

Zelena Inna

**COMMUNICATIVE-COGNITIVE APPROACH TO TEACHING
FUTURE TEACHERS OF A SPECIAL FACULTY DISCUSSION IN
ENGLISH**

*Ushynsky University,
Odesa, Ukraine*

Abstract. *The article deals with substantiating the lingual-methodological peculiarities of teaching future teachers discussion in English on the basis of communicative-cognitive approach. There has been considered that discussion relates to the form of polygraphic speech which has the features of both monological and dialogical speech as well as its own peculiarities, the mastery of which is necessary for the successful communication in the discussion. It has been concluded that participating in a discussion of a certain number of participants requires the procedural structuring of their speech product which is ensured by the use of clichés thus in the training-preparatory phase and the phase of discussion development for communicative intent there have been selected definite discussion holding clichés. There have been chosen certain assessment criteria for communication skills in discussion and determined effective group discussion skills in particular involving others, balancing your viewpoint with those of others, being sensitive to others, building consensus, displaying confidence or expressing a lack of confidence when genuine doubt exists, active listening, taking turns etc. The students have been encouraged to a specially prepared discussion on the discussion plan or agenda. As the means for discussion materials there have been selected inspiring quotes of well-known people, 6 minutes BBC resources and IELTS speaking aids.*

Keywords: *discussion in English, communicative-cognitive approach, discussion clichés, assessment criteria for communication skills in discussion, effective group discussion skills, discussion agenda.*

The relevance of research. Nowadays discussion in English is the main form of interaction during scientific and intercultural conferences, roundtables, projects etc. both in education and in future teaching activities. The problem of investigating the diversity of lingo-methodical peculiarities of teaching future teachers discussion in English have been specified in the latest researches of a number of scholars, in particular teaching high school students discussion of problems in English in the process of intercultural communication (A. Gordeyeva), teaching future teachers discussion in English on the basis of authentic poetry works (N. Andronic); using discussion as an intensive technique at the stage of speech practice (G. Kitaygorodskaya) etc. Despite the number of works the lingual-methodological peculiarities of teaching future

teachers discussion in English on the basis of communicative-cognitive approach hasn't been the subject of thorough research.

Thus, *the purpose of the article* is to substantiate the lingual-methodological peculiarities of teaching future teachers discussion in English on the basis of communicative-cognitive approach.

Being aware of the essence of the communicative-cognitive approach to teaching a foreign language, namely immersion in a foreign language where certain professional issues are discussed in the language (according to O. Tarnopolsky) as well as the fact that the cognitive approach to learning is realized in the case when the student is the center of the educational process the training of students of the English-language discussion is of dominant significance.

N. Andronik rightly believes that it is important for a teacher to be able to speak to the audience, to argue one's own opinion, to influence, to persuade and stimulate to action. Such speech is characterized by increased complexity because it requires the logical construction of statements, clear causal relationships, argumentation and counterarguments taking into account socio-cultural conventions [1].

According to N. Andronik the linguistic reaction of the participants in the discussion takes the form of polygonal statements of different lengths: from the minimum volume of speech messages (replicas) to detailed reasoned statements. As a result of group discussion a coherent text is created. It has also been found that an oral reasoned polylogical expression of a participant in a discussion consists of three interrelated elements: theses, evidence and facts. Thus for carrying out counter-arguments it is necessary to observe four steps: to specify the thesis which must be refuted; to deny the thesis by guiding antithesis; to provide evidence and facts to support counter-arguments; to sum up by comparing antithesis and thesis [1].

I. Zaitseva [2] defined the participants' strategy in oral communication as a complex of speech actions aimed at solving the problem situations in a discussion.

Thus it is quite obvious that participating in a discussion of a certain number of participants requires the procedural structuring of their speech product which is ensured by the use of clichés. For instance, in the training-preparatory phase and the phase of discussion development for communicative intent the following clichés have been selected [3]:

✓ **asking someone for their opinion about a topic: Yes/No questions** (*Do you believe in ...? Do you think everybody should ...? Would you ever consider ...?*), **Wh questions** (*What do you think is the problem between... and ...?*);

✓ **delaying strategies:** *I can't answer that directly. That's a tough question to answer, because... Well, it depends on what you mean...; asking someone information (Do you happen to know whether or not...?);*

✓ **presenting arguments:** **presenting the most important point** (*The main thing is...Primarily.*), **presenting a number of arguments** (*First of all, ... There're two points here. Firstly, ... Secondly, ...There are two problems here....*), **adding an argument** (*Again, that depends on ... In addition ...*);

✓ **giving your opinion about a topic:** **expressing a strong opinion** (*In my reckoning, ... I definitely think that ...I have a reason to believe. I'm pretty sure that...*), **expressing certainty** (*According to government statistics, ...Actually, ...Obviously, ...Undoubtedly.Surely.*);

✓ **agreeing:** **expressing complete agreement** (*Exactly! Precisely! Totally! I couldn't agree with you more!*), **agreeing in part** (*Yes, perhaps, however ...Well, yes, but ...Yes, in a way, however ...Hmm, possibly, but ...*), **expressing conditional agreement** (*I'd agree with you if ... I'd certainly agree if you're thinking of ...*);

✓ **disagreeing:** **expressing complete disagreement** (*I disagree entirely. I'm afraid I can't agree. On the contrary! Definitely not! That's ridiculous!*), **using irony to express disagreement** (*Come off it! Come on! You can't actually mean that!Are you pulling my leg?You must be kidding!*), **dismissing an argument as irrelevant or improbable** (*That isn't the point. That's highly debatable. That's highly unlikely.*), **disagreeing diplomatically through doubt:** (*I wonder whether that's the case. I'm not so certain. Well, it depends...*), **disagreeing in part, appeal to logic** (*That doesn't necessarily follow. That isn't strictly true.*);

✓ **countering:** **countering directly through antithesis** (*But why ...? But if ...But surely, ...*), **countering politely through partial agreement followed by antithesis** (*I'd love to, but...That would be great, except that...That may be so, but...Possibly, but what I'm concerned with is...*);

✓ **expressing cause and effect:** **cause** (*The reason why... is ... Due to ...,... Since....*), **result** (*For this reason,... Owing to this, ...Therefore. Consequently,...*);

✓ **clarification:** **asking someone to repeat** (*Pardon?Excuse me?Could you say that again?Would you mind repeating that please?*), **giving clarification after misunderstanding** (*Don't get me wrong...Don't misunderstand me...*);

✓ **illustrating a point:** *Take for example ...To illustrate my point...);*
expressing solutions and alternatives: *The best way to ... is ...Alternatively, ...Instead, ...The alternative is...;*

✓ **interrupting:** **polite interruption** *Sorry, but... May I add something?I'd like to say something about that);*

✓ **getting back to the point:** *Anyway...In any case,...Returning back to...To get back to the point...;*

✓ **generalizations:** *Generally,...Typically,On average, Speaking in general terms,...;*

✓ **conclusions:** *So in short,...So, finally,...All in all,...Summing up, ...*

A compulsory component in the organization of the discussion is the teacher's assessment both general and the student's speech activity. Thus as assessment criteria for communication skills in discussion there have been chosen the following ones:

Excellent (5): *interaction* (Can present ideas articulately and persuasively in a complex discussion. Sophisticated arguing and turn-taking strategies.), *professional vocabulary* (Has a very good command of professional vocabulary.), *language quality* (Can consistently maintain a high degree of grammatical accuracy.), *fluency* (Fluently and spontaneous. Wide vocabulary evident.), *pronunciation* (Accurate pronunciation and intonation in most instances.), *presentation* (Student is thoroughly familiar with the topic and can respond confidently and spontaneously to complex questions. Presentation is well structured.);

Very good (4): *interaction* (Can successfully present and justify ideas in a formal discussion. Turn-taking handled appropriately.), *professional vocabulary* (Has a good command of professional vocabulary.), *language quality* (Can maintain a good degree of grammatical accuracy; occasional errors do not impede communication.), *fluency* (Fluent and spontaneous, but occasionally needs to search for expressions.), *pronunciation* (Pronunciation and intonation generally accurate.), *presentation* (Presentation is clearly structured and appropriate to the audience. Good eye contact, minimal need to refer to papers.);

Good (3): *interaction* (Keeps up with the discussion and can justify an opinion. Responds and interacts adequately with other speakers.), *professional vocabulary* (Has an adequate vocabulary to express himself/herself on matters connected to his/her field.), *language quality* (Can communicate with reasonable accuracy.), *fluency* (Can produce stretches of language with a fairly even tempo.), *pronunciation* (Some inaccuracy in pronunciation and intonation.), *presentation* (Evidence of a standard three part structure.);

Satisfactory (2): *interaction* (Has some difficulty keeping up with the discussion and arguing an opinion.), *professional vocabulary* (Limited professional vocabulary.), *language quality* (Communication generally successful though limited in terms of accuracy.), *fluency* (Generally acceptable tempo, but often hesitant as he/she searches for expressions.), *pronunciation* (Frequent inaccuracy in pronunciation and intonation.), *presentation* (Some structural weaknesses. Basic level of acquaintance with the topic.);

Poor (1): *interaction* (Has marked difficulty in keeping up with the discussion and contributes only occasionally.), *professional vocabulary* (Basic professional vocabulary only.), *language quality* (Communication characterized by frequent inaccuracies and misunderstanding), *fluency* (Frequent hesitations and pauses, can produce only short stretches of language at best), *pronunciation* (Key words regularly mispronounced, strong mother-tongue influence.), *presentation* (Structure lacks coherence. Speaker is unfamiliar with the topic.);

Inadequate (0): *interaction* (Severe difficulty in following the discussion and no active involvement.), *professional vocabulary* (Professional vocabulary minimal.), *language quality* (Communication limited at best.), *fluency* (Cannot produce complex sentences or link phrases coherently.), *pronunciation* (Control of the sound system so weak that comprehension is difficult.), *presentation* (Lacks the features of an acceptable presentation).

At the initial stage of our experimental work on teaching students of the 3rd year of a special faculty discussing in English the students have been informed that the first step in a discussion is to plan it thoroughly thus provide the framework for it. According to R. Lander [5] the agenda or plan becomes the external tool to help students stay focused on the topic. The following is a generic agenda or plan: list the facts that are known; list the facts that are not known; define the problem to be discussed; list the questions that need to be answered; determine the criteria needed for a good solution; propose several solutions to the problem; evaluate each solution according the criteria you set.

Thus primarily the students of the 3rd year have been provided with the discussion plan, then the list of effective group skills (by R. Lander) has been brainstormed with the students which included: involving others; balancing your viewpoint with those of others; being sensitive to others; building consensus; displaying confidence or expressing a lack of confidence when genuine doubt exists; contributing vs. participating; active listening; taking turns; staying on task. The students have been also reminded that the solution or answer is the last part of the discussion and that they had to gather all their information before they began to look for an answer. They have been to keep a set of organized notes to help focus their discussion and explained the necessity to create more urgency to stay on topic.

As the means for discussion material for the 5th unit “Painting” (from the course book V. Arakin for the 3rd year students of a special faculty) there have been selected famous quotations of well-known people, in particular “*Painting is poetry that is seen rather than felt, and poetry is painting that is felt rather than seen.*” (Leonardo da Vinci); “*Art is the lie that enables us to realize the truth.*” (Pablo Picasso); “*Art is the only serious thing in the world. And the artist is the only person who is never serious.*” (Oscar Wilde) etc. In addition, there have been only picked out discussion themes (from IELTS resources) for instance: *For a long time art has been considered an essential part of all*

cultures in the world. However, nowadays people's values have changed, and we tend to consider science, technology and business more important than arts. What do you think are the causes of this? What can be done to draw people's attention to art? etc. Eventually the students have been offered to listen to BBC 6 minutes English and afterwards encouraged for discussion.

It should be noted that there have been positive changes in the level of discussion skills development after the formative experiment among the students of the experimental group, as follows: the high level of discussion skills development was fixed among 17.65% of students (it was 9.9%), the average – in 48.31% of the respondents (it was 19.23%), the low level of discussion skills development was found only among 34.04% of future teachers (it was 71.68%). Among the students of the control group there have occurred positive changes in the dynamics of the levels of discussion skills development as well, however not so significant. Thus, among high school students the high level of discussion skills development has been represented among 11.77% of future teachers (it was 9%), the average level – among 20,35% of respondents (it was 16,53%), the low level of discussion skills development revealed 67.89% of students (it was 74.47%).

Conclusions. Thus the applied discussion techniques provided a thorough linguistic basis for the formation of a foreign language communicative competence and discussion skills in particular.

References translated and transliterated

1. Andronik, N. P. (2009). Navchannia maybutnikh uchyteliv anhlovnoyi dyskusii na osnovi avtentychnykh poetychnykh tvoriv [*Teaching future teachers of the English-speaking discussion on the basis of authentic poetry works*]. Candidate's thesis. – Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
2. Zaitseva, I. V. (2011). Problemnyi metod navchannia anhlovnoho dialohichnoho movlennia maybutnikh filolohiv [*Problem method of teaching future philologists English dialogical speech*]. 20, 111–119. [in Ukrainian].
3. *Expressions for discussion and debate*. Retrieved from www.teflsites.com/Expressions%20for%20Discussion%20an... [in English].
4. *Assessment criteria for communication skills*. Retrieved from <https://kielikeskus.jyu.fi/opetus/englanti/degree-specific-courses/communication-skills/communication-skills-assessment-criteria> [in English].
5. Lander Richard (2002). Scored Group Discussion: an assessment tool. Retrieved from <https://www.sps186.org/downloads/basic/344717/Discussion> [in English].