

A Classroom Discourse Orchestration Framework for Pre-Service Foreign Language Teachers

Nilufar Ulmasovna Ochilova

Doctoral Researcher, Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute, PhD in Philological Sciences, Uzbekistan

Received: 08 December 2025; **Accepted:** 27 December 2025; **Published:** 31 January 2026

Abstract: This conceptual study develops a Classroom Discourse Orchestration Framework for preparing pre-service foreign language teachers to align teacher talk with pedagogical purpose and learner participation. A function-first synthesis of classroom discourse, teacher competence, and interaction research identified five orchestration decisions: framing the activity, opening the interactional space, sustaining learner meaning, regulating participation, and closing with learning visibility. Each decision is represented through purpose, teacher move, learner opportunity, and evidence. The framework differs from generic discourse competence models by treating real-time coordination of participation and learning as its unit of analysis. It offers a basis for microteaching tasks, observation protocols, and performance-oriented assessment without claiming untested effectiveness.

Keywords: Pedagogical discourse competence, classroom interaction, orchestration, teacher talk, learner participation, pre-service teacher.

Introduction: High language proficiency does not automatically enable a novice teacher to manage classroom communication. A pre-service teacher may produce accurate explanations yet close down learner thinking through rapid questioning, complete a learner's turn too early, or offer feedback that contains no usable next step. The professional problem is therefore not only what language the teacher knows, but how discourse choices coordinate pedagogical purpose, time, attention, participation, and meaning.

Communicative competence traditionally includes grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic dimensions. This architecture remains essential for language users, but teacher education requires a further specification. Teachers do not merely participate in interaction; their institutional role gives them disproportionate influence over who speaks, what counts as an acceptable response, when a topic is closed, and how error is interpreted. Pedagogical discourse competence names the capacity to exercise that influence purposefully and ethically.

Recent work has described discourse competence as a

meta-concept in language teacher education and has proposed broad cognitive-pragmatic structures for future teachers. The present study selects a narrower unit: real-time orchestration of classroom participation around a learning purpose. It asks which decisions make orchestration observable and teachable in pre-service preparation.

The dissertation problem isolated in this article is the fragmentation of teacher talk into isolated techniques that do not coordinate participation around a learning purpose. The scope is therefore deliberately restricted: it is not another component model of discourse competence, but a real-time account of how a teacher frames, opens, sustains, regulates, and closes an episode. This boundary prevents the recurring term pedagogical discourse competence from turning separate publications into paraphrases of the same claim. It also makes the article accountable for one identifiable conceptual or design outcome.

The analytical unit was defined as purpose, teacher move, learner opportunity, and observable consequence. Sources were not grouped merely

because they used similar terminology. Each proposition was coded for the professional decision it explains, the opportunity it creates or removes for a learner, the evidence by which it can be examined, and the contextual limitation that qualifies the claim. This function-first procedure reduced category inflation and preserved the sequential character of classroom discourse.

The design outcome is the Classroom Discourse Orchestration Framework. Its content validity was examined against three requirements: direct correspondence with the focal problem, visibility in a feasible pre-service teacher task, and capacity to support a subsequent instructional decision. The framework is therefore presented as an analytically reasoned prototype. It does not convert conceptual synthesis into an unsupported claim of intervention effectiveness.

METHODS

The study used a conceptual design methodology. Sources included research on classroom discourse, interactional competence, dialogic teaching, teacher professional competences, and reflective practice; CEFR mediation and interaction descriptors; and the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages. Claims were coded according to four questions: What pedagogical purpose is pursued? What teacher discourse move enacts it? What opportunity does the move create or remove for learners? What observable evidence follows?

Candidate categories were retained if they involved a distinct temporal decision in a classroom episode, could be observed in a transcript or recording, and could be deliberately rehearsed in microteaching. Overlapping categories were merged, while broad dispositions such as confidence were excluded unless translated into discourse action. The outcome is an analytic design proposition rather than an experimentally validated intervention.

The synthesis differentiated the focal problem into framing communicative purpose, opening entry routes, sustaining learner meaning, regulating participation, and closing with learning visibility. These dimensions should not be read as interchangeable competences. Each captures a different decision point and produces a different kind of evidence. Their connection lies in the

movement from interpreting a situation to creating an opportunity, observing its consequence, and deciding what must be retained or redesigned.

The first dimension, framing communicative purpose, establishes the professional purpose of the episode. A novice must distinguish the curricular intention from the discourse action that is supposed to enact it. Without this distinction, an apparently communicative activity may still distribute all interpretive authority to the teacher, while a concise intervention may create substantial room for learner reasoning.

The second dimension, opening entry routes, concerns the alternatives available at a consequential moment. The relevant question is not whether a preferred form appears, but why that option fits the learners, timing, relationship, and task. Requiring at least two plausible alternatives makes tacit assumptions visible and enables the student teacher to anticipate both an intended opportunity and a foreseeable cost.

The third dimension, sustaining learner meaning, turns the planned decision into inspectable performance. Consider a teacher responding to an incomplete answer by preserving its ownership, connecting it to a peer contribution, and returning both learners to the task criterion. The move cannot be evaluated from wording alone. Its adequacy depends on sequential placement, delivery, the learner's available response route, and what actually happens in the following turn or action.

The final dimension, closing with learning visibility, makes redesign part of competence rather than a remedial activity after failure. A student teacher may retain the original move, modify its timing, combine it with another mode, or reject it after examining evidence. In each case, the decision must be justified by the learning purpose and by an observed learner consequence rather than by personal preference.

The primary evidence is the sequential relation between a teacher move and the participation or meaning-making that becomes possible next. This formulation guards against counting visible techniques as proof of competence. A question, recast, pause, visual support, or feedback statement becomes professionally meaningful only when its function and the learner opportunity that follows can be reconstructed from the episode.

RESULTS

The first orchestration decision is framing the activity. The teacher converts a curricular goal into an intelligible communicative purpose, defines the expected learner action, and makes the success conditions visible. Framing is not synonymous with giving longer instructions: an economical frame can clarify why learners are speaking, what they need to produce, and how they will know they have completed the task.

The second decision is opening the interactional space. The teacher selects question type, wait time, nomination practice, and permission to volunteer in ways that shape who can enter the discourse. Display questions can check a shared reference point, whereas referential and probing questions can open reasoning. The criterion is functional fit rather than a universal preference for one question type.

The third decision is sustaining learner meaning. Instead of evaluating the first clause and moving on, the teacher may acknowledge content, request clarification, invite elaboration, revoice without appropriating authorship, or connect two learner

contributions. The fourth decision is regulating participation. It includes redistributing turns, preventing domination, re-engaging quiet learners without public exposure, and shifting between whole-class, pair, and group interaction.

The fifth decision is closing with learning visibility. Closure summarizes neither the teacher's performance nor the activity sequence alone; it makes emerging learning available for inspection. The teacher may return to criteria, contrast earlier and revised responses, elicit a learner-generated synthesis, and identify an unresolved question. Together, the five decisions form an episodic arc while remaining adaptable rather than scripted.

For each decision, the framework links purpose, discourse move, learner opportunity, and evidence. For example, a probing question is not judged by its grammatical form alone. Its adequacy depends on whether it elicits elaboration and whether the subsequent turn shows the learner using the opened opportunity. This evidence chain prevents intention from being mistaken for impact.

Table 1. Classroom Discourse Orchestration Framework

Decision	Core teacher move	Learner opportunity	Primary evidence
Frame	Clarify purpose, action, and criteria	Understand why and how to participate	Task-oriented learner start
Open	Select question, wait, and entry route	Enter the interactional space	Distribution and depth of first responses
Sustain	Probe, clarify, connect, or revoice	Develop and relate meanings	Expanded or linked learner turns
Regulate	Redistribute turns and interaction mode	Participate equitably and safely	Broader, purposeful participation
Close	Return to evidence and criteria	Articulate learning and next question	Learner-generated synthesis

The specific contribution is a performative unit of analysis for pre-service teacher rehearsal and observation. This distinguishes the article from the other studies in the publication set. It neither reclaims their models nor repeats their assessment constructs; it develops the single dissertation problem assigned to this paper and states what falls outside its explanatory reach.

In teacher education, the Classroom Discourse Orchestration Framework can organize a compact cycle of transcript comparison, individual design, peer

challenge, microteaching, and evidence-based revision. The tutor supplies a consequential situation rather than a model answer. Students first articulate the purpose, then compare alternatives and predict learner opportunities before performance. Post-performance discussion begins with a selected piece of evidence, which limits impressionistic praise or criticism.

Context sensitivity remains essential. The same linguistic form can perform different work with another age group, proficiency level, institutional norm, or interactional history. Consequently, the framework is

not a script or a frequency checklist. Its educational value lies in making the grounds and consequences of a choice discussable while preserving the teacher's responsibility for situated judgment.

Future empirical work should collect the sequential relation between a teacher move and the participation or meaning-making that becomes possible next across repeated episodes. Expert review can establish relevance and clarity, but developmental sensitivity requires longitudinal comparison of student decisions. Learner response, student-teacher explanation, and mentor observation should be triangulated so that neither external scoring nor self-report becomes the sole warrant for a claim of growth.

Uzbek scholarship provides an important local foundation for the framework. Jalolov treats foreign-language teaching as an integrated system of objectives, speech activity, instructional conditions, and assessment rather than as the transmission of language forms. Jalolov, Makhkamova, and Ashurov further connect language-teaching methodology with classroom technologies and professional teacher decisions. Muslimov and colleagues define pedagogical competence through the situated performance, analysis, and improvement of professional tasks. Together, these positions support the orchestration construct as the real-time alignment of pedagogical purpose, teacher discourse, and learner participation in the context of Uzbekistan's pre-service teacher education.

DISCUSSION

The framework extends the alignment between pedagogical purpose and language use emphasized in classroom discourse research. Its distinctive contribution is an orchestration lens: competence is not reduced to coherence of teacher speech, nor to possession of a repertoire, but concerns the situated coordination of moves across an episode. This focus also clarifies why an isolated 'good phrase' may be ineffective when its timing or turn allocation is inappropriate.

Cirocki and Hallet position discourse competence as an overarching goal of language teaching and as an important part of professional teacher education. The present framework complements that macro-curricular position by specifying a performative layer of

teacher competence. Dorofeeva's cognitive-pragmatic account foregrounds meaning in professional contexts; orchestration specifies how meaning opportunities are opened, sustained, and made visible in the classroom.

The framework can inform three tasks: analysis of contrasting transcripts, microteaching with a contingency introduced by a peer, and evidence-based reflection on a short episode. It should not be used as a rigid checklist that rewards visible frequency. A teacher may intentionally withhold a move, and the quality of a decision depends on purpose and learner response. Future studies should examine expert content validity and the framework's sensitivity to growth across repeated teaching episodes.

CONCLUSION

The Classroom Discourse Orchestration Framework identifies five teachable decisions that connect pedagogical purpose with learner participation: framing, opening, sustaining, regulating, and closing. Its purpose-move-opportunity-evidence chain makes pedagogical discourse competence observable without reducing it to decontextualized language forms. The framework provides a principled foundation for pre-service rehearsal, observation, and subsequent empirical validation.

REFERENCES

1. Cirocki A., Hallet W. Teacher Education and Professional Competences // Professionalising English Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024. P. 43-71. DOI: 10.1017/9781009350235.003.
2. Council of Europe. CEFR Companion Volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2020.
3. Newby D. et al. European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages. Graz: ECML, 2007.
4. Walsh S. Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action. London: Routledge, 2011. DOI: 10.4324/9780203827826.
5. Seedhouse P. The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.
6. Alexander R. Developing dialogic teaching: genesis, process, trial // Research Papers in Education. 2018. Vol. 33(5). P. 561-598. DOI: 10.1080/02671522.2018.1481140.
7. Walsh S., Mann S. Doing reflective practice: a data-

led way forward // ELT Journal. 2015. Vol. 69(4). P. 351-362. DOI: 10.1093/elt/ccv018.

- 8.** Canale M., Swain M. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches // Applied Linguistics. 1980. Vol. 1(1). P. 1-47.
- 9.** Dorofeeva A.S. Formation of Discourse Competence of Future Foreign Language Teachers: Candidate Dissertation. Kaliningrad, 2025.
- 10.** Vance N. Communicative Competence. EBSCO Research Starters, 2019.
- 11.** Jalolov J.J., Makhkamova G.T., Ashurov Sh.S. English Language Teaching Methodology. - Tashkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2015.
- 12.** Jalolov J.J. Chet til o'qitish metodikasi. - Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2012. - 432 b.
- 13.** Muslimov N.A., Usmonboyeva M.H., Sayfurov D.M., To'rayev A.B. Pedagogik kompetentlik va kreativlik asoslari. - Toshkent: Sano-standart, 2015. - 120 b.