DISCUSSION-BASED APPROACH IN FOREIGN LINGUOMENTALITY ACQUISITION: PERFORMING A VARIETY OF ESSENTIAL SOCIOCULTURAL ACTS THROUGH PURPOSEFUL COMMUNICATION

The problem of learning foreign languages for better cultural understanding is becoming an essential part of education standardizing. The content, submitted in language symbols of certain ethnos, represents particular mental and social practice with obvious relation to historical discourse. Acquiring two or more cultural ideologies through foreign language mastery provides the multiplication of conceptual model of civilization. Therefore, possessing polylingual mind, the recipient becomes a producer of a new more complicated picture of the world, accordingly represents the new language reality.

The need for further reflection on this topic derives from two facts: through discussion, teachers can increase students’ positive productive response to suggested issues in the process of foreign language learning and help them to develop their language personality and communicative skills; all participants can benefit from a classroom polemics because they learn to analyze different types of information from various perspectives.

The article is devoted to the peculiarities of lingualization a cultural picture of the world through discussion-based techniques in foreign language acquisition. It implicates the systematic use of discussions to accomplish specified objectives. The paper emphasizes the importance of education aims assignment in order to estimate students’ performance at every degree level of conversational strategy. This approach is effective across a range of situations and for low-achieving as well as high-achieving students for its mutual mode when the recipient becomes a producer of a new more complicated picture of the world, accordingly represents the new language reality.

The problem of purpose is to clarify essential verbal techniques of foreign language acquisition performed through a discussion-based approach. Classroom discussion as a term that refers to verbal interchanges among teachers and students in a classroom is investigated by modern scientific community at cognitive background. Rebecca Hughes suggests, «it is evident that our strongest and most direct associations ought to be with the spoken language, in speaking we must have all our associations between ideas and words in perfect working order, we have no time to pick and choose our words and constructions, as we do in writing» [6, p. 143]. This approach to language learning is based on teacher’s communicative competence. The researchers are unison in their opinions: to promote participation during a conversation, teachers must ask open-ended questions that enable longer, more varied student responses, require more varied teacher responses, and encourage more student-to-student interaction [5, p. 8].

Conversation-based foreign language teaching involves the systematic use of discussions to accomplish specified objectives. Difficulties occur in an ability to compose sentences, but for a variety of reasons it’s not the only ability we need to communicate. Communication only takes place when we make use of sentences to perform a variety of different acts of an essentially social nature. Thus we do not communicate by composing sentences, but by using sentences to make statements of different kinds, to describe, to record, to classify and so on, or to ask questions, make requests, give orders» [8, p. 16].

Communicative skills describe student’s performance at each degree level of conversational strategy acquisition. J. T. Dillon accentuates that typically educator provides a wide variety of questions to achieve an equally wide variety of purposes, accordingly,
questions are often classified by the educational objectives they are intended to serve [2]. These objectives have been classified in taxonomies, which serve as categories of educational objectives or outcomes. The scientists believe that the numerous taxonomies for classifying educational objectives have been developed by talented educators, but, according to John Henning’s supposition, the original and most widely used conceptions belong to the mid-twentieth century under the leadership of Benjamin Bloom.

There are the six levels of educational objectives in Bloom’s taxonomy: knowledge level, comprehension level, application level, analysis level, synthesis level, and evaluation level [1]. John Henning has worked out an adaptable algorithm for carrying out a procedure for identifying the stages of question-based educational discourse in terms of Bloom’s taxonomy: 1) at the knowledge level, the student is asked simply to remember, recognize, or recite previously learned information, ideas, and principles. The knowledge level can include a wide range of material located in memory, such as terminology, specific facts, procedures (e.g., conventions, trends and sequences, classifications and categories, criteria, methodology), and universals (e.g., principles, generalizations, theories, and structures). At the knowledge level, the students are only asked to recall what they know from memory; they are not asked to manipulate or transform information in any way; 2) at the comprehension level, students are asked to demonstrate their understanding of the meaning or significance of ideas. They may be asked to interpret facts and principles, interpret verbal material, interpret charts and graphs, estimate the future consequences implied in data, or justify methods and procedures. Comprehension level questions might prompt students to cite, classify, compare, convert, describe, review, or summarize; 3) at the application level of Bloom’s taxonomy, students are asked to apply their previous learning in new situations. They may select, transfer, and use data and principles for the purpose of completing a problem or task. Questions at the application level could prompt students to act, administer, apply, articulate, assess, chart, choose, collect, modify, or operate; 4) at the analysis level, students are asked to divide and organize concepts, ideas, or other information into their component parts to better understand its organizational structure. This may include looking for patterns, recognizing hidden meanings, analyzing the relationship between parts, and recognizing guiding organizational principles. The analysis level is considered cognitively higher than the application level because it requires an understanding of both the content and the structure of an idea; 5) at the synthesis level of Bloom’s taxonomy, students are asked to originate, integrate, and combine ideas into a product or plan. They may be engaged in writing an essay, composing a speech, designing an experiment, creating a classification scheme, or generating any kind of project that requires the formulation of new patterns or structures. Questions may prompt students to adapt, anticipate, arrange, assemble, categorize, collaborate, collect, hypothesize, or integrate; 6) at the evaluation level, students are asked to make value decisions about issues, resolve controversies or differences of opinion, or develop opinions, judgments, or decisions. Learning outcomes in this area are highest in the cognitive hierarchy because they incorporate elements of the previous five categories, plus conscious value judgments based on clearly defined criteria. Questions at the evaluation level may prompt students to compare and discriminate between ideas, assess the value of theories or presentations, or make choices based on reasoned argument and the value of the evidence [5, 18–21]. Therefore, Bloom’s taxonomy provides a relatively simple way for teachers to identify whether or not their lesson plans are likely to lead to higher level outcome.

The distinction feature of discussion-based education occurs in the field of general subject mastery, reading comprehension, conceptual understanding, problem-solving ability, moral development, attitude change and development, and communication skills. «The representation always involves recontextualization» [7, p. 96], so teachers should encourage audience to interpret information creatively. They must consider the questions they ask, listen carefully to student responses, and then respond to them while keeping the conversation focused on a particular set of objectives.

The modern scientific approach to the instructor’s role in class discussion clarifies the set of significant issues concerning conversational rules and structure, in order to achieve high-level communicative competence. Zoltán Dörnyei and Sarah Thurrell identify six points that may be particularly relevant to a conversation course: opening, turn-taking, interrupting, topic-shift, adjacency pairs, closing [3, pp. 42–43]. Recognizing the importance of classroom discussion, we can interpret this model in order to reach FLT aims, that’s why we consider following set of issues and samples the most productive for improving conversational techniques:

1. Openings. The main rule is to start with open-ended questions and then follow that with follow-up questions. Depending on the subject to discuss, the teacher decides which phrase can be the most appropriate: a) greetings and introduction: How are you? – Fine, thanks. And you?; How are you doing? – Very well. And you; b) specified questions or situated issues: Excuse me, do I know you from the last September Norfolk conference?; How’s the family? – They’re very well, thank you. And yours?; Your dog is so cute! What’s its name?; It looks like it’s going to rain/snow; c) making a comment about the current social context: The shopping in this shopping centre is fantastic! So, what’s your favourite brand?; It’s an interesting painting, isn’t it? – Yes, it is. What do you think about author’s style?; This is a great song – I love Latin music. How about you?

2. Turn-taking ability. This item is extremely important for students with different cultural backgrounds. There are a lot of ways for speakers to manage turn-taking and they vary in different mentalities. Areas that can be considered in language teaching include pronunciation, intonation, grammatical structures, utterances such as «ah», «mm» and «you know», body language and gestures. This can be done with recordings of bad turn-taking, e.g. one person dominating the conversation or people talking over each other. A similar way of approaching the topic is to ask them to divide the phrases they hear into two categories: «interrupting» and «keeping the turn».

3. Interruption skills. For better language understanding students should know that there are some reasons why a person may interrupt others while speaking. But the most significant problem occurs in the field of a good impression of your personality. The most straightforward way to escape this occurrence can be done by designing activities in which one participant is bound to be interrupted when the partner notices something about what he/she says. Moreover, students can be asked to correct others and replace «impolite» interruptions with «polite» content by showing appropriate flash cards while their classmates make conversation. There is a set of phrases: I’m sorry to interrupt, but..., Before we move on to the next point, may I add...?; Sorry, I didn’t catch that, is it possible to repeat the last point.; Excuse me (name), may I add to that...?; Do you mind if I jump in here?; Pardon me...; I don’t mean to intrude.

4. Topic-shift features. This ability should be considered as a solution to a problem of unsuccessful transfer of speakership. McCarthy (1991) indicated that the topic shifting is very important in keeping the conversation going on and avoiding silence. A new topic may be initiated at the beginning of a conversation, after a previous topic has been terminated, or after a period of silence. Some conversational routines could be very helpful while changing topic: Oh, by the way... or That reminds me of... Students could also be taught phrases that help them return to the subject: Going back to...; As I was saying... or Yes, well, anyway. It teaches them to perceive that all listed sayings signal the upcoming new topic.

5. Adjacency pairs. The concept of «adjacency pairs» was developed predominantly by Sacks and Schegloff (1973). An adjacency pair is composed of two turns produced by different speakers which are placed adjacently and where the second utterance
is identified as related to the first, e.g. question «What’s your name?» requires the addressee to provide an answer in the following turn. If interlocutor replies «I’m John» it completes (satisfies) the pair while answer «I’m allergic to shellfish» fails to complete the pair. Adjacency pairs include such exchanges as question/answer; complaint/denial; offer/accept; request/grant; compliment/rejection; instruct/receipt. According J. E. Garratt, «if children did not develop the ability to understand and communicate through using such conversation techniques as questions and answers, it would be difficult to interact normally in society» [4].

6. Closing. Researchers admit, there are three stages in ending conversation: pre-closing, follow up and closing. At these stages would be useful to employ such language units to practice students’ conversational skills: 1) pre-closing stage: It’s been nice talking to you; It’s been great talking with you; I really enjoyed meeting you; It was nice meeting you; I’m sorry, but I have to go now; I’m afraid I have to leave now; Thanks for the information/tour/your time; Thanks for taking the time to talk with us; 2) follow up stage: I’ll give you a call; I’ll send you an e-mail; We’ll send out that information right away; Could I contact you by e-mail/at your office?; How do I get in touch with you?; 3) closing stage: I look forward to seeing you again; We’ll see you on Friday, Let me give your business card; Here’s my e-mail/office number; We’ll be in touch; Call me if you have any questions.

The result of effective interaction between students language performance and discussion-based approaches to the development of understanding suggests that students, whose classroom communicative experiences emphasize multitargeted sociolinguistic context of high academic demands, internalize the cultural aspects and communicative content of foreign ethnic environment necessary to engage in the contemporary intercultural polylanguage society.
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INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION: TO THE PROBLEM OF STEREOTYPING

Спілкування між двома культурами включає в себе генерацію, передачу, прийом і відтворення заходяться в по- відомлення або інформації. Цей процес включає в себе набагато більше, ніж мова, хоча мова є ключем до комунікації і відіграє провідну роль в будь-якій культурній програмі навчання. У цей статті розглядається проблема стереотипів, їх вплив на поведінку людей в процесі спілкування, проблеми, які вони можуть викликати і шляхи їх вирішення.

Ключові слова: стереотипи, міжкультурна комунікація, взаємодія, узагальнення, поведінка.

Обіцяю, що воно братимуться в себе генерацію, передачу, прийому і відтворення заходяться в по- відомлення або інформації. Цей процес включає в себе набагато більше, ніж мова, хоча мова є ключем до комунікації і відіграє провідну роль в будь-якій культурній програмі навчання. В цій статті розглядається проблема стереотипів, їх вплив на поведінку людей в процесі обіцяю, проблеми, які вони можуть викликати і шляхи їх вирішення.

Ключові слова: стереотипи, міжкультурна комунікація, взаємодія, узагальнення, поведінка.

Our desire to communicate with strangers and our relationships with them depend on the degree to which we are effective in communicating with them. Communication barriers in intercultural communication are generally considered factors such as language, modern technology, stereotyping and prejudice, anxiety, assuming similarity instead of difference, ethnocentrism. All these may lead to intercultural miscommunication by providing a narrow image of the «other» culture. Such barriers that may be perceptual, emotional, cultural or interpersonal need to be avoided, first and foremost by becoming aware of possible preconceptions (prejudice and stereotypes) to function along with the intercultural [6, p. 171].

There are many factors restricting or improving people’s communication, one of them is stereotyping.