER-STUDENTS' RELATIONSHIP IN CLASSROOM  
SITUATIONS**

**BY**

**ADIKA, OPEYEMI JACOB**  
**ENG/14/1952**

**SUBMITTED TO:**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES,  
FACULTY OF ARTS,  
FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OYE-EKITI**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE  
AWARD OF BACHELOR OF ARTS**

**NOVEMBER, 2018**

## **CERTIFICATION**

This is to certify that the research work was carried out by ADIKA, Opeyemi Jacob with matriculation number, ENG/14/1952 in the department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Federal University Oye-Ekiti, under my supervision.

---

**Adaku Amaechi**  
**Supervisor**

---

**Date**

---

**Dr. Paul Onanuga**  
**Head-of-Department**

---

**Date**

## **DEDICATION**

This research work is dedicated to Almighty God, the behemoth of lore, my parents, Mr. Jacob Adeniyi Adika & Mrs. Kikelomo Oluwatoyin Adika, my siblings; Jesutofunmi, Blessing Adika and of course my pundits across the macrocosm.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I candidly appreciate the LORD God Almighty, for giving me the copious grace and privilege to successfully write this project, even though I never knew I would ever be able to write an acknowledgement, but lately, I came to realized that if the Lord does not build a house, those who build labour in vain. I express my sincere gratitude to heavenly father!

My sincere appreciation goes to my unflagging pilots: Mr Jacob Adeniyi Adika and Mrs Kikelomo Oluwatoyin Adika, who helped in steering my life and career to appropriate directions all the way. For I know, that your supports and prayers have been what has been keeping me going from the scratch. It is my earnest plea that the fruit of your labours on me and my siblings will not turn sour when ripe! God bless you for me.

My undiluted appreciation goes to my Head of Department, Dr Paul Onanuga and my lecturers that taught me during my degree programme. The first woman I met in my pre-degree days, Dr Sandra Nwagboso, who turns to be a mother and a mentor; Dr (Mrs) Chinyelu Agwu, my lecturer, who turns to be mother till her last day in Federal University Oye-Ekiti, Mrs Akinwumi, Dr Adeniyi, Dr. Iruegbu Obinna, Dr Harry Olufunwa among others. I celebrate you all and thank you for impacting my life.

To my indefatigable supervisor, Adaku Amaechi, who sincerely helped me in the course of this project from the Yes to the Amen, and did not for once neglect me or leave me to myself. I remember the times she will say to me “Jacob, you can do it, just go and use this method and that method...”. I candidly appreciate you ma, you are more than a supervisor, a lecturer, but a mother to me, and you are one in a million.

I cannot but remember everyone that took me as their child and catered for my needs in one way or the other. I appreciate Mr. & Mrs. Ademola Adika. I cannot but celebrate and appreciate my own uncle Bro. Abel Olamide Adika (Ableman), the general overseer of Kingdom Light House Ministry (worldwide) and everyone connected to this great ministry starting from Bro. Tomide, Bro. Daniel, Bro. Dammy, Bro. Femi, Sis. Roseline Ajala, Sis Juwon among others. I will be indebted for not appreciating my own siblings in person of Jesutofun Adika, Blessing Adika, Wuraola, Mary, Busayo, Ayobami, Samuel Ojo, Musa Samuel, Esther (Isemilate), Femi Adesola among others.

To those that helped me in the course of my project, the likes of my friends and well-wishers: Dr Adeniyi, Adenekan Samson (Psalmology), Ojumoola, David Kayode (my own twin brother and my Govy 1), Auta Michael, who will always release his generator for me to use when my laptop battery got spoilt. Also, my co-supervisee, Olusola Abiola, Oyetibo Naimat. To my course mates and friends: Alade Blessing Modupe (my deputy-governor), Adejulo Samuel Oluwatobilola, and my entire Golden class of 2018, I would have love to mention you all but I celebrate you.

To all hommies; Adenuga Godwin Boluwaji (Uptimum), Ogunleye Boluwatife, my vice (my love); Auta Michael, Olowolafe Kikelomo (the one who really cares). My school daughters: Kehinde, Taiwo, Timileyin, Semiloore, Ruth, Oyindamola among others and my school sons: Ope-Gangan, Samuel, Sunday, John among others. To all EXCOS of ASF 2017/18 Academic Session and all members, I sight you and appreciate you all for your support and kindness.

Finally, to all unsung persons in this acknowledgment, you are all important to me, I will not turn rebellious and bad in your hands, Thank you so much.



## **TABLE OF CONTENT**

Title page	i
Certification	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgement	iv-v
Table of Content	vi-viii
Abstract	ix

### **Chapter One**

1.0	Introduction
1.1	Background to the Study
1.2	Statement of Problem
1.3	Aim and Objectives
1.4	Research Questions
1.5	Scope of the Study
1.6	Significance of the Study

### **Chapter Two – Literature Review**

2.0	Introduction
2.1	A Review of Relevant Literature

2.1.0 The Concept, Socio-political Equation

2.1.1 Social Inequality

2.1.2 Scholarly Perspectives of Lecturer-Students Relationship

2.1.3 Lecturers and Students' Expectation

2.2 Concept of Power and Inequality Evident in Lecturer-Students Relationship

2.3 The Role of Language in identifying Socio-political Issues

2.4 Theoretical Framework

2.4.1 Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis

### **Chapter Three - Research Methodology**

3.0 Introduction

3.1 Research Design

3.2 Research Procedure

3.3 Method of Data Collection

3.4 Instrumentation

3.5 Research Participants

### **Chapter Four - Data Presentation and Discussion of Findings**

4.0 Introduction

4.1 Systematic Presentation and Discussion of Findings



#### 4.1.0 Overview of Classroom Discourse

##### 4.1.1 Identification of data

#### 4.2 Linguistic Analysis of the texts (Vocabulary, Grammar and Textual Structure)

##### 4.2.1 Lexis

##### 4.2.2 Grammar

##### 4.2.3 The Use of Code-switching

#### 4.3 Analysing Text 3 and Text 3

### **Chapter Five**

#### 5.0 Summary

#### 5.1 Findings

#### 5.2 Conclusion and Recommendation

### **References**

## **ABSTRACT**

This study is to critically examine the socio-political equation of lecturer-students' relationship in a classroom situation. The main objective of this study is to investigate lecturer-students' relationship in a classroom situation focusing on the social equation and political equation evident in the relationship and also to explicate how the socio-political equation of this relationship affects or influences productivity in students. Through observation, the investigator was able to collect words and expressions used by the lecturers in classroom to portray socio-political imbalance in classroom discourse which was critically analyzed. From the investigation, it was discovered that in most classroom discourses there are some linguistic portrayals of power and inequality in lecturer-students' relationship and this is mostly in the lecturers' lexis and syntactic use of language. Nevertheless, the research also bring to fore that despite the reflection of social and political imbalance in some classroom discourse, there are other discourse that shows or project socio-political equation. Recommendation was made to improve learning through having equation in the relationship between lecturers and students especially in classroom situations.

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.0 Background to the Study

It is now well known, after Gramsci (1946) and Althusser (1971), that the institutions of civil society such as family, school, religion, media, market, advertising, among others, have their own specific definable means of constructing texts, meanings and thus discourses. The use of symbolic practices of these institutions apparently encodes their ideologies. This implies that the use of language is neither neutral nor straightforward. It collapses the neutrality of language as a strict medium to send and to receive messages. Language is thus understood as a structuring and inflected medium. In this light, it can therefore be said that any act of symbolic expression emerging from an institution inevitably forms the location where the ideologies of that institution are transacted and sometimes contested.

The word 'ideology' was first coined by the French rationalist philosopher Destutt de Tracy in the 1790s to describe the 'science of ideas' as opposed to metaphysics. He proposed ideology as a discipline which would enhance people to recognize their prejudices and biases. It could simply be put as a perspective for social subjects to perceive and interact with their immediate social environment. It is the common sense of the social subjects. For Kavanagh (1998:306), ideology is a term that embodies all the problems associated with the cultural complexity of language; it has a rich history, during which it has taken on various, sometimes, contradictory meanings.

Ideology is closely linked to power and language which emanates from or could be traced to the concept of socio-political issues. Firstly, language is the commonest form of social behaviour. Societal differences are constituted (if they do not exist) and legitimized (if they

already exist) through the forms of language use (black and white, poor and rich, teacher and student etc.). Secondly, following Althusser, it is learnt that the power relations, by their very character, are always asymmetrical. These asymmetrical power relations, which are part of its ideologies, are negotiated and perpetuated through its discourse.

Power is an indispensable element of any critical discourse analysis (CDA). Thus, imagining lecturers as the most powerful creatures in the class seems believable, but how is power relation represented in lecturer's discourse or conversation? From a Marxist point of view, as reported by Wodak (2001), Critical Discourse Analysis maintains that language is not powerful on its own – it gains power by the use powerful people make of it. Along the same vein, Jones (2007) says, “words don't produce or interpret themselves; people, engaged over some matter, are responsible for that”.

Also, Foucault (1972) sometimes refers to power as knowledge, because in discourse, power and knowledge are working together in relation to resistance. It may be implied that what gives a teacher power in the class is his knowledge; and discourse not only transmits and produces power, but also can undermine and expose it. Now, to have a clear understanding of the concept of power, it calls on a necessity to explore or investigate how this power is linguistically expressed by lecturers and even students in the classroom.

Looking at most organizations, relationship is seen as the main way to achieve success. Often, the ability to effectively interact with others plays a pivotal role in the successes or failures of the individual. Within our society, many professionals including doctors, politicians, social workers, lecturers, and so forth rely on social skills to be effective. Inherent within these professions is a level of leadership, as each position demands the ability to effectively understand and navigate human behavior. (Juchniewicz, 2008, p. 1) Lecturing is considered a demanding

and challenging social activity in our society with the ultimate goal of training students to acquire the ability, knowledge, social values and skills in order to apply and integrate them in the community.

Generally, it is agreed that good teaching involves good communication between the lecturer and students which enhance good relationship between the two. The best productivity in a classroom comes from effective co-operation between the lecturers and the students. Therefore, lecturers' roles can be vital to the efficacy of the language learning. Lecturers need to be supportive because a supportive lecturer is one who not only creates efficient and positive classroom environment but also who encourages students to behave well in classroom and be motivated.

In respect of the above, from the perspective of critical discourse analysis, Dangel and Durden (2010), claimed teacher's talk is a powerful classroom tool to convey and construct meaning. Henceforth, it is plausible that while using a language, a teacher certainly conveys his thought. More so, Dangel and Durden assert that "teacher's" words and the way they use them create meaning for students as well as themselves" (p. 75)

Baumeister and Leary (1995) published a review article focusing on the human need to belong, proposing the 'belongingness hypothesis', that 'human beings are fundamentally and pervasively motivated by a need to belong, that is, by a strong desire to form and maintain enduring interpersonal attachments' (p. 522). Subsequent research has demonstrated that quality relationships have an impact on human beings with respect to motivation, social competence and wellbeing in general (Bergin & Bergin, 2009).

Therefore, this research work aimed at exploring the concept of power and inequality in lecturer-students' relationship using the classroom discourse.

## **1.1 Statement of the Problem**

Language and in fact vocal productions have different functions and according to the speech act theory of J. L. Austin, utterances both written and spoken have particular effect on both parties in a discourse. Many researchers have written on classroom discourse and the universal trend in power and inequality in classroom settings.

While Hussain et al (2013) based their research on the descriptive study of a teacher's perspective regarding creating and maintaining a positive teacher-student relationship with the teacher's professional experience at undergraduate levels, Bruney (2012) deals majorly with how the teacher-student relationship influences the development of trust and emotional intelligence in the elementary classroom. It is evident that these researchers have looked into the different facets of lecturer-students relationship in classroom situation and also its influence on the students' performance but a few have used Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a theory to explore or analyze the socio-political equations in lecturer-students relationship as it may be in classroom situations. This study will then focus on exploring lecturer-students classroom relationship and illustrating the concept of power and inequality in the relationship.

## **1.2 Aim and Objectives**

It is the aim of this study to explore socio-political equation in lecturer-students relationship at the classroom level.

Specifically this study wants to achieve the following objectives:

- To investigate socio-political equation in lecturer-students relationship.
- To explore the linguistic signifier of lecturer-students relationship in classroom discourse.

- To explicate how the socio-political equation of this relationship affect or influence productivity in students.

### **1.3 Research Questions**

The research work attempts to answer the questions below:

- ◊ What socio-political equations are evident in lecturer-students relationship?
- ◊ What linguistic signifiers of socio-political equation is evident in lecturer-students' relationship?
- ◊ How does the socio-political equation of lecturer-students relationship influence students' productivity?

### **1.4 Scope of the Study**

This study concentrates on the socio-political equation of lecturer-students relationship in the classroom situation. It is an attempt to investigate power and inequality in classroom interactions existing between lecturers and students. It makes use of the Critical Discourse Analysis, an approach to Discourse Analysis. The data for the study will emanate from the discourse prevalent among lecturer and their students in a classroom setting. This will be recorded manually and analyzed based on the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach.

### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

This research mediates between social science and linguistics. Social science is a branch of science that deals with the institutions and functioning of human society and with the interpersonal relationships of individuals as members of the society. On the other hand, linguistics is the scientific study of language. Obviously, the research is studying the objects of concerns in the two disciplines. In a succinct description, we can say it investigates the role of

language in human society focusing on the interpersonal (lecturer-students) relationships in a classroom discourse.

The need to embark on this research work is justified by the concern of the researcher to bring to fore the impact that formulates the lecturer-students relationship in critical discourse analysis. This study will serve as a mirror in exploring the concept of power and inequality in lecturer-students relationship and probably its influence on classroom discourse. It will be of immense help to the scholastic work as new views will be offered and more perspectives to contemporary lecturer-students relationship will be given attention. It presents information not only to add to the current literature on the relationship between lecturers and students, and the communicative language teaching approach, but also to bring another dimension of understanding to the data collected through classroom discourse. It provides important information and powerful data capable of helping lecturers and students see the impact of their relationships/interaction in the learning process. It will as well help intended researcher to source for more information on critical discourse analysis (CDA).



## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.0 Introduction**

The issue of power in education has been explored in some depth by various scholars; yet, as Oyler (1996) points out, most of these explorations and analyses are fairly theoretical, abstract, or general in nature, and do not go into detail about how power relations are played out inside specific classrooms. Exceptions to this generalization include Oyler (1994)'s own work and that of Gore (1996). On the other hand, while the topics of power and inequality have each been the focus of empirical and theoretical investigation in educational research, the two have rarely if ever been juxtaposed. Researchers have looked either at power (e.g. Apple, 1982; Gore, 1994), teacher-students relationship (Hamre et al, 2012; Birch & Ladd, 1997). However, as Maxwell (1991) and others have noted, there is a relationship, and an intimate and important one at that. This study examines the socio-political issues (power and inequality) in the relationship between lecturers and students, and specifically to suggest equality in the aspects of linguistics and interaction in a classroom situation. This is based upon the premise that teaching is inherently a moral activity. The morality of teaching, in turn, has far less to do with distinguishing between good and bad practices. Rather, my interest in this research concerns ways in which moral values, conflicts of values, and moral dilemmas are played out in the context of classroom discourse. In the process of engaging with this issue, it is useful to apply different yet related theoretical frameworks to the micro-analysis of linguistic and other interaction in classrooms. The present paper constitutes one such application.

## **2.1 A Review of Relevant Literature**

The topic of power and inequality and their several representations and portrayal in lecturer-students' relationship is such that has been discussed by some scholars. However, scholars, especially those in education and teaching line have done so much work on the issue of power in teacher-student and student-teacher relationship but only few focused on the aspect of language use to portray dominance in the classroom, none has really focused on post-secondary education (tertiary institution) and also, only few focused on having egalitarianism (having equal or balance socio-political interaction). Here, interrogation will be placed on socio-political equation that is, having equality in both social and political aspect of lecturer-students relationship in classroom situations. Finally, scholarly researches on the topic will be reviewed.

The term classroom discourse refers to the language that lecturers and students use in communicating with each other in the classroom or during lectures. Talking, or conversation, is the medium through which most teaching takes place, so that study of classroom discourse is the study of the process of face-to-face classroom teaching or discussion. The first use of audiotape recorders in classrooms was reported in the 1930s, and during the 1960s there was a rapid growth in the number of studies based on analysis of transcripts of classroom discourse. In 1973, Barak Rosenshine and Norma Furst described seventy-six different published systems for analyzing classroom discourse.

### **2.1.0 The Concept, Socio-Political Equation**

The concept, "socio-political" is defined according to Merriam Websters Dictionary (2018) as one relating to, or involving a combination of social and political factors. Also Cambridge English Dictionary defines it as "the tool used to describe the differences between groups of people relating to their political beliefs, social class, etc. It is simply talking about

having different social background, ideology and power negotiation in various social spheres such as education, family, government, religion, economy, entertainment among others. It explicates the issue of power and inequality found in these social gatherings or organization. It equally refers to the term that helps identify various issues regarding inequality both politically, socially, academically among others. The term is somewhat related to the issue of power and inequality in the society (social inequality).

### **2.1.1 Social Inequality**

Social inequality refers to relational processes in society that have the effect of limiting or harming a group's social status, social class, and social circle. Areas of social inequality include access to voting rights, freedom of speech and assembly, the extent of property rights and access to education, health care, quality housing, traveling, transportation, vacationing and other social goods and services.

Apart from that, it can also be seen in the quality of family and neighbourhood life, occupation, job satisfaction, and access to credit. If these economic divisions harden, they can lead to social inequality. The reasons for social inequality can vary, but are often broad and far reaching. It can emerge through a society's understanding of appropriate gender roles, or through the prevalence of social stereotyping. It can also be established through discriminatory legislation. Social inequalities exist between ethnic or religious groups, classes and countries making the concept of social inequality a global phenomenon. Social inequality is different from economic inequality, though the two are linked.

Also, it could refer to disparities in the distribution of economic assets and income as well as between the overall quality and luxury of each person's existence within a society, while economic inequality is caused by the unequal accumulation of wealth; social inequality exists because the lack of wealth in certain areas prohibits these people from obtaining the same housing, health care, etc. as the wealthy, in societies where access to these social goods depends on wealth.

Social inequality is closely linked to racial inequality, gender inequality, and wealth inequality and educationally. The way people behave socially, through racist or sexist practices and other forms of discrimination, tends to trickle down and affect the opportunities and wealthy individuals can generate for themselves.

In family settings for instance, fathers are culturally given the overall power to make and enforce decision without negotiation with mother as it affects their children, this is evident most especially in most African countries. The major tool used in identifying the issues surrounding power relation in the above is majorly through language and action.

In its negotiation of power relation in the society, it looks into the various level of educational background both the higher level (post-secondary education or tertiary institutions) and the lower level (pre-secondary and secondary education) where inequality is also an order of the day. In classroom for instance, it is evident that the lecturers wield the supreme power over the students such that they exercise the power even during lectures. This in turn according to research may mar the relationship between lecturers and students and also could affect effective classroom discourse.

“Equation” on the other hand is defined as “an assertion that two expressions are equal, expressed by writing the two expressions separated by an equal sign; from which one is to determine a particular quantity”. Also, equation is defined as “a small correction to observed values to remove the effects of systematic errors in an observation according to English Dictionary (2008). Simply put, “equation” is trying to put a balance on various differences both socially and politically. Bringing the two concepts together, the “socio-political” and “equation”, the concept of “socio-political equation” is to interrogate inequality in Lecturer-Students relationship and this is the concern of this research work to look at the inequalities or the exercise of power that are evident in Lecturer-Students Relationship in a classroom situation or setting which could be through their choice of words during lectures or the level at which students were able to relate well with their lecturers for effective learning.

### **2.1.2 Scholarly Perspectives of Lecturer-Students Relationship**

Lecturer-Students relationship is one of the most essential factors that spell the excellence of the student both academically and some other aspects of life. There is a great deal of literature that provides substantial evidence that strong relationship between teachers and students are essential components to the healthy academic development of all students in schools (Birch & Ladd, 1998; Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Pianta, 1999; Eccles & Wigfield, 2002).

Successful lecturers are those that possess the ability to maximise the learning potential of all students in their class. Developing positive relationships between a lecturer and students is a fundamental aspect of quality teaching and student learning. Positive lecturer-students relationships promote a sense of academic belonging and encourage students to participate cooperatively. Students develop confidence to experiment and succeed in an environment where they are not restricted by the fear of failure nor subdued by the power of inequality employed in

the classroom. Lecturers are able to assist students with motivation and goal setting, and students can turn to them for advice and guidance.

This body of literature involves several genres of research that have been conducted over decades, investigating the interactions between lecturers and their students and what effect those interactions have on learning. There is credible evidence that the nature and quality of lecturers' interactions with students most especially in a classroom has a significant effect on their learning (Brophy-Herb, Lee, Nievar, & Stollak, 2007). Educators, psychologists, social constructivists, and sociologists have all contributed to the growing interest in targeting interventions toward improvements in the quality of lecturers' interactions with their students.

Hamre et al (2012) posits that “teachers need to be actively engaged in interactions with students in order for learning to occur” (p. 98). This presupposes the essentialism of a positive lecturer-students relationship most especially in an academic environment.

Today, knowledge dissemination by the lecturers is becoming an issue without mutual understanding and relationship between the lecturers and students. Literature reveals that a positive relationship between the teacher and students is much needed and becoming fundamental in the holistic development of students as argued by Hamre & Pianta, (2001). Many studies have pointed the importance of understanding the development of high quality teacher-student relationships on children's and adolescents' outcomes (Hoy & Spero, 2005). Positive teacher-student relationships are high in closeness like mutual respect, caring, and warmth between teachers and students (Birch & Ladd, 1997; Hughes, Gleason, & Zhang, 2005; Pianta, 2001). This presupposes that even in tertiary institutions were lecturer is being used as against teacher; the above is applicable because both are concerned with impacting knowledge in

students. There is a need for positive lecturer-students relationship which could give students the freedom of expression that will foster effective learning.

Lecturer-students relationships can be the key to whether positive or negative motivations exist in students' attitude toward learning, and relationships can have a deep effect on someone's life style. By having a supportive relationship with lecturers, students will be motivated, will feel protected and this sense of security and friendship will create an empathy which is important to get students interested and desirable to succeed.

Hargreaves (1994) stated:

Good teaching is charged with positive emotion. It is not just a matter of knowing one's subject, being efficient, having correct competencies, or learning all the right techniques. Good teachers are not just well oiled machines. They are emotional, passionate beings who connect with their students and fill their work and classes with pleasure, creativity, challenge and joy. (p. 835).

From the statement above, Hargreaves posits that effective and efficient teaching is charged not only by the amount of lecturer's intelligence or competence of a particular course or the exercise of power in the classroom discourse but with positive emotion in the classroom. He further explains that good teachers (lecturers) are not just well oiled machines but are emotional, passionate beings that connect with their students and fill their work and classes with pleasure, creativity.

The lecturer-students relationship has an important impact on students' attitudes and achievements, as well as the relationships that students create inside the school. If students feel comfortable with the lecturers and the environment in the school, they can construct more positive relations such as friendship, develop a better way to behave in the social context and improve their social skills (Larson, 2011). In addition to these possibilities, Nugent (2009)

suggests that by creating healthy relationships, teachers can motivate students during the learning process, which is one of the main objectives in a teacher's practice. This author also suggests that in order to do this, lecturers have to be aware of the students' emotional and academic needs. By these means, the creation of positive relationships between lecturers and students would be easier.

According to Giles (2008), it is during the first lesson of a course when both students and teacher establish the bases for this relationship. The greetings, the rules and what is expected from each other are discussed. Furthermore, according to a study performed by Marzano and Marzano (2003), it is where they can establish the procedures and rules related to the interaction and behavior inside the classroom which comprise the basis for a positive relationship. One aspect to take into account when studying lecturer-students relationships is the expectations they have about each other, which is a characteristic that defines how satisfied they feel. In our experiences inside a classroom, as a teacher and/or a student, the more satisfied both parties are, the better relationship they can build.

### **2.1.3 Lecturers' and Students' Expectations**

When developing a positive relationship inside the classroom, certain factors need to be taken into account that may affect, either in a positive or a negative way, the lecturer-student relationship. One of these important factors is lecturers' and students' beliefs or expectations. For example, a lecturer has expectations when working with new students. Owing to educational and social demands, lecturers expect students to develop and improve not only their academic and social skills, but also the skills needed to grow as a person in a changing society. These expectations not only influence a lecturer's behavior and practice, but they also have an impact on their relationships with students.



Perhaps even more importantly, Bordia, Wales, Pittam, and Gallois, (2006, p. 3) claim that, “the fulfillment of students’ expectations may be directly linked to motivation and performance in language learning.” For example, the ways in which both the lecturers and the students behave in the classroom may, to a certain extent, be influenced by their expectations of each other (Tsiplakides & Keramida, 2009). According to Narváez (2009), there are two ways students conceptualize lecturers. One way is the lecturer as a person. Students expect a lecturer to be interested in them, not only as students, but as people as well. The other way is the professional concept of a lecturer. According to the students in Narváez’s study, this refers to the level of the lecturer’s commitment and dedication to his/her practice. Students like a lecturer who is concerned about them, and who does not consider his/her profession only as a job. The combination of these views helps to understand how expectations are constructed and also understand that the relationship between lecturers and students is not only the responsibility of the lecturers, but also of the students.

The relationship between lecturers and students affects the quality of students’ motivation to learn and classroom learning experiences. According to Davis (2003),

Operating as socializing agents, teachers can influence students’ social and intellectual experiences via their abilities to instill values in children such as the motivation to learn; by providing classroom contexts that stimulate students’ motivation and learning; by addressing students’ need to belong; and by serving a regulatory function for the development of emotional, behavioral, and academic skills. Moreover, supportive relationships with teachers may play an important developmental role during the transition to and through middle school. However, developing relationships with an early adolescent presents unique challenges to middle school teachers (p.207).

From the above, I can say that it is important to have lecturers who care for their students’ needs and strengths, and who holds a supportive relationship with their students, giving them the same chances and opportunities to participate in the learning process. These opportunities make students feel comfortable and free to interact in the classroom and improve their academic skills.

A lecturer who cares about their students transmits knowledge affectively and has a good interaction with them. In addition he/she also provides the students the opportunity to create an emotional link. Allen, Gregory, Mikami, Lun, Hamre, & Pianta (2013) suggest that “improving the quality of teacher-student interactions within the classroom depends upon a solid understanding of the nature of effective teaching for adolescents” (p. 77). Allen et al., 2013 cites Brophy, 1999; Eccles & Roeser, 1999; Pressley et al., 2003; Soar & Soar, 1979 who studied a number of descriptions of classroom environments or quality teaching discussed in the educational and developmental literatures listing factors likely to be related to student learning (p. 77). Allen also notes that Hamre and Pianta developed an assessment approach that organizes features of teacher-student interactions into three major domains: emotional supports, classroom organization, and instructional supports (p.77). The emotional link makes the students feel comfortable in front of the teacher and class, which is essential the student’s success or failure. Classroom organization is the way lecturers manage the classroom in order to achieve several goals, first of all classroom goals, which encompasses the way that lecturers physically arrange the classroom for learning. Instructional supports are important to help lecturers to provide the best strategies, support which will better help them to differentiate instruction and meet all students’ needs and promote their engagement in the learning process.

Normally, lecturers have an important role and effect on students. Students’ successes and failures can be directly linked or attributed to a lecturer’s effectiveness and how he or she leads and manages his or her classroom and how he or she communicates and motivates students to learn. When students have supportive relationships with their lecturers, they feel more motivated and engaged in the learning process. A caring teacher tries to create a good classroom environment is the one who students will respond to, and the students will be more able to learn.

Weber, Martin, & Cayanus, 2005 (Mazer, et al., 2013, p.255), found that when students consider their classroom work to be meaningful, have the opportunity to demonstrate their competence, and believe their input is vital to the course, they are motivated to communicate with their instructors for relational, functional, and participatory reasons. Interested and involved students learn better. “Students with high interest perceive a content area to be important, are active and involved in the subject, and feel knowledgeable in the subject matter” (Mitchell, 1993; Tobias, 1994). According to, Krapp, Hidi, & Renninger, 1992 (cited by Joseph P. Mazer, 2013, p. 256) “Interest is often triggered in the moment by certain environmental factors (e.g., teacher behavior) and can be characterized from the perspective of the cause (the conditions that induce interest) or from the standpoint of the person who is interested.” Mazer (2012) notes “Students who experience heightened emotional interest are pulled toward a content area because they are energized, excited, and emotionally engaged by the material” (p.99). It is crucial to be inserted in a safe environment where students can feel engaged and motivated to learn, share their experiences, and demonstrate their competence.

## **2.2 Concept of Power and Inequality Evident in Lecturer-Students Relationship**

The lecturers have been seen as the ones who exercise power in a classroom setting because of their institutional position. Being the one who decide content and aim of a lesson, they are seen as the ones who control classroom interaction and steer it to the pre-determined direction. However, the institutional position that places the lecturer in a more powerful position in a classroom compared to students should be separated from the discursive power that is enacted in the interaction between the lecturers and students. To this end, Thornborrow (2002) and Manke (1997) argue that the institutional position does not automatically allow the teacher to control the interaction in a classroom, but rather that the power relations in a classroom are

constantly being negotiated through interaction. These studies show that discursive power is not a static phenomenon that someone can possess; rather it is created through the contributions that every participant makes to the interaction. Thus, since the interaction in the classroom is shaped by both the lecturers and students, also the latter should be seen as important contributors to classroom power relations.

The institutional setting and the interaction in the classroom have to be taken into consideration when examining the construction of power relations through classroom interaction, since the institutional setting greatly influences the interactional context (Thornborrow 2002). Thus, even though institutional and interactional power can be seen as two separate factors, both views are important in constructing the overall picture of classroom power relations and having an influence on each other.

### **2.3 The Role of Language in identifying socio-political Issues**

Language is the employment of written or spoken words to communicate. It is fundamentally essential for communication and interpersonal interaction among individuals. In the society, language has several roles it performs. It could be a means of expressing one's feelings, emotions and thoughts. It could also be a means for the exchange of greetings and pleasantries among strangers or familiar people, thereby bringing about unification and familiarity. Language also helps in trading, and other business interactions. To ask questions, reply to them and express satisfaction, language is very essential. It is also the tool for the understanding of a person or people's speech community. For the purpose of education, telling of stories and recollection of experiences, language is also instrumental. Without language, it becomes extremely difficult to do all of these. Feelings, intentions and situations cannot be expressed. In fact, it becomes difficult to find out who a person truly is without language. For example, a deaf and dumb

person who cannot express himself in signs will be difficult to understand or identify. As earlier stated, language is mainly divided into two: verbal and non-verbal language. Verbal language is the spoken medium of communication while non-verbal language includes writings, signs and gestures used to express ideas or communicate. At this juncture, it is noteworthy that one of the major roles of language is the identifying socio-political issues. In Fairclough's approaches Critical Discourse Analysis, particularly discourse as a social practice. He believes that our language, which shapes our social identities and interactions, knowledge systems, and beliefs, is also shaped by them in turn. To reach the goal of helping to raise the awareness to the question that language can influence the dominance of one group over another.

## **2.4 Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework instrumental for the analysis of how the socio-political equation is linguistically portrayed in lecturer-students relationship in classroom situation is Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis.

### **2.4.1 Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis**

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a linguistic field concerned with the analysis of texts or spoken discourse with the purpose of revealing and illustrating social elements like power, dominance, bias and inequality. The concern of critical discourse analysts is to understand, expose and oppose social inequality. This is why the concepts of discourse, genre, and style are intimately connected with each other. They are dealing with the macro and micro levels of sociological and linguistic studies. There is a dialectic relationship between social actors or individuals (micro structure) and the social practices and values (macro structure). In this background, a multiplicity of texts is in close interaction with social parameters to bring about

different ideological, identities and power structures. In this respect, the voice given to the macro structures, i.e. government and institutions or the micro structures i.e. individuals are immensely affected by the theorists' ideological orientations. However, Fairclough (1995) defines Critical Discourse Analysis as follows:

By critical discourse analysis I mean discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony. (pp. 132-133)

Fairclough approaches Critical Discourse Analysis, particularly discourse as a social practice. He believes that our language, which shapes our social identities and interactions, knowledge systems, and beliefs, is also shaped by them in turn. To reach the goal of helping to raise the awareness to the question that language can influence the dominance of one group over another, Fairclough has put a great emphasis on raising the level of people's consciousness, for he assumes that in discourse, the subjects do not, strictly speaking, know what they are doing, and they are unaware of the potential social impact of what they do or utter. His way of thinking implies some other notions. First, language is a part of the society and not somehow external to it. Second, language is a social process. Third, language is a socially conditioned process, conditioned that is by other (non-linguistic) parts of society (Fairclough, 1989). Fairclough's notion of text is exactly the same as Halliday's, and this term covers both written discourse and spoken discourse. Halliday's view of language is as a 'social act'. Fairclough believes that text is a product, not a process. Fairclough employs the term 'discourse' to refer to the complete

process of social interaction. Text is merely a sector of this process, because he examines three elements of discourse, namely *text*, *interaction*, and *social context*. In addition to text itself, the process of social interaction involves the process of text production and text interpretation. Hence, text analysis is inferably a part of discourse analysis. Fairclough (1989) identifies three dimensions for CDA:

**Description** is the stage which is concerned with formal properties of the text. **Interpretation** is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction by seeing the text as the product of the process of production and as a resource in the process of interpretation. **Explanation** is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context, with the social determination of the process of production and interpretation, and their social effects (pp. 26-27).

In all these stages, analysis is the main concern, but its nature is different in each stage. Analysis in the first stage limits its boundaries to labeling the formal properties of the text and regards text as an object. In the second phase, Critical Discourse Analysis goes through the analysis of the cognitive process of the participants and their interactions. When a speaker utters a word, a cognitive process occurs for the listener to decode what he said. Finally in the third stage, the aim is to explain the relationship between social events and social structures that affect these events and also are affected by them.

With regards to ideology and power, Fairclough takes a rather traditional approach towards power, and does not agree with Foucault. From Fairclough (1995)'s point of view, Foucault considers power as a pervasive force and symmetrical relations that is dominant over the whole society and is not in the hands of one special group or another; whereas in

Fairclough's thinking, the relations of power are asymmetrical, unequal, and empowering that belong to a special class or group (Ahmadvand, p. 86).

Several approaches have been made to the examination of Critical Discourse Analysis. Wodak (2001) has put forward some features for the historical approach to CDA as follows:

This approach is interdisciplinary. Like other critical linguists, Wodak acknowledges the intricacy of the relationship between language and society. As a result he believes that CDA is interdisciplinary in nature. 2. This interdisciplinary nature could be seen both in theory and practice. He combines argumentation theory and rhetoric with Halliday's Functional Linguistics. 3. This approach is problem-oriented rather than emphasizing some special language issues. 4. Methodology and theory are chosen through eclecticism. 5. In this approach the analyst is always on the move between theory and empirical data. 6. Historical context will go under investigation and will be incorporated into the analysis of discourse and texts. (pp. 69-70)

The other issue put forward by Fairclough (1995b) is that while earlier contributions in Critical Linguistics (CL) were very thorough in their grammatical and lexical analysis they were less attentive to the intertextual analysis of texts:

the linguistic analysis is very much focused upon clauses, with little attention to higher-level organization properties of whole texts. (p. 28)

Despite raising these issues with regards to earlier works in Critical Linguistics, Fairclough (1995b) still inserts that:

the mention of these limitations is not meant to minimize the achievement of critical linguistics they largely reflect shifts of focus and developments of theory in the past twenty years or so. (p. 28)



The "shifts of focus and developments of theory" which Fairclough (1995b) referred to here have not resulted in the creation of a single theoretical framework. This is the more reason why Van Dijk (1988) further explains that:

Discourse is not simply an isolated textual or dialogic structure. Rather it is a complex communicative event that also embodies a social context, featuring participants (and their properties) as well as production and reception processes. (p. 2)

By "production processes" van Dijk(1988) means journalistic and institutional practices of news-making and the economic and social practices which not only play important roles in the creation of media discourse but which can be explicitly related to the structures of media discourse (Sheyolislami, p. 4).

Another main approach in Critical Discourse Analysis is that of Norman Fairclough whose theory has been central and essential to Critical Discourse Analysis over more than the past ten years. Fairclough (1989), in his earlier work, called his approach to language and discourse *Critical Language Study* (p. 5). He further described the objective of this approach as:

a contribution to the general raising of consciousness of exploitative social relations, through focusing upon language (p. 4).

This aim in particular remains in his later work that further develops his approach so that it is now one of the most comprehensive frameworks of Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1992, 1993, 1995a, 1995b; Chuliaraki and Fairclough, 1999). Chuliaraki and Fairclough (1999) claim that:

CDA of a communicative interaction sets out to show that the semiotic and linguistic features of the interaction are systematically connected with what is going on socially, and what is going on socially is indeed going on partly or wholly semiotically or linguistically. Put differently, CDA systematically charts relations of transformation between the symbolic and non-symbolic, between discourse and the non-discursive.

(p. 113)

According to Fairclough(1995b):

linguistic analysis is descriptive in nature, whereas intertextual analysis is more interpretative. (p. 16)

Fairclough (1992) defines the intertextuality mentioned here as:

basically the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth. (p. 84)

Fairclough (1992) further identifies two types of intertextuality:

"manifest intertextuality," and "constitutive intertextuality." (p. 85)

The former refers to the heterogeneous constitution of texts by which "specific other texts are overtly drawn upon within a text." This kind of intertextuality is marked by explicit signs such as quotation marks, indicating the presence of other texts. Constitutive intertextuality, on the other hand, refers to the "heterogeneous constitution of texts out of elements (types of convention) of orders of discourse (interdiscursivity)" (p. 104).

This kind of intertextuality refers to the structure of discourse conventions that go into the new text's production. Fairclough (1992) provides several examples of these processes of intertextuality. Fairclough (1995) claims that intertextual properties of a text are realized in its linguistic features since it assumed that texts may be 'linguistically heterogeneous' (p. 189).

Nevertheless, Fairclough (1995b) asserts that:

linguistic analysis is descriptive in nature, whereas interpretative analysis is more interpretative. Linguistic features of texts provide evidence which can be used in intertextual analysis, and intertextual analysis is a particular sort of interpretation of that evidence . . . (p. 61)

Discourse analysts naturally make assumptions about how audiences read and comprehend texts. They even appear and try to interpret texts on behalf of the audiences. The issue at stake here is how a discourse analyst knows how audiences consume media discourse, how and what they comprehend or understand and what sorts of impacts these reports have. It is safe to say that all analysts, including Critical Discourse Analysis practitioners, agree that different audiences may interpret texts differently. This, however, is one of the strongest arguments that critics of Critical Discourse Analysis have brought forward against discourse analysts who base their conclusions on their own interpretations, regarding the impact of media discourse on audiences (Fairclough, 1996; Widdowson, 1995). Critical Discourse Analysis practitioners are the first to acknowledge that different readers might read similar texts differently (Fairclough, 1995b). In a similar vein, Van Dijk (1993) states that:

media recipients [are] active, and up to a point independent, information users" and they may form interpretations and opinions of news reports different from those the newspaper projected or implied (p. 242).

This seems to indicate that it is not possible to say how people read and interpret a news report for instance. Fairclough (1995b) therefore concludes that:

It strikes me as self-evident that although readings may vary, any reading is a product of an interface between the properties of the text and the interpretative resources and practices which the interpreter brings to bear upon the text. The range of potential interpretations will be constrained and delimited according to the nature of the text. (p. 16).

For the purpose of this research work, the theory adopted for data analysis shall be Normal Fairclough's theory, the first analytical focus of Fairclough's model - *text*. Analysis of text involves linguistic analysis in terms of vocabulary, grammar, semantics, the sound system, and cohesion-organization above the sentence level and how the sentences portray the issue of

power and inequality in classroom situation. It is an approach to language study to demystify what, through language which may be hidden to people.

In conclusion, this chapter has been concerned with an in-depth review of relevant literature and theoretical framework employed for the purpose of the research work. While reviewing relevant literature, topical issues socio-political issues generally and in classroom discourse, lecturer-students relationship was also examined. All these are aimed towards the understanding of socio-political equation in lecturer-students relationship with the theory of Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis. The ideology of power and inequality and their representation in lecturer-students relationship was also explored in consideration of its occurrence. There was also an examination of language and its role in identifying socio-political issues. This chapter also afforded the opportunity to critically dissent Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis theory which constitute the theoretical framework on which the research hinges.

## CHAPTER THREE

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### 3.0 Introduction

**Methodology** is the systematic, theoretical analysis of the methods applied to a field of study. It comprises the theoretical analysis of the body of methods and principles associated with a branch of knowledge. Typically, it encompasses concepts such as paradigm, theoretical model, phases and quantitative or qualitative techniques.

For the purpose of this inquiry, a qualitative interpretative research approach was employed. It was considered to be the most suitable approach to carry out this inquiry because it offers the researcher a wide range of possibilities in order to gain and understand an interviewed person's ideas and perceptions. In this particular case, we wanted to know the perceptions of the students regarding the lecturer-students relationship in the classroom, and how these affect the students' motivation in the learning process and their productivity.

According to (Cresswell, 1998), qualitative research is defined as:

An inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem. The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting. (p. 14)

Also, qualitative interpretative research also emphasizes the researcher's interpretation based on the information provided by the research participants. The researcher takes into account different aspects, such as the participants' personal experiences, their cultural background, as well as the case to be studied and, as a result, achieves a plausible interpretation of the data. The data

collected are words, descriptions and experiences of different processes instead of numbers as in quantitative research. For this reason, it is important to acknowledge that as these findings are based on the researchers' interpretation of the data' perceptions of their realities, other interpretations, meanings and understandings are possible. However, this is acceptable as, according to Parker (1999),

“...there will always be a gap between the things we want to understand and our accounts of what they are like if we are to do qualitative research properly” (p. 3).

### **3.1 Research Design**

Uba (2006) viewed research designed in any area of study as a plan or blue print, which specifies how data relating to a given problem should be collected and analyzed. It provides the procedural outline for the conduct of any investigation.

This research is design with the sole purpose of finding out the social-political issues evident in lecturer-students relationship most especially in a classroom setting. It also seeks to explicate how the socio-political issues of this relationship affect or influence productivity in students.

### **3.2 Research Procedure**

The first step in the research procedure consisted of gaining permission to carry out this inquiry. Immediately this was achieved, the next step was participation of the researcher in the classroom where we have lecturer and students under the lecture of a particular course. They were selected by means of convenience sampling. During convenience sampling or, as it is sometimes called, accidental sampling (Cohen et al, 2000), the researcher chooses some selected lectures which mediates between the lecturers and students to know “to what extent were the

students able to participate actively and relate with their lecturers in classroom” and to know what socio-political issues evident in the interactions.

### **3.3 Method of Data Collection**

For the purpose of this study, both primary and secondary data have become the only possible means of getting relevant information in a research work. The primary data collection of this study is the audio recording of some selected classroom interactions between lecturer and students and interview of some students to determine their perception towards their lecturers in Federal University Oye-Ekiti. This will help know and analyse the socio-political measures in the relationship between lecturers and students in an academic environment. Also, to get more information, some semi-structured interviews were conducted to get more views about lecturer-students relationship in a classroom setting.

### **3.4 Instrumentation**

The instrument used for this study is audio records of some selected lectures and interview of some student.

### **3.5 Research Participants**

The research participants consisted of about 70 to 80 students in each lecture rooms selected for analysis, one in the faculty of education (Biology Education) and others in the faculty of arts (English and Literary Studies and History and International Studies), Also in faculty of management science. This number of participants was chosen based on the number of students receiving lectures in the specific course. This was helpful because both the lecturers and the students were not aware of the fact that the lecturer is being recorded. This gives the

researcher solid information about the classroom discourse most especially considering the relationship between lecturers and students.



## CHAPTER FOUR

### DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

#### 4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the data from the primary source of this study, analyzes and discusses findings of the research. Analysis of texts includes linguistic analysis, which is vocabulary, grammar, semantics, the sound system, and cohesion-organization above the sentence level.

#### 4.1 Systematic Presentation and Discussion of Findings

##### 4.1.0 Overview of Classroom Discourse

The term classroom discourse refers to the language that lecturers and students use in communicating with each other in the classroom or during lectures. Talking, or conversation, is the medium through which most teaching takes place, so that study of classroom discourse is the study of the process of face-to-face classroom teaching or discussion. The first use of audiotape recorders in classrooms was reported in the 1930s, and during the 1960s there was a rapid growth in the number of studies based on analysis of transcripts of classroom discourse. In 1973, Barak Rosenshine and Norma Furst described seventy-six different published systems for analyzing classroom discourse.

It soon became clear from these early studies that the verbal interaction between lecturers and students in tertiary institutions had an underlying structure that was much the same in all classrooms, and at all grade levels, in English-speaking countries. Essentially, a lecturer asks a question, one or two students answer, the lecturer comments on the students' answers (sometimes summarizing what has been said), and then asks a further question. This cyclic pattern repeats itself, with interesting variations, throughout the course of a lesson.

It is on this regard that the conversation below shall be analysed based on descriptive linguistic analysis (vocabulary: lexical and reference chains, field taxonomies, attitudinal lexis; grammar: clausal structure, types of participants processes, circumstances, connections, mood, modality; Textual Structure: generic structure, written versus spoken mode, cohesive ties, coherence) and the interdiscussive analysis shall be established in relation to power and inequality.

#### **4.1.1 Identification of data**

The first text was taken from Faculty of Arts, the department of English and Literary Studies and the second text was taken from Faculty of Science Education (Biology Education Department). The third text was taken from the department of History and International Relation while the last one is from the Faculty of Management Science (Mass Communication). This was done to have a random sampling.

#### **4.2 Linguistic Analysis of the texts (Vocabulary, Grammar and Textual Structure)**

##### **4.2.1 Lexis**

*At the vocabulary level, lexical and reference chains shall be concentrated upon. Lexis is a term in linguistics for the vocabulary of a language. In generative linguistics, a **lexis** or lexicon is the complete set of all possible words in a language. In systemic-functional linguistics, a **lexis** or **lexical item** is the way one calls a particular thing or a type of phenomenon. In the text above, several words or group of words are used to portray or imply identity, status and power relation with regard to lesson cohesion.*

Meaningful words are put together to form a sentence and sentences were put together to form the discourse. While the lecturer was discoursing or conversing with the students, it is evident

that their choice of words shows their identity as lecturers that can instruct in the class and that of the students that must adhere to the instructions. Words like the personal pronoun “**you**” that he uses while teaching the student on the foregoing topic is directed to the student and “**I**” too refer to him. The lecturer uses expression that is stringed together while giving the students steps of answering literary questions and most especially questions regarding the course. Also, the words are not too difficult to understand in terms of simplicity and complexity. Moreover, there is no reflection of abusive words in the conversations (both TEXT 1 and TEXT 2).

#### **4.2.2 Grammar**

Grammar enables the language to function by commanding universality and predictability of the rules of structure. Grammatically, the speech or statement of the lecturers to the student is highly grammatical, and an ungrammatical structure of sentence was not used. This is set to affect the students in using grammatical sentence structure even outside the classroom. There is consistency in his use of language from the word structure to the clause structure. The main characteristics of traditional grammar relate to usage, diction, style and punctuation.

Traditional Grammar organizes words base on eight different parts of speech. The parts of speech are verbs, nouns, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections. Individual words can function as different parts of speech, so they are identified by their use in a particular instance. The parts of speech are important to identify because they determine how sentences are organized and punctuated.

Diction is the proper use of words. In language, there are different words and phrases for different contexts, so there is no such thing as a universally correct word or phrase. Problematically, words are arbitrary and cultural-specific, having different meanings for different people. However, words must convey or transmit meaning to function, and diction ensures that

words work to communicate and express meaning by enforcing their rational and appropriate use.

Style – Sentence Structure, conventionally grammatical rules mandate that sentence contain both a subject and a predicate. Sentence types that are commonly used in the poem are the declarative and interrogative. The use of these sentence types harmonies with the tone and the mood of the speaker. The lecturer uses declarative sentences and interrogative sentences to foster good relationship with the students and also to accommodate the students' opinion and participation in class. Such interrogative sentences are:

How many of **you** still read that thing? – *Text 1*

what do you do?

You have done serological preparation in animals. Yes or No

Are hearing that for the first time?

The person did not talk about serological planning? – *Text 2*

The lecturers uses this type of sentences to bring out the duty of the students and also to make the class interactive as against the domineering lecturers who do not give room for question and answers from the students. This presupposes the good relationship between the lecturers and the students because with this, students will be priviledged to participate well in class and foster good relationship between both sides.

The lecturer shows a sign of commitment to what they are saying. In a verbal equivalent to their tonal expressivity, he seems to adopt using language belonging to what Martin (1997) calls the “appraisal” system (attitudinal words communicating affect, judgment or appreciation; words that attempt to engage; or words expressing force or focus). These behaviors could be seen to increase their status, as more powerful persons do not need to show deference, explain themselves, or make them vulnerable to challenge (Eggins, 1994). More significantly, they do

not soften their commands in the class, with the use of “you might or may” as seen in their statement above.

#### **4.2.3 The Use of Code-switching**

In linguistics, code-switching occurs when speaker alternates between two or more languages, or language varieties, in the context of a single conversation. Multilingual, speakers of more than one language, sometimes use elements of multiple languages when conversing with each other. Thus, code-switching is the use of more than one linguistic variety in a manner consistent with the syntax and phonology of each variety.

From both Text 1 and Text 2 which are from classroom discourse, the lecturers are noted for the use of two languages such as English language and Yoruba in their conversation in class.

Instances of this are:

“Haha e de ma paro ti o bo yin lese...”

Haahaa...

“Shey be de so pe no lekan”, ok, ki ni eni to ko yin pe fun yin nigbayan?

Mi o da siyan o

The above is evident so much in Text 2 from the lecturer. This could be a deliberate act of the lecturer to disseminate his/her message to the student in a more simple and comprehensive way and as a matter of fact, research has it that students learn more or comprehend and relate more in their mother’s tongue/language.

#### **4.3 Analysing Text 3 and Text 3**

The discourse above is the transcription of the interviews of a student in both Faculties of Arts and Management Science on the research topic show that the student’s knowledge about

lecturer-students relationship is based on interaction. They established that the life of any relationship either positive or negative is planted on interaction. So, he said that lecturer-students relationship has something to do with interpersonal interaction between lecturer and the students in the university.

According to the first respondent, the issue of power could be found in their interaction with students in classroom through their choice of words or use of language in communicating ideas, feelings, thought and emotions. He claimed that there are some of their lecturers that do not relate with the students positively and this could mar the students' productivity both academically and even socially. Nevertheless, he further explained that there are some other lectures that relates well with them both in class and outside the classroom.

Also, from the second respondents, there is issuance of threat, this means that some lecturers are used to using threatening words or statements such as **“I can get you out of this school”**, **“Do you know what I can do?”**, **“Do you know me at all?”** and the concept of making students unworthy through some lecturers choice of words such as: **“I can see carryovers”**, **“I know some of you will still sell groundnut along the street”**, **“I know some of you will still carry this course”**. All these expressions have a ways of affecting the students both emotionally, psychologically and even academically. For instance, from this research, I got to know that in the above department, most of the student failed beautifully not because they have not ready well but because of the wrong impression they had about the lecturer and even the course itself, a very good number of the students failed because the lecturer taking the course most especially has failed to encourage the student and not that alone, the lecturer has failed to bring out potentials in the students.

In conclusion, the above data has showed some of the linguistic signifiers evident in lecturer-students relationship in classroom situations and the focus was on the lexis while other features are examined. The data shows that even though there are some discussions which projects the socio-political issues, others projects the socio-political equation or balancing of lecturer-students relationship but statistically, it is evident that most lecturers relates well with the student in the case study that is, there is socio-political equation in most classroom.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

#### 5.0 Summary

The research, which documents lecturer-students relationship in classroom situation/settings, sought to explore or interrogate the socio-political issues evident in lecturer-students' relationship in classroom situation. This research work is divided into five (5) chapters, the first chapter served as a general introduction which discusses the background to the study, statement of problem, aim and objectives of the study, research questions, and significance of the study among others. In chapter two (2), the views of the scholars in lecturer-students' relationship, definition and scholarly view of social and political issues evident in classroom discourse and theoretical framework was projected. Chapter three (3), contains the method of data collection, method of data analysis, data instrumentation, research design among others. Chapter four (4) deals with the data analysis of observations and interviews while chapter five (5) of this research work gives a condensed picture of the whole work, conclusion and recommendation that suit the identified problems.

#### 5.1 Findings

The findings of this investigation on interrogating socio-political equation of lecturer-students relationship in a classroom settings or discourse specifically in some selected faculties in Federal University Oye-Ekiti, where the data for analysis was taken are as follows:

This research brings to fore the fact that in most classroom discourse there are some linguistic portrayal of power and inequality in lecturer-students relationship and this is mostly in lecturer's lexical and syntactic use of language that is, the choice of words and sentences as they relate with meaning. From the interview of some students, it becomes evident that some lecturers



uses words like “insane- are you insane?”, “stupid - are you stupid?”, “Do you know me?”, “Do you know what I can do”, “how dare you talk to me like that?”, “you have no point”, “what a waste”. The significance of these words is that, they have negative impact on the students both socially, morally and academically. From the interview, it was found that students that fall under this lecturers that has this kind of poor relationship, are not motivated, encouraged and also tends to have low academic performance. This is because in a situation like this, such lecturer rarely gives students room neither for asking questions nor to contribute in class.

Moreover, this research also project the fact that some lecturers are found making issuance threatening statements such as: “Do you know me?”, “Do you know what I can do?” among others. This presupposes that students found under these lectures are seen as inferior to the lecturers while the lecturers are seen as the superior being in class. The significance of this is that the students may find it so difficult to relate well and flow well with the lecturers in this category and as a matter of fact this set of students may be affected emotionally, socially and academically.

Nevertheless, this research also found out that not all lecturers falls in this category, while we have some with little or very low measure of positive and good relationship between lecturers and students, there are some other lecturers that has a very good relationship with the students and this in turn as resulted in the students’ excellent performance both academically, emotionally, and socially as ascertained through the interview conducted with the selected students.

## **5.2 Conclusion and Recommendation**

In this research work, the critical analysis of the lecturer-students relationship has been done through the application of Fairclough's critical discourse analysis, focusing on the linguistic signifiers of socio-political imbalance and equation of the relationship respectively. This research work which uses CDA that focuses on how language receives its power by those who use it and how this is constructed through spoken texts in communities, schools and classrooms has identified some of the linguistic signifiers of power and inequality both at the lexical level and the syntactic level.

This research work concludes that, classroom discourse between lecturers and students reveals that power and inequality are evident in some classroom based on observation and exposition of some selected classroom discourse coupled with the interviews conducted. The research work as well shows that there is socio-political "equation" that is, balancing in some classroom discourse as recorded by some students in the interview conducted.

This study hereby recommends that when understanding is threatened by formality, "equation" can be considered. This is because it will be of immense good to bring about positive productivity and projection of potentials in students since it will create an accessibility of the lecturers and foster motivation of students especially in classroom situations.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, J., Gregory, A., Mikami, A., Lun, J., Hamre, B., & Pianta, R. (2013). Observations of effective teacher-student interactions in secondary school classrooms: Predicting student achievement with the classroom assessment scoring systemsecondary. *School Psychology Review*, 42(1), 76-98. Retrieved March 27, 2015, from Maxwell Library.
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Baumeister R. F., Leary M. R. (1995). *The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation Psychological Bulletin*. p. 497-529.
- Bergin C., Bergin D. (2009). Attachment in the classroom *Educational Psychology Review*. p. 141-170.
- Birch, S., & Ladd, G. (1997). The teacher-child relationship and children's early school adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35, 61-79.
- Bruney, G. (2012). *The teacher-student relationship: The importance of developing trust and fostering emotional intelligence in the classroom*. University of Toronto. p. 2
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London, UK: Routledge/Falmer
- Cresswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dangel, J.R. and T.R. Durden (2010). *The nature of teacher talk during small group activities*.
- Davis, H.A. (2003). Conceptualizing the Role and Influence of Student-Teacher Relationships on Children's Social and Cognitive Development. *Educational Psychologist* 38(4), pp. 207-234.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teacher's work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hamre, B.K., & Pianta, R.C. (2001). Early Teacher-Child Relationships and the Trajectory of

- Children's School Outcomes through Eighth Grade. *Child Development* 72(2), pp. 625–638.
- Hussain, N., Nawaz, B., Nasir, S., Kiani, N., & Hussain, M. (2013). Positive teacher-student relationship and teachers experience – A teacher's perspective. *Double Blind peer reviewed international research journal*. Vol. 13 (3) p.2
- Jones, P.E., 2007. Why there is no such thing as “critical discourse analysis”. *Language & Communication*, 27: 337-368.
- Parker, I. (1999). Qualitative research. In P. Banister, E. Burman, I. Parker, M. Taylor, & C. Tindall (Eds.) *Qualitative methods in psychology: A research guide* (pp. 1-16). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Pianta, R.C., (1999). *Enhancing Relationships Between Children and Teachers*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tsiplakides, I., & Keramida, A. (2009). Helping students overcome foreign language speaking anxiety in the English classroom: Theoretical issues and practical recommendations. *International Educational Studies*, 2(4), 39-44.
- Wodak, R., 2001. What CDA is about—a summary of its history, important concepts and its development. In R.. Wodak & M. Meyers (Eds.) *Methods of CDA* (pp: 1-13). London: Sage Publication.
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.