رهنمودهای به کار رفته در کلاسهای دانشگاه

(علمی – پژوهشی) *

دکتراحیا عمل صالح

استــــــادیار دانشگاه علوم پزشکی شیراز

دکترلطف الله یارمحمدی

استــــــــاد دانشگــــــاه شیــــــراز

چکیده

این پژوهش اشکال وکارکردهای گوناگون رهنمودهای به کار رفته درکلاسهای دانشگاه علوم پزشکی شیراز را مورد بررسی قرار می دهد.

بسیاری بر آنند که رهنمودها از جنبه های مهم گفتمـان کلاسـی اسـت.در ایـن پژوهش از ۴۵۶ رهنمود به کار رفتـه ده شـکل و هشـت کـارکرد مشـخص شـد. یافته ها نشان می دهد که هرچند شکلهای گوناگون رهنمود در کلاسها بـه کـار می رود، نوع دستوری و سوالی پربسا مـدترین رهنمـود هـا اسـت. بـه عـلاوه، رایجترین کارکردها در این زمینه بر پایه انگیزش و آموزش است.

کلید واژه ها: آموزش عالی ،گفتمان کلاسی ، رهنمود و آموزش

Directives Used In University Classrooms

1. Introduction

In speech act theory, directives are defined as the speaker's acts which attempt to make the addressee do, or sometimes not do, something. Despite different forms which they may take, directives are typically expressed by imperatives. And the speaker generally expects compliance on the part of the hearer. In classrooms, too, teachers do use directives and prospect students' compliance. In this connection, Tapper (1994) discusses the possible undesirable consequence of students not following directives. He points out that in school settings, students would be punished in case they don't follow directives whereas, in colleges, they understand that following directives would help them to accomplish the task properly.

Although directives, in essence, expect a non-verbal behavior from the hearer, it is of fundamental importance for the speaker to choose among different forms of directives, the one which suits the circumstance best and furthermore, poses the least possibility of offense to the hearer(s), or to use Brown and Levinson's (1987) term, not to pose 'face-threatening act'. In other words, the speaker has to express his intention appropriately with regards to the hearer's age, rank, and sex, among others. Hence, directives, like other types of speech acts, may be expressed in various forms. They may be expressed, for example, in the forms of imperative, interrogative, and declarative. Furthermore, they may be phrased in the forms of

command, condition, and even wish as mentioned by Bolinger (1967, cited in Tapper, 1994).

2. Objectives of the Study

The present study tends to examine directives used in university classrooms of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences. In this connection a number of research questions are given in the following:

Research Questions

1. What particular forms of directive are used in the classrooms?

2. What is/are the function(s) of directives used in the classrooms?

3. Is there any relationship between the use of particular forms of directive and teachers' attitude towards the learners/classrooms?

3. Review of the Literature

The major feature of a directive as defined in the speech act theory is to elicit non-verbal behaviors from the hearer. Such behaviors, with regards to the options given to the addressee, are divided by Tsui (1995) into two classes: in one, the addressee has the option of compliance, while in the other, s/he does not. They are referred to as *requests* and *directives*, respectively. Fraser (1975b, cited in Ervin-Tripp, 1976), however, places both requests and directives under the category of requesting, in terms of the speaker's expectation from the hearer to perform the action expressed by the statement.

Making a distinction between an order and a request, in terms of their "preparatory condition," Searle (1969) purports that the speaker giving direction *must be in a position of authority* over the addressee. Moreover, while a request is typically expressed in the interrogative form, an order, generally, is in the form of imperative, or a declarative, stating the speaker's desire.

Directives, as argued by Tsui (1995) can be divided into two main subclasses, namely *advisives* and *mandatives*. She defines advisives as directives which make the hearer do the action expressed for his/her own benefit, whereas mandatives are those performed for the benefit of the speaker. In addition, one may respond advisives, but not mandatives, by thanking. Katz (1977, cited in Tsui, 1995), makes a distinction between positive and negative advisives in terms of benefits they offer to the addressee. The former, the positive advisives, is referred to as advice and the latter, negative one, as warning. Warning is a kind of directive, stating or implying that it is preferable for the addressee to follow the directive; otherwise, some undesirable consequences may arise. It is not uncommon for the warning to state the action along with a reason. In contrast, an advice advocates the desirable consequences of the stated action on the part of the hearer.

Tsui (1995) defines a *mandative* as a directive advocating a course of action or avoiding an action for the benefit of the speaker. They comprise two subclasses: *instructions* and *threats*. The former is produced due to the speaker's desire or want, for

the benefit of the speaker; the latter, i.e. threat, while sharing the above feature in the case of the hearer's non-compliance will put some undesirable consequences into the action. In contrast, since in instructions, unlike threats, the person has the right or authority to make the addressee to perform the action, there is no need to resort to the stating of the unwelcome results of non-compliance.

Regarding different forms which directives may take, it is argued that although the primitive form of a directive is known to be imperative, they, similar to other types of speech act, can be expressed via various other forms. In this respect, Holms (1983, cited in Tapper, 1994), has identified five variations in addition to imperative. They are as follows: *you imperative, present participle; verb ellipsis; imperative + modifier;* and *Let + us.* She also adds interrogatives and declaratives as possible forms of expressing directives.

Similarly, Ervin-Tripp (1976) has found five types of directives, namely, *needs statement, imperatives, embedded imperatives, permission directives,* and *question directives.* What determines the use of these variants instead of imperative seems to be derived from different sources? Ervin-Tripp claims that one factor can be the amount of tact or knowledge the speaker tends to put forward. Moreover, Goatly (1995) argues that social factors are crucial in determining different forms of directives. He asserts that "the first feature Leech identifies is the cost/benefit to the hearer. The most direct form of directives are usually considered as impolite if the action is costly to the

hearer، but are perfectly polite if the action is to the hearer's benefit" (p.269). Thus، depending upon the age، sex، rank and distance of the interlocutors as well as the context of situation the speaker may choose either of the forms cited above.

Furthermore، he identifies two types of social factor influencing the forms of a directive: *vertical* and *horizontal social distance*. The former، vertical، deals with "status difference" in which the higher the rank، age or status of the interlocutor، the more indirect the utterance is expected. The horizontal social distance، or "the degree of familiarity or solidarity"، has to do with the point that the direct form of a directive is acceptable when there is familiarity and solidarity among the members of the group. An appropriate directive، according to Sinclair & Coulthard (1974) Comprises "*Modals + you + feasible action*." They argue that if the pattern fulfills these three features، it is directive. By incorporating modals in their formula، they mean the modals *can، could، will، would* and *going to*: by *you،* they emphasize that the subject of the directive and addressee must be identical and finally، by *feasible action،* they mean the possibility of the action to be performed at the time of directing.

The forms of a directive make a continuum ranging from the most forceful ones i.e. imperatives to the least i.e. hints. Although، this might be true in certain conditions، it might fail to determine the forcefulness of an utterance، based on the syntactic form alone. Jones (1992) introduces the context and paralinguistic factors such as intonation، laughter and gestures

as devices used to intensify, or, on the contrary, mitigate *the force of a directive*. He also provides a list of devices for reducing the forceful effects of direct directives, such as the use of *inclusive pronoun* (*we*), *please*, *modals*, *quantifiers*, or providing a reason for the directive.

In classrooms, as a distinct context, the forms of a directive can even reveal the attitude of the instructor towards the learners. In this connection, White (1988, cited in Goatly, 1995) points out that there might be a connection between the directive forms used in the classroom and the teacher's attitude towards his students. White postulates that "one might distinguish three kinds of attitudes to students and their activities and to teacher roles. In the first, the educational process emphasizes doing things *to students*, in the second *with students*, and in the third *for students*" (p.271). It is argued that in the first process, i.e. to students, the distance between the teacher and students is greater than the other two and the teacher is in authority. In the second one, i.e. with students, there seems to be cooperation as well as solidarity between the instructor and his students. In the third one, i.e. for students, the students act as *customers*; they might be equal in status with the instructor, or even higher. This postulated classification seems to require further research to be substantiated.

This implies the limited choices, teachers have at their disposal with regard to the relationship they wish to establish with their students. Teachers, of course, are not completely free in choosing the kind of relationship they

may want to settle. This is "determined by relationships of power in particular social institutions and in the society as a whole" (Fairclough, 1989,   p.31). Thus the type of directive teachers employ not only exhibit the power relation in that institution, in this case educational setting, but also it can construct and legitimate that kind of relationship.

The other point to be mentioned about the forms of a directive is the connection between their forms and functions. It is noticed that the same form may imply different functions or conversely, the same function be expressed via a variety of forms. In this connection, Tsui (1995) points out that there might not be a correspondence between the meaning of illocutionary verbs and their functions. Hence, this study is an attempt to identify different directive verbs used in classrooms and to work out the functions of the verbs as well.

Ervin-Tripp (1976) points out that the addressee has at his disposal the information necessary for constructing suitable schemata. She puts forward the term "transactional settings". By this, she means the information which prepares the scene of interaction in advance and pinpoints the role each party is going to play. The other factor which seems to be important for the construction of the schemata is the relationship between the speaker and hearer in terms of social status, and rank. For instance, being in a classroom setting, as a certain schemata has already been formed by the speech community, even a single word uttered by the teacher can be interpreted as a directive.

Why do directives despite having so many different forms are interpreted as directives?

Ervin–Tripp (1976) answers the above question by providing the proposition of "directive rules." She argues that the members of a community share "the cultural knowledge" which helps them to have certain expectations of every interaction. This seems to be very important in bringing the members of the community at similar interpretations of "structured settings" such as army, classrooms, shopping and so forth. It is believed that each of these settings demands different types of interactions. Hence, the hearer would correctly interpret an utterance as a directive provided that the particular form used meets the requirement of the context. The classical question, put foreword by Searle (1969) "can *you pass the salt?*" is an instance of the above statement. It can be interpreted as a directive, and not as a question about one's ability.

A number of studies have been carried out to analyze and find communication patterns used in classroom interactions (Seedhouse, 1996; Nunnan, 1987; Silberstein 1993, etc.). Nunnan, for instance, states that in a traditional classroom, the interlocutors usually follow the *IRF* cycle. That is to say, it is expected first to have the teacher initiation (*I*), followed by the learner response (*R*), and finally the teacher's follow– up (*F*). The present study, however, focuses on teacher initiation(*I*), specifically to find out how different forms are used to serve as directives. Accordingly, the current study is intended to identify

the kinds of directive used by the university professors in the Shiraz University of Medical Sciences.

4. Method

4.1 Data for the Study

The present study is an attempt to investigate the forms and the functions of directives in Persian utilized by teachers in the university classrooms. Furthermore, it is to identify the frequent directive forms utilized in classes.

To do this, seven lecture- type classes, each of two hours durations, in which tape-recording was possible without distracting the teacher, were chosen. The teachers were native speakers of Persian. They gave lectures in large halls, addressing to about 200 students. Tape recording was carried out by the students. This is routinely done by students in their lecture- type classes.

4.2 Data Collection and Analysis

The data were all the instances of directives, derived from seven classrooms, each lasting about 2 hours. Directives derived from the classes are utterances which make students follow them verbally or non-verbally. As all the utterances are those used in the classrooms, it is expected to face verbal responses more often than non-verbal ones.

For the purposes of this analysis, the data were first examined for the variety of directive forms followed by their functions. Then, the distribution of directive forms and functions were to be tabulated and discussed accordingly.

5. Results and Discussion

After the analysis of the data, a total of 456 directives were identified from the transcripts of the tape-recorded lectures. Then, they were classified according to their forms and functions.

Ten Persian directive forms were extracted from the data. They are then presented in table 1.

Table 1

Directive Forms

Form	*Number of Instances*	*% of All of Directives*
1. Imperative	161	35
2. Interrogative via Pitch	81	17.5
3. Interrogative	65	14.5
4. Declarative	59	13
5. Let's See	26	5.7
6. IF Clause	23	5+++++++
7. Modal	18	4
8. Imperative+ Please	18	4
9. Passive	4	0.9
10. Imperative+consequence	1	0.2
TOTAL	456	100

Table 1 shows the frequency of the directive forms. Ten forms are identified in the directives expressed in the classrooms. Hence, it is interesting to note that out of 456 directive instances, 161 ones (35%) belong to the imperative which is by

far the most frequent form. Both types of interrogatives, taken together, make up the next more frequent form (32.1٪). And declaratives are ranked the third.

Some examples are given below for further clarification:

1. Imperative

a. –xub deggat konid.

(well notice you (pl.)).

–Pay attention.

b. dah dagigeh ?estera:hat.

(ten minute rest)

– Have a ten– minute rest.

2. Interrogative via Pitch

1. az leha:z–e amalkard   ?

(from aspect of function?)

– From functional point of view?

b. agar Oxon   roo–ye Oxon   gara:r begire ke yek mowred–e na:der ast be na:m–e

(if Oxon. on Oxon placed which one case rare is named?)

– What is called this rare case when an Oxon overlies another one?

3. Interrogative

a. shoma: mida:nid ke ?in che seluli hast?

(you know this what kind cell is?)

– Do you know what kind of cell is it?

b. tavajjoh da:rid.

(notice you have).

– Do you notice?

4. Declarative

a. yek ʔeslayd raː entexaːb mikonid.

(a slide you will select)

–You will select a slide.

b. dar ravesh–e tiyuːb be in surat ʔamal mikonim.

  (in method tube this face act we.)

– In tubal method we will act this way.

5. Let's See

a. hala bebinim ke vazifeʔshaːn chist.

  (now we see their task what is)

– Let's see what their task is.

b. biyaːid bebinim ke biyoshimi–ye in ʔanzim chist.

  (come we see biochemistry of this enzyme what)

– Let's see what the biochemistry of this enzyme is.

6. If clause

a. agar negaːh konid.

 (if   look you (pl.)).

– If you look at this part.

b. agar in gesmat raː dar nazar begirid.

  (if this part consider you (pl.))

– If you take this part into consideration.

  7. Modal

a. mitavaːnid laːm raː be do gesmat tagsim konid.

  (can you lamella into two part do you (pl.)).

– you can divide the lamella into two parts.

8. Imperative ₊ please

a. lotfan befarmaː–yid.

(please sit you (pl.).

– Sit down, please.

9. passive

a. pas ?az 24 sa:?at a:b?e oksijen–e ?eza:fe? shavad.

  (after 24 hour water oxygen be added.)

– After 24 hours, oxygenated water is added.

10. Imperative + consequence

a. deggat befarma:–yid ta: batn–e chap ra: bebinid .

  (notice you (pl.) left chamber to see you (pl.)).

–pay attention to see the left chamber.

    Eight function types were extracted from the data. Table 2
shows the functions in terms of their frequency and percentage.

Table 2

Directive Functions

Function	Number of instances	٪
1. Elicitation	140	30.7
2. Instruction	133	29.2
3. Attention– getter	992	1.7
4. Suggestion	37	8.1
5. Tactfulness	26	5.7
6. Advice	11	3.4
7. Conditional	9	2
8. Threat	1	0.2
TOTAL	456	100

Some examples of directive functions given in the following for
further clarification:

1. Elicitation

a. xob، now–?e sevvom ra: mitava:nid mesa:l bezanid?

  (well kind third can you example give?)

– Well، can you give us an example for the third type?

2. Instruction

a. pas ?az 24 sa:?at nega:h mikonim.

 (after 24 hour look we).

 _ After 24 hours، we will look at it.

3. Attention –getter

a. xob deggat konid.

 (well notice you (pl.)).

–Well، pay attention.

4. Suggestion

a. mixa:hid yek 10 dagigeh ?estera:hat da:shte ba:shid.

 (want you (pl.) one 10 minute rest have you (pl.).

 – You may have a ten– minute rest.

5. Tactfulness

a. ?agar lotf konid ?eslayd–e digar ra: nesha:n bedahid.

  (if be kind you (pl.) slide another show you (pl.)).

–Would you show the other slide please?

6. Advice

1. mova:zeb ba:shid ?aglab in sargije–ha: ba: ?adam–e ta?a:dol hamra: ?ast.

 (notice you (pl.) usually this dizziness with disequilibrium accompany is.)

_ Take notice that this dizziness is usually accompanied with disequilibrium.

7. Condition

a. ?agar in gesmat ra: dar nazar begirid.

  (if this part consider you (pl.))

– If you take this part into consideration.

8. Threat

a. har kas sohbat konad miguyim biyad jelow va java:b bede.

  (each person talk say we come front and answer.)

–Whoever speaks in the class I will ask them to come over here and answer the questions.

As it is shown in table 2, the most frequent function expressed by directive utterances is elicitation, followed by instruction and attention–getter in sequence. That is to say, out of 456 instances 30.7٪   belong to elicitation, to 29.2 ٪ instruction and 21.7 ٪ to attention –getter.

Instructions refer to utterances which are issued to get the addressee to perform an action, while *elicitations*, mostly expressed by interrogatives, tend to make the students provide the required information. What is interesting is that the speakers tended to express "interrogatives via pitch" or even *plain interrogatives* louder and in clearer forms whenever the students didn't respond to the questions posed. And finally, attention– getters refer to instructions used to attract students' attention. Thus some functions may be realized by several forms while some others are not. For instance, *instruction* was expressed through interrogatives, imperatives, declaratives, modals and passive, whereas *attention getter* only by

imperatives. It is interesting to note that while one function may be realized by various forms, speakers generally tend to use only one or two forms most often. For example, although instruction is realized by five different forms, imperatives are by far the most frequent form used. In addition, it should be noted that of all the directive forms used, imperatives, comprise 161 instances, and interrogatives, both forms taken together, 146 instances. The distribution of forms and functions and their relationship are demonstrated in Table 3.

Table 3

Table 3

Distribution of Directive Forms and Functions

	IF Clause	Interrogative	Interrogative via Pitch	Imperative	Imperative + Please	Imperative + Consequence	Declarative	Let's See	Modals	Passive
1. Conditional	7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2. Tactfulness	12	–	–	–	18	–	–	–	–	–
3. Elicitation	4	55	81	–	–	–	–	–	7	–
4. Attention-getter	–	–	–	65	–	–	–	–	–	–
5. Instruction	–	10	–	96	–	–	37	–	9	4
6. Suggestion	–	–	–	–	–	–	9	26	2	–
7. Advice	–	–	–	–	–	–	12	–	–	–
8. Threat	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	–	–
TOTAL	23	65	81	161	18	1	59	26	18	4

The highly frequent presence of imperative when the teacher tends to elicit, to instruct or even when (s)he wants to attract the students' attention suggests the teachers' tendency to present themselves as the authoritative figures in that interaction.

Regarding the directive forms used in the classrooms, along with their functions, the findings of this study reveal the attitude of the teachers towards the students. That is to say the findings suggest that the observed classes seem to be in favor of *to students* classes as advocated by White (1988,cited in Goatly,1995) in which the teacher's status is high and (s)he is in authority. In such classes, the teacher has the right to ask students questions or give them instructions. In addition, as there is a vertical distance between the teacher and students, the students are obliged to follow or carry out the *want* of the teacher. For instance, in the case of interrogative/elicitation, it was noticed that whenever there were not appropriate answers, on the part of students, the same questions were repeated louder and in more emphasized ways. This shows that teachers expect students to comply in answering the questions.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the study would come up with different results if it took different settings into account and were not confined to classrooms.

6. Concluding Remarks

Based on the preceding discussion, the following results can be concluded:

1. The tendency of teachers in directing the students can be characterized by using high percentage of imperatives (35 ٪) and very low percentage of "please" (4 ٪). This suggests that teachers tend to believe that s/he is the authority figure and the whole process of instruction is to the benefit of the students.

2. Classrooms are the types of setting in which imperatives are the most frequent form of directives. The assumption behind using imperatives may be the point that teachers consider the lesson or the instruction to the benefit of the students. This could justify teachers' using high percentage of direct imperative with a few instances of *please*.

3. In using 'please' forms, teachers seem to be aware that although the form is a "politeness marker", if overused, it may, nevertheless, indicate that students will do a favor if they follow the directives.

In this respect, Goatly (1995) asserts that:

The more direct forms can also be useful as signals that the teacher is quickly establishing a standard situation where the normal obligation [sic] and rights of the pupils and teachers obtain. Further reasons for recommending the more direct forms are to do with ease of comprehension (p. 282).

Furthermore, House (1989, cited in Goatly, 1995) claims that it is very common to use imperatives in classroom situations and it is *apparently socially licensed*. In addition, it is the most expected form expressed in such a context.

4. Another feature worth noticing is that teachers were clearly in the state of authority, whereas solidarity would glide as the teacher began giving instruction related to carrying out a task in the laboratory. In such a setting, the teacher mostly resorts to using *inclusive pronouns*, such as '*we*'. This may be due to the fact that in the laboratory, both teachers and students spend

relatively long time to work on certain things and this might affect the power relation between the instructor and students, leading to a more solidarity relationship. In this regard, Bourne (2001) points out that:

Teachers and pupils thus construct ways of organization and interaction which allow both teachers and pupils to cope with   classroom life in dignity, sets of routines which accommodate each other's interests with a minimum of conflict (p.106).

Inclusive pronoun is a devise for reducing the forcefulness of the imperatives. The teachers tended to use direct imperatives during the lectures. However, they shifted to *inclusive* instead of *exclusive* pronouns (26 out of 59 declaratives) when the instruction concerned carrying out a task in the laboratory.

The examples, given below show the use of exclusive pronouns in the classroom and inclusive ones in the lab respectively:

1. Exclusive pronoun:

a. in gesmat ra: mola:heze mifarma:yid.

   (this part see you (pl.)).

– You can see this part.

b. ka:ri ke shoma: anja:m xa:hid da:d.

   (work you do should)

– What you should do .

2. Inclusive pronouns:

a. chand ta: ?az in coloniha: ra: bar mida:rim.

  (some of colonies take we.)

– We will take a number of these colonies.)

b. pas ?az 24 sa:?at nega:h mikonim.

 (after 24 hour look we).

_ After 24 hours, we will look at it.

This change of tone implies that the teacher intentionally wants to provide a more intimate atmosphere to help students in the process of carrying out the task. It should be noted that, students, while working in the lab, generally need help to accomplish the required task and they might be reluctant to ask for help in the absence of a relatively friendly atmosphere. In this regard, Hyland (2002) posits that "this collocation of directives and inclusive pronouns…helps to create a more personal relationship… by involving them more directly as participants in the action" the teacher wants to fulfill (p. 228).

7. Implications of the Study

1. Since directives are also expressed in the forms other than the imperatives, they may be misinterpreted, hence leading to communication failure. Directives, due to their nature of being *non- refusable requests* expect the hearer to conform. The hearer, however, if not familiar with the convention, might misinterpret the speaker's intention. The present study is an attempt to find different directive patterns used in Persian to

help those individuals involved in teaching Persian to the non-natives.

2. A good translator, also, apart from other skills, needs to be conscious of different forms of utterance which may serve the same function, or different functions which may be expressed through one single form.

The multifunctionality of utterances is known to be an important obstacle in learning a foreign language or in appropriately translating an utterance from the source language to the target one or vice versa. Thus, identifying the forms and functions of directives in Persian, and their relationship in specific contexts can shed light on teaching Persian discourse to non-natives as well as translators.

References

Bourne، Jill(2001). Discourses and identity in a multi‑lingual primary classroom. Oxford Review of Education، 27(1)، pp. 104‑114.

Brown، P. and Levinson، S. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language uasage. Cambridge: Cambridge University   Pess.

Ervin‑Tripp، S. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. Language in Society، 5، pp.   25‑55.

Fairclough، N. (1989). Language and power. London: Longman

Goatly، A. (1995). Directness، indirectness and difference in the language of classroom management: Advise for teacher trainees. IRAL، 33، pp. 267‑284.

Hyland، Ken (2002). Directives: Argument and engagement in academic writing. Applied Linguistics،23(3)، pp. 215‑239.

Jones، K. (1992). A question of context: Directive use at a Morris team meeting. Language in Society، 21، pp. 427‑   445.

Sinclair، J. & Coulthard، R. M. (1974). Toward an analysis of discourse. London: Oxford University Press.

Searle، J. R. (1969). Speech acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tapper، J. (1994). Directives used in college laboratory oral discourse. System، pp. 205‑222.

Tsui، Amy B. M. (1995). English conversation. Oxford University Press.

Key to Persian Phonemic Symbols

Vowels and Diphthongs

Persian Symbol	PersianKey Word	English Key Word
i	daːrid	sit
e	negaːh	ten
a	agar	man
aː	daːrid	arm
o	konid	saw
u	surat	too
ay	ʔeslayd	bite
ey	beyn	eight
ow	jow	bout

Consonants

Persian Symbol	Persian Key Word	English Key Word
p	pedar	pay
b	bedahid	bird
t	deggat	teacher
d	konid	deep
k	konid	car
x	xub	Not present

Consonants, con.

Persian Symbol	Persian Key Word	English Key Word
g	gesmat	Not present
g	negaːh	got
ch	cheraː	chair
j	tavajjoh	june
f	ʔezaːfe	father
v	mitavaːnid	voice

s	gesmat	see	
z	?eza:fe	zoo	
sh	da:shte	ship	
h	har	help	
m	?amalkard	man	
n	nega:h	nose	
l	?amal	leg	
r	?agar	ride	
y	yek	yet	
?		? in	Not present