

RU

Анализ интонационных особенностей и коммуникативных стратегий вежливости в речи учителя на уроках английского языка

Иванова Ю. Е., Михалева Е. И.

Аннотация. В статье представлены результаты фонопрагматического анализа коммуникативных стилей обучения, используемых студентами бакалавриата на педагогической практике в школе и кандидатами на сдачу экзамена CELTA. Цель исследования – выявить коммуникативные стратегии во взаимодействии учителя со студентами на занятиях по английскому языку. В работе описывается просодическое оформление речи двух групп информантов – ненативных носителей английского языка – с фокусом на использовании ими стратегий негативной вежливости, характерной для британской лингвокультуры, и проявлении национальной идентичности русскоговорящих в преподавании английского языка. Научная новизна исследования заключается в выявлении прямой зависимости выбора коммуникативных стилей обучения и интонационных особенностей от стратегий вежливости. Определено, что клишированность педагогического дискурса варьируется на уровне просодии, отражая национально-специфические характеристики в речи учителя иностранного языка. В результате исследования с использованием перцептивного и аналитического методов анализа было выявлено, что в группе кандидатов на сдачу экзамена CELTA фонетическая компетенция сформирована достаточно полно, информанты для взаимодействия со студентами на занятиях по английскому языку выбирают фонетические признаки, характерные для британской культуры (негативной вежливости), в то время как в группе студентов университета – будущих учителей английского языка – в большей степени проявляется влияние родного языка. Информанты в основном реализуют стратегии позитивной вежливости, присущие русской культуре, и не задумываются о выборе соответствующих интонационных средств, осуществляя негативный перенос коммуникативных стратегий и интонации, что неизбежно приводит к иноязычному акценту в речи, а также проявлению национальной идентичности в речи на английском языке.

EN

Identifying intonation features and politeness strategies in classroom language

Ivanova J. E., Mikhaleva E. I.

Abstract. The paper presents the results of the phonopragmatic analysis of the communicative styles of BA students in teaching and CELTA candidates. The focus is made on classroom management and prosodic characteristics used in the speech of two groups of non-native informants. We aim to find the connection of speakers' national identity and language teaching. Regarding pronunciation as part of a person's identity, the authors carry out a comparative analysis of English and Russian cultures and examine linguistic and paralinguistic expression of national indexical features in communication. Singling out the strategies that allow teachers to carry out classroom interactions with their students, identifying the correlation of classroom interaction language and speech prosody with politeness strategies provide the novelty of the research. We clearly stated that conventionality of classroom language discourse varied at the level of prosody and reflected national specific characteristics in the speech of a foreign language teacher. Due to perceptive and analytical methods of analysis, we recognized that CELTA candidates follow standardized teaching framework requirements, whilst future language teachers demonstrate the influence of native language interference to a greater degree. The findings show that the tendencies that reveal the status inequality in classroom interactions between teachers and students are in the choice of prosodic features and language construction. University students in teaching realize strategies of positive politeness culture typical of their own Russian culture; in the group of CELTA candidates the level of phonetic competence and personal experience is higher thus they choose phonetic features characteristic of negative politeness culture.

Введение

It often happens that we perceive and interpret what other people tell us by hearing their intonation rather than paying attention to what was said. Indeed, prosody plays an important role in recognizing the meaning of utterances, the attitude, and emotions of speakers. However, while communicating in the English language and articulating our thoughts, we are less conscious and even negligent in terms of intonation, causing ambiguity, misunderstanding, and failure in communication. There are myriad examples to illustrate that prosodic features inappropriately used lead to different communication errors, and many of such cases are analysed by scholars of prosody (Ivanova, Mikhal'eva, 2022; Вишнеvская, Левина, 2007). Yet despite these obvious shortcomings in communication, non-native speakers of English give little attention to the role of prosody. If we turn to the analysis of communicative styles of teachers and the language of teaching English at schools, cursory attention if any at all is given to prosody, largely because teachers do not realize that as soon as they switch to English and speak the language, they act as ambassadors or representatives of the English culture. Obviously, this identity is transmitted through appropriate language strategies and intonation. As far as studies involving both strategies and prosody in interaction between teachers and students at the lessons are concerned, we cannot single out any of them. All the above explains the relevance of the study.

The tasks of this study are the following: to elaborate on classroom language strategies; to identify their correlation with politeness strategies; to analyse the prosody in interactions between teachers of English and their students.

Since intonation is one of the components of culture, our initial hypothesis was that national identity and culture codes manifest in the speech of a foreign language teacher through intonation and strategic classroom language. This preliminary assumption was supported by perceptive and analytical research methods. The speech of English language teachers is analyzed on the level of performance and perception, and politeness strategies are examined to identify the parameters that affect the style of communication.

Practical value of the study is that it contributes to a more profound understanding of the importance of prosody in communication. Research findings can be used in the teaching courses of English Phonetics, Phonostylistics, Methodology.

Getting the results of the study was possible thanks to the theoretical background based on the works devoted to cross-cultural analyses (Schauer, Culpeper, Marti et al., 2014; Culpeper, 2016; Sinkevičiūtė, 2010; Ларина, 2009; 2013; Иванова, 2019); intercultural interaction, communication styles and models of politeness (Brown, Levinson, 1987; Spencer-Oatey, 2008; Culpeper, Kan, 2019; Ларина, 2003); the phenomena of intonation, interference, and accented speech (Брызгунова, 1984; Иванова, 2001; Янко, 2008; Михалёва, 2012; Couper-Kuhlen, 1986; Ladd, 1996; Cruttenden, 1997; Roach, 2009; Crystal, 2012; Wells, 2018).

Language students as well as teachers in this study come from various backgrounds. They have different levels of education, nationality, and diverse age range. The level of the target language in the group with Russian graduate students teaching English at secondary schools is A1-A2, thus, it is still a problem for the learners to conduct meaningful conversations at the lessons. The four teachers, females aged 21-22 years, were new to language teaching. They were still students at the university undergoing practical teaching session at schools in Moscow. To protect their anonymity, we will code them as Teacher 1, Teacher 2, Teacher 3, and Teacher 4.

CELTA candidates were in our second group of the informants (we codified them as C1 and C2). CELTA is a teacher training qualification for teaching English as a second or foreign language. Two demo lessons of CELTA candidates (Lesson 1 (L1). Teaching English to Adults (CELTA Training). 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I2ueisaLUi8>; Lesson 2 (L2). A CELTA Course Training Lesson. 2014. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=po2hzB6SI8M>) were chosen for our analysis, because we assume that the standard requirements which they have to follow will make them adapt to the standardized style of teaching and interaction with students.

Discussion and results

Following Culpeper and Kan (2019), who highlighted the role of keyword analysis in constituting the nature of a communicative style, we perform some analysis to identify the most (in-)frequently used keywords or style markers, as it will affect the communicative style of the teachers. Together with it, while scrutinizing communication between the teachers and their students at the lessons, we pragmatically interpreted the context and commented on the rapport orientated strategies. With reference to Spencer-Oatey's (2008), Culpeper and Kan's (2019) works on intercultural interaction where they introduced rapport management strategies, we relate to them and summarize them in our study:

- 1) rapport enhancement orientation: a desire to strengthen or enhance harmonious relations;
- 2) rapport management orientation: a desire to maintain or protect harmonious relations;
- 3) rapport neglect orientation: a lack of concern or interest in the quality of relations;
- 4) rapport challenge orientation: a desire to challenge or impair harmonious relations (Culpeper, Kan, 2019, p. 7).

The authors further elaborated on these actions and drew a parallel between these strategies and Brown and Levinson's (1987) model of politeness, which we consider relevant for our paper.

Despite quite an evident shortcoming of Brown and Levinson's model, which in some studies presented as ideal only for individualistic Anglo-Saxon society unlike some non-Western group-oriented cultures (Alabdali, 2019),

we can emphasize its efficacy for examining the politeness strategies as well as guiding speakers to improve their speech. The key concept of face in their model embraces a numerous number of strategies, thus being applicable to many cultures and quickly turning into the subject of research of different cross-cultural analyses (Schauer, Culpeper, Marti et al., 2014; Culpeper, 2016; Sinkevičiūtė, 2010; Ларина, 2003; 2009; 2013; Иванова, 2019).

In comparative analyses between English and Russian cultures, there is a general view that the British use a negative politeness culture, while the Russians tend to use positive politeness.

In British culture, scientists emphasize its polite and indirect character, as well as deep concern about non-imposition (Brown, Levinson, 1987; Fukushima, 2000; 2015; Haugh, 2013; Haugh, Kádár, Mills, 2013; Ryabova, 2015). Restraint, caution, and contact avoidance are characteristics of negative politeness (Ryabova, 2015, p. 92). As a result, the speaker uses hedging to keep face.

It is stated that the well-known concept of 'privacy' is one of the main characteristics of the British communicative style. According to T. Larina, it is 'a zone of personal autonomy into which no one is allowed to enter' (Ларина, 2009, p. 73). This personal autonomy is manifested in avoiding situations of influence on others, as well as unwillingness to experience it from the outside, in demonstrating tolerance to the interests, values, character, and behaviour of interlocutors. Here, we note the importance of communication with status inequality in English culture, as the situations we analyse are classroom interactions between teachers and students. We will point out that the British do not demonstrate power based on the principle of equality, which is also one of the most significant English cultural values that affect the style of communication.

Belonging to the group-oriented culture where cooperation, co-dependency and subordination prevail, the Russian communication style is characterized by its outspokenness, directness, and imposition. These features are markers of the high index of power distance or vertical distancing. Status inequality is revealed via directness, interruptions, advice acceptable in communication, whilst British culture demonstrates status symmetry of all the participants of the discourse.

Comparing the two styles of communication, it should be noted that in British culture, the focus is on the form, while in Russian culture, the communicative approach is content based. At the same time, T. Larina (Ларина, 2009) states that representatives of both styles employ a mix of strategies in the speech acts.

In the present study, we concentrate on negative politeness strategies, since we attempt to analyse the speech of English language teachers. We stick to the idea that language teachers are mediators not only of the language, in our case the English language, but also of the culture, thus, they should be demonstrating politeness strategies specific to the culture in focus.

While observing the process of teaching English, we recognized the influence of native language interference. Our special attention was focused on prosodic interference. It is believed to be one of the crucial difficulties faced by the learners mastering the English language. Transfer from the mother tongue (L1) to the foreign language (L2) causes many deviations in the prosodic patterns in oral communication.

Being under the strong influence of the native intonation patterns, foreign language learners substitute unfamiliar intonation components for the suprasegmental characteristics of their mother tongue, thus leading to the wrong intonational organization of the utterance on the level of performance. On the level of perception, they also do not feel the difference in intonation contours, which then results in their speech. Linguists have identified the most common mistakes made by the Russian learners of English. Some of them will be referred to later in our study.

Researchers connect the ideas of individual and cultural differences with the question of pronunciation and intonation (Михалёва, 2018). David Block's contribution to the area of identity and language learning, and teaching has been significant. He managed to give a new perspective to the previous studies of the issue and further developed a poststructuralist view on identity. Considering the complexity of defining the term, he scrupulously examines its seven perspectives or layers. In citing Lambert, Block highlights that learners 'must be both able and willing to adopt various aspects of behaviour, including verbal behaviour, which characterize members of the other linguistic-cultural group' (2007, p. 48). As far back as 1973, a Canadian psychologist and Professor Wallace E. Lambert, widely known for his contributions to language education and bilingualism, recognized that language is inevitably and intricately linked to culture and different cultural changes play a role in language acquisition (Lambert, Tucker, 1973).

Another distinguished linguist Alexander Z. Guiora in a series of studies emphasized the importance of the ability to authentically pronounce a second language. He claimed that pronunciation is the aspect most closely connected to identity and by learning a second language people are acquiring a new identity (Guiora, Brannon, Dull, 1972).

In contemporary works on language and identity, the overall view is that language in all its levels (lexical, grammatical, and phonetic) participates in transmission of culture. Among several articles theorizing national identity, Y. E. Ivanova, E. I. Mikhaleva and T. N. Efimenko's empirical work on internationalization in stand-up genre is worth mentioning. The concern of the researchers was chiefly to analyze the talks of six well-known comedians from the USA, the UK, and Russia from the point of the prosodic features used in their speech. The findings were that the speech pattern used in their talks was universal. The study confirmed that 'if a comedian performs in the style of a stand-up, it will sound American because they adopt the stylistic features of American stand-up whether or not the comedian actually has or has not those features' (Ivanova, Mikhaleva, Efimenko, 2020, p. 302).

At the same time, there is an assumption that national identity retaining in the mind of the speaker remains in the production of a foreign language, thus causing a phenomenon called 'foreign accent', and some speakers might fear losing their own identity and are not eager to integrate into a new culture. Contrary to this explanation, we argue

that a foreign language poses no threat to the learner's identity but the failure to take it in may lead to negative consequences, such as a failure in education or career prospects. Besides, when speaking of the teachers of English, we realize that they do not only work with the language, but they also teach it to others and by doing so, they should be intelligible and represent the culture and identity of the native speakers.

We are convinced that since lessons are carried out in English, the teacher acts as a mediator of the English/British culture, thus, the politeness strategies should be used according to the ones which are typical of and accepted in that culture. Considering this, we examine the language of the candidates focusing on the characteristics of the negative politeness culture:

- Being indirect.
- Questioning, hedging.
- Impersonal constructions.
- Giving the partner the option not to do the act.
- Modality.
- Minimizing the imposition.
- Expressing thanks and encouragement.

The teacher language, used at the lessons and being universal in the academic discourse, was categorized and analysed from the point of its strategy (Getting students involved; Giving instructions; Giving feedback) and each phrase was examined not only according to the Politeness Theory, but also according to prosodic characteristics used. The tones and melody for some sample sentences is marked in brackets after the word in focus; the list of abbreviations is given at the end of the article. The results of the study allowed us to identify both common ground and points of difference in the discourse of the representatives of two different cultures.

Teacher 1

The teacher speaks very fast and indistinctly, her articulation is quite poor. She does not project her voice and mutters the instructions under her breath and receives the same incomprehensible and inarticulate responses from her students. She frequently refers to her notes and loses eye contact with her class. While doing so, she bends too low to the notes, which are on the table, not bothering about her listeners. At the same time, she often switches to Russian during the lesson to explain some new material, as well as to translate English phrases to her students into Russian, but such a technique seriously inhibits from fully immersing into the language and results in the lack of knowledge in it. There is very little interaction with the students, who follow the course of the lesson with difficulty and get easily distracted from it. The overall impression is negative.

Most of the keywords (*please, girls, guys, let's, next, read, so, what, do, ask, who, the task, the exercise, translate, great*) can be categorized as introducing the strategies of giving instructions, requesting, giving information: 'So, read sentence number 2. Please, read and translate. Let's do the following thing'.

T1 communicative style is orientated to rapport maintenance. The teacher does not reveal any personal information and neither has she encouraged it from her students. She is not emotionally involved with the activity and her students do not get any support either.

T1 rarely uses the names of her students while addressing them, which is quite unusual but can be explained in the way that she is a temporary teacher and has just had a few hours with them. She does not encourage her students to work hard and barely praises their contribution to the lesson. For instance, the teacher swallowed the word 'great', which was meant to complement the correct answer, once and the next time pronounced it with a level tone very unemotionally, which resembled more of a filler to a pause than an approval.

Teacher 2

T2 speaks at a fast pace, but unlike T1, her voice is quite loud and the children can hear her well. The articulation is sometimes not very distinct due to the quick tempo of her speech and shortcomings in the pronunciation of some sounds. The teacher is enthusiastic about her students. T2 has constant eye contact with them, she keeps moving during the lesson and approaches different groups of students working together on some tasks to listen to them and correct their mistakes or give feedback. Though reducing the distance between herself and the students non-verbally, i.e. by coming to their places, her role is still domineering as she keeps standing beside them and does not take a seat with them.

The students are involved and participate eagerly in different activities. There is more interaction between students, and we can explain this by the fact that the students have a higher level of English and perhaps they feel more confident.

The keywords show that T2 has a communicative style that is orientated to rapport management (*so, look, please, exchange, read, explain, come up with, present, ideas, can, next, thank you, ok*). Her communicative strategies are mainly of giving instructions: 'You have 2 minutes to look at the picture and come up with your ideas. Exchange the ideas. So, please repeat the whole sentence. Who's ready? Add something, please'. The manner is rather direct and disciplinarian.

It is worth noting that there are also the strategies of giving information and expressing positive evaluation: 'We're going to continue talking about families. We're going to come back to the text. Right you are'. However, T2 uses the same constructions and vocabulary, which we would suggest simplifies the language a lot.

Encouraging the students to contribute to a discussion, T2 asks questions, so that we can qualify it as the strategy of involvement: 'Can you name three qualities? Can we call Daniel an ideal boy?'. It would appear more rapport enhancing if she could use some self-disclosing communicative strategies at the lesson and come up with something like 'When I read the text I thought of...' and 'What qualities can you name?'. This is pertinent to learning situations to demonstrate personal involvement, interest, and emotions together with the students.

Scrutinizing the work of both teachers (T1, T2), we would like to point out that neither of them encourages the students non-verbally. The emotional attitude of the melody does not show warmth or involvement in the process either. They are too serious, reserved and very concentrated on the task they perform. The reasons for this may be nervousness, lack of experience in teaching, the level of their English and cultural competency. Both teachers choose direct strategies, which can be explained by an asymmetrical relation between the superior teachers and their students, when the speakers of greater importance adjust this kind of strategy towards their inferior addressees.

Prosodically T2 uses many falling tones: High Falls and Low Falls: 'One more (HF) minute'. Sometimes addressing her students, she calls their names with a Low Fall nuclear tone, which sounds too categorical, and such a tone triggers a different interpretation. She seems not to invite them into a conversation but, on the contrary, stop them from joining in it.

Other nuclear tones that are encompassed by the speaker are Fall-Rise and Low Rise: 'OK' (LR), 'probably' (FR), 'Good morning' (LR), 'guys, right' (LR). As for general and special questions, T2 marks them with corresponding rising and falling nuclear tones, respectively. However, the tones resemble more of the Russian tones that are not very sharp and prominent. She may heavily stress out other words within the sentence, thus misleading the listeners in what exactly she wants to know by the question. Though we must admit that the students do not pay any attention to the intonation, and they have no difficulty understanding their teacher. What affects their perception more in instructions is when they are given with the Russian nuclear tone, which means that we perceive the tone of voice better in our native language.

Russian BA students teaching English online

Considering global digitalization of all spheres of life, the pandemic issue and as a result a sudden forced transition to an online form of teaching, we tried to analyse two online lessons. The questions we asked ourselves were if the professional communication between a teacher and a student online is in any way different from the one in the real classroom? Will the teacher have to alter the classroom interaction in any way and what strategies and prosodic characteristics of teacher language will be used? Lessons 3 and 4 are taught in virtual and online formats.

Teacher 3

T3 prepared and presented her lesson for certification of students graduates. Lesson planning fully satisfies the requirements. Despite a virtual demo lesson that lacks the rapport with students, T3 demonstrates excellent techniques of interactivity by addressing students and giving them time to think and try to answer: 'What can you see? What do you think? Have you ever done that in English? Did you guess right?'

Speech presentation is on a high level, too. Pronunciation and intonation are correct and stylistically adequate. This might be because the candidate spent a year in England.

At the same time, we notice reserved or even subdued manner of speaking in the introductory part, which is pronounced on a narrow pitch unemotionally, without projecting the voice. However, during the lesson the melody gets more varied, there are frequent pitch changes, and the vivacity of the voice is expressed via a set of prosodic features mostly realized in the combination of contrasting High Head and Low Fall or Fall-Rise.

Examples of classroom interaction: Getting students involved:

- Hello (LF), dear students. I'm glad to see you here (MH + LF).
- If you are ready (HH + LF) to start our lesson (FR), please (LF), continue watching (LF) this video. I hope you like it (HH + LF).

Giving feedback:

- You did a great job today (HH + LF).
- Thank you for the lesson (HH + LF). See you next time (HH + LF). Bye (FR).

The peculiarity of the lesson is the lack of two-way communication, that is why we mostly hear T3 giving instructions. The common intonation pattern used is High Head and Low Fall. There is a noticeable compound tune Fall + Rise and a Falling melody in more extended phrases:

- All right (HH + LF). **Let's** begin our lesson (FH + LF). **Look** at the picture (HH + LF).
- **Let's** look at another picture (HH + LF). You **have** (HF) **to** listen carefully (LR) to the statements that I make (HH + LR) and **agree** (LR) with me or **correct** me if I'm wrong (HH + LF). **Let's** try (LF).

A mix of strategies of negative and positive politeness cultures is observed in this virtual classroom interaction. The candidate uses direct sentences, the modal verb 'have to', imperatives, which are softened using the word 'please'. We hear modality with the verb 'might', minimizing the imposition and giving the option not to do the act, as well as several forms of encouragement and expressing thanks. Intonation patterns also contribute to the manner typical of negative politeness.

Overall, T3 manages to create a friendly atmosphere at the lesson, trying to include common patterns of classroom interaction with varied British English intonation and nuclear tones. T3 has a communicative style that is oriented to rapport management.

Teacher 4

An online one-to-one lesson was the first experience for the candidate. Lesson planning is standard, the manner of the teacher is calm and friendly. There were all stages of the lesson present starting with a formal greeting and a phonetic exercise as a warm-up activity. T4 has a communicative style that is oriented to rapport enhancement orientation: a desire to strengthen or enhance harmonious relations. She tries to encourage the student, has small talk with him, asks questions and reacts by laughing or using exclamations and words of thanks.

Classroom interaction: Getting students involved:

- Hello (LR), can you hear (LR) me (IC-4)?
- So (LF), how did you spend your time (LR)?
- Well (LR), so let's start the lesson itself (FH + FR).

Giving feedback:

- Oh (MR), that's awesome (HH + MR).
- Ok, great (LFs/LRs).
- Yes (HF), that's right (HH + HF).
- I thank (LF) you for the work (LF) that you have just done (HH + LR)...

Teacher Talk prevails over Learner Talk. The narrow voice pitch is typical of the Russian manner of speaking, falls and rises, even though used correctly on the focus words, are substituted by IC-1, 2, 4, which are clear examples of the negative transfer.

Giving instructions:

- So **look** at the screen (HH + LF).
- So (LR) right now (LR) I **want you to** listen to the text (HH + LR) and **repeat** (LF) after it (LF), ok (LR)?

T4 uses imperatives, modal verbs (have to, should, can) with a falling IC-2; the choice of the verb 'to want' demonstrated directness and imposition. This characterizes the speaker as rather direct and imposing, using the strategies of positive politeness culture.

CELTA candidates teaching English

Having high awareness of language and a competence in English (C1+) is prerequisite enabling the candidates to undertake the course. Besides, during the course, CELTA candidates research such topics as Phonology, the practical significance of similarities and differences between languages, varieties of English, multilingualism, and the role of first languages. Lessons should be held in an enthusiastic, efficient, and engaging way, there should be balance between LT (Learner Talk) and TT (Teacher Talk). Instructions should be made clear, and lessons run smoothly. Other requirements are: be confident, speak clearly projecting your voice, get student's attention by increased loudness.

Lesson 1 (Teaching English to Adults) is given by a Russian candidate (C1) – an educator, educational technology specialist originally from Russia and now based in the Middle East. Overall, his accent can be characterized as American.

The teacher is enthusiastic, engaging. The style is friendly and polite. There is a balance between TT and LT. The role this teacher takes on in this lesson is of an activator and a manager, and he uses different interaction patterns during the lesson. C1's communicative style is focused on challenge orientation: a desire to challenge or impair harmonious relations. He is emotionally involved with the activity, and his students are encouraged throughout the lesson. Objectives of the lesson were made clear to the students. Explanations were explicit.

C1 uses emotional Fall-Rise tones, sometimes adds Stepping Head + Fall to slow down his instructions focusing on every word of the sentence. Sometimes he repeats the same sentence to let the students understand the task. The candidate speaks in a slow tempo and gesticulates a lot to support his instructions.

As stated above, the teacher language used at the lesson is analysed from the point of its strategy. In C1 language, we can notice the use of a negative politeness strategy in most phrases. For example, student involvement is realized via minimizing the imposition and indirectness:

- The first (HF) thing I'm gonna do (LR) is for you (HF) to look (HF) at these pictures (HF) on the board (LR) and (LR) in (HF) pairs (LR) think (LF) about who (Stepping Head) are these people (LR). Are they doctors (LR)?
- Does everybody (HH) agree (LR) (L1)?

The interjection *Ok* is used with a rising tone to check whether the students are following him and with a low fall to mark the end of the previous activity or instruction and proceed to a new one.

Candidate 1 uses a few directives expressed by an imperative, which is typical of positive politeness culture. The tones used are Low Falls and Low Rises in combination with High Head:

- I'm gonna hand out an exercise for you. I **want you to** look at these sentences and think which word: 'did' (LF), 'do' (LR) or 'does' (LR) or maybe nothing (FR) comes (LF) into each (HH) gap (LF). Ok (LR)?
- And you have five (Accidental Rise) seconds (LF) remaining (LF) and your time (LR) is up (HF) (L1).

In the last sentence, the teacher raises the voice pitch and loudness using an Accidental Rise on the key word to attract the attention of the students, who are busy working in their groups.

Lesson 2 (A CELTA Course Training Lesson) is given by another Russian candidate (C2) who did her CELTA course in England. The accent is Russian English. C2 follows all the CELTA criteria and gives a lesson in the standard format.

The general impression we get watching this demo lesson is that the candidate feels rather uncertain while talking to the group of students. It seems that she is a bit tense while taking this form of assessment, controlling each movement and phrase because of a few reasons: an unfamiliar group of students, the lesson is video recorded and there is a group of assessors in the room.

However, overall, the atmosphere in the classroom is quite calm. C2 smiles, walks freely, comes up to every student and talks to them. The manner of C2 is friendly, soft, and unimposing, in a way a bit cautious. The teacher here is in the role of a controller and a prompter nudging students forward in a supportive way. It is obvious that C2 wants to cooperate. Her communicative style is rapport challenge orientation: a desire to challenge or impair harmonious relations.

Greeting:

- Ok (Rise IC-4). So (Fall IC-1) hello (Fall/IC-1) everybody (Rise IC-4). Hello (Fall/IC-1).

Giving feedback:

- Oh ok. Ok. So thank you very much (IC-4) (L2).

C2 involves the learners in the process of studying, LT prevails over TT, however, the language of student involvement and instructions is rather limited. Multiple pausing speaks of the barrier, inner tension, and self-control. The candidate either lacks linguistic or psychological confidence (unfamiliar group of students plus assessors). Students are noticeably more active working in pairs than responding to the questions of the teacher and speaking individually.

At the same time, the repetitive manner of language behavior, lack of pitch changes, speed and loudness leads to monotony, inexpressive speech patterns. Negative prosodic transfer is observed in most classroom management phrases analyzed. We notice IC-1, 4, which express rises and falls but partly correspond to the English language tones.

C2 demonstrates strategies of positive politeness culture typical of the native culture: imperatives, directness, minimized distancing. At the same time, even though limited in variation, there are instances of modality in the sentences, encouragement (ok) and thanking (thank you very much).

Giving instructions:

- Now in pairs: you two, you two, you two (Rise/ IC-4), **try and decide** what teenagers usually speak about. You **may use** these constructions (IC-1).

- **Have a look** at these pictures. Now **have a look** at these questions.

- I **want you to** tell us about your partner the person you're sitting next to (L2).

The pitch of voice also plays a role in expressing the politeness of the utterance. C2 has a tendency towards negative intonation transfer when she substitutes British English intonation patterns by the intonation constructions of her native language. The voice pitch is narrow mid. C2 uses simple and compound tunes: Falls, Rises, Fall-Rises. Melody used in special and general questions is: Mid Level Head + Fall-Rise, Mid Head + Fall/Rise. Pre-Head in all intonation patterns of the speaker starts at Mid Level. We can notice the use of Russian tones by the candidate: IC-1 represents gradual lowering of tone and is used in the Russian language to express finality in the syntagm. IC-2 is a falling tone to express prominence in the phrase. IC-4 is a falling-rising-level tone used in non-final position and in questions.

Considering the norms of behavior, we can say that both lessons of CELTA candidates were well presented. The classroom management and interaction were adequate and up to the level of the students (A1, elementary adult learners). Taking into consideration that all lessons given by the novice teachers are held in an unfamiliar class, we can ignore a slight tension or lack of students' emotional rapport with the teacher. The relationship between the teacher and students is semi-formal, the teachers do not demonstrate their status.

Conclusion

The research findings of the present study allow us to make some conclusions.

We began the article by identifying the communicative strategies used by the teachers during their classes. Following Spencer-Oatey's (2008), Culpeper and Kan's (2019) studies of communicative styles and keyword analyses made it possible to single out frequently used keywords in the classroom discourse and characterize teachers' communicative styles. Our empirical analysis was also informed by the notion of positive and negative Russian and British politeness cultures and intonation patterns typical of these cultures, thus enabling us to describe their characteristic features in the teachers' styles. The article discloses 1) differences in lexical units of teachers' styles, 2) characterizes their communicative functions, 3) directed towards established rapport orientations and 4) identifies prosody in participation of teachers and interaction with students.

Most of our conclusions about communicative styles become apparent from the words and prosodic characteristics taken place more often in the speech of our respondents. We notice that when the involvement of teachers in performance is higher, they try to build common ground with students, and their styles are oriented more to enhancement rather than maintenance, students' participation is more active, and perception is positive. However, a surprising finding with schoolchildren in our research is the fact that they perceive instructions, requests or evaluations given in English with Russian intonation patterns very naturally, not undermining disparities between contexts and melody.

The status of a teacher is revealed in the manner of speaking, ways of giving instructions, prosodic characteristics. We notice a combination of strategies from both negative and positive politeness culture. This explicit modality is manifested in speech constructions. Tonality is a key factor demonstrating the role and status of a teacher, i.e. implicit modality or illocutions that express the state of the speaker, their individual manner, and style of presentation.

Thus, Group 1 teachers express the hierarchical relationship with their students, using mostly direct classroom language strategies like instructions, requests. Imperatives are used with a falling tone, which adds the attitude of authoritarian categorical statement. The most frequent are the positive politeness strategies: direct imperatives, personal constructions, modality, direct address. Group 2 aims at indirectness and minimizing the imposition. A mix of negative and positive politeness strategies is used in the speech of CELTA candidates.

National identity is expressed in the interaction between teachers of English and their students through the following prosodic characteristics: voice pitch of the Russian speakers is lower and narrower. The use of Level Heads with a few nuclear tones in compound sentences, Descending Heads are not typical of the Russian language, so such types of heads are rarely used by Russian language teachers.

Russian forms of nuclear tones are partially transferred. This concerns the tendency to substitute English contours by the Russian ones. The reason for this may be due to insufficient level of speech competence of Russian students who fail to apply theoretical knowledge in practice. The choice of prosodic characteristics, on the one hand, corresponds to English patterns; however, the actual pronunciation of tones is realized with Russian interference. At the same time, we notice that Russian students perceived the instructions given with the mother-tongue intonation patterns better than the ones given with English patterns.

Human voice is very informative, and not only does it express one's individual features, but it also is key to understanding one's national identity and culture. Since the concept of culture varies in every society and there is no universal definition of what politeness is and how it is manifested linguistically, in different countries, phonetic norms, which correspond to the norms of communication and polite behavior, are different. That is why one needs to consider cultural and situational variation assessing the speech behavior of a person. As for language teaching, communicative style of teachers and their verbal and non-verbal manner of interaction with the audience should correspond to the norms and codes of the studied language.

In conclusion, speaking about the profession of a language teacher who acts as a mediator of cultures and a source of ethno- and linguocultural information, we face the problem of insufficient manifestation of the importance of the role of a teacher and tasks in front of them. Being experts in the field of foreign languages, teachers should be transmitting their knowledge and experience via positioning themselves as a role model, setting an example for their learners, the teacher speaking in a foreign language should be identified by their students as a near-native speaker.

Further research perspectives lie in the comparative study of Russian and English politeness strategies, intonation interference and the expression of national identity in different types of discourse.

The list of abbreviations of nuclear tones and heads used in the article

HF – High Fall
 LF – Low Fall
 LR – Low Rise
 MR – Mid Rise
 HH – High Head
 MD – Mid Head
 FH – Falling Head
 IC – Intonation Construction

Источники | References

1. Брызгунова Е. А. Эмоционально-стилистические различия русской звучащей речи. М., 1984.
2. Вишневская Г. М., Левина Т. М. Английская супraseгментная фонетика: учеб. пособие. Иваново: Изд-во ИвГУ, 2007.
3. Иванова Ю. Е. Компаративный анализ лингвокультурологических особенностей дискуссии в англоязычном и русскоязычном полилоговом общении // Язык и культура. 2019. № 48. <https://doi.org/10.17223/19996195/48/9>
4. Иванова Ю. Е. Просодические характеристики наречий-интенсификаторов в современной деловой английской речи: экспериментально-фонетическое исследование на материале американского варианта английского языка: дисс. ... к. филол. н. Иваново, 2001.
5. Ларина Т. В. Англичане и русские. Язык, культура, коммуникация. М.: Языки славянских культур, 2013.
6. Ларина Т. В. Категория вежливости в английской и русской коммуникативных культурах: монография. М., 2003.
7. Ларина Т. В. Категория вежливости и стиль коммуникации: сопоставление английских и русских лингвокультурных традиций. М.: Рукописные памятники Древней Руси, 2009.
8. Михалёва Е. И. Корреляция психологического типа личности с просодическими средствами // Традиции и инновации в лингвистике и литературоведении: межкаф. сборник науч. статей / науч. ред. К. М. Баранова, О. Г. Чупрына. М.: Московский государственный областной университет, 2018.
9. Михалёва Е. И. Место диалектной речи в фонетической системе английского языка // Вестник Московского городского педагогического университета. Серия: Филология. Теория языка. Языковое образование. 2012. № 1 (9).
10. Янко Т. Е. Интонационные стратегии русской речи в сопоставительном аспекте. М.: Языки славянских культур, 2008.
11. Alabdali T. S. Revisiting Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory: A Middle Eastern Perspective // Bulletin of Advanced English Studies. 2019. Vol. 2 (2).
12. Block D. Second Language Identities. L.: Continuum, 2007.
13. Brown P., Levinson S. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
14. Couper-Kuhlen E. An Introduction to English Prosody. L.: Edward Arnold, 1986.
15. Cruttenden A. Intonation. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
16. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

17. Culpeper J. Impoliteness Strategies // *Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society* / ed. by A. Capone, J. L. Mey. Cham: Springer, 2016.
18. Culpeper J., Kan Q. Communicative Styles, Rapport and Student Engagement: An Online Peer Mentoring Scheme // *Applied Linguistics*. 2019. Vol. 41. Iss. 5.
19. Fukushima S. In Search of Another Understanding of Politeness: From the Perspective of Attentiveness // *Journal of Politeness Research*. 2015. Vol. 11 (5).
20. Fukushima S. Requests and Culture: Politeness in British English and Japanese. Bern: Peter Lang, 2000.
21. Guiora A. Z., Brannon R. C. L., Dull C. Y. Empathy and Second Language Learning // *Language Learning. A Journal of Research in Language Studies*. 1972. Vol. 22. Iss. 1.
22. Haugh M. Im/politeness, Social Practice and the Participation Order // *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2013. Vol. 58.
23. Haugh M., Kádár D., Mills S. Interpersonal Pragmatics: Issues and Debates // *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2013. Vol. 58.
24. Ivanova Y. E., Mikhaleva E. I. The Role of Prosody in Expressing Culture-specific Speech Behaviour of Language Teachers in English // *Training, Language and Culture*. 2022. Vol. 6 (1).
25. Ivanova Y. E., Mikhaleva E. I., Efimenko T. N. Internationalization of Stand-up Comedians' Speech Behaviour: Loss of National Identity? // *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences. Conference Proceedings*. L., 2020.
26. Ladd R. Intonational Phonology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
27. Lambert W. E., Tucker G. R. Sociocultural Aspects of Language Study // *Focus on the Learner: Pragmatic Perspectives for the Language Teacher* / ed. by J. W. Oller, J. C. Richards. Rowley: Newbury House, 1973.
28. Roach P. English Phonetics and Phonology: A Practical Course. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
29. Schauer G. A., Culpeper J., Marti L., Nevala M., Meilian M. Impoliteness and Emotions in a Cross-Cultural Perspective // *SPELL: Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature*. 2014. Vol. 30.
30. Sinkevičiūtė V. A Comparative Analysis of Politeness in First Encounter Conversations in British English Film and Peninsular Spanish Film // *Lexis*. 2010. HS 2. <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.820>
31. Spencer-Oatey H. Face, (Im)politeness and Rapport // *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory* / ed. by H. Spencer-Oatey. 2nd ed. L. – N. Y.: Continuum, 2008.
32. Wells J. C. English Intonation. Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Информация об авторах | Author information

RU

Иванова Юлия Евгеньевна¹, к. филол. н., доц.

Михалева Елена Игоревна², к. филол. н., доц.

¹ Финансовый университет при Правительстве Российской Федерации, г. Москва

² Московский городской педагогический университет

EN

Ivanova Julia Evgenievna¹, PhD

Mikhaleva Elena Igorevna², PhD

¹ Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, Moscow

² Moscow City University

¹ yueivanova@fa.ru, ² mihalevaei@mgpu.ru

Информация о статье | About this article

Дата поступления рукописи (received): 21.07.2023; опубликовано online (published online): 01.11.2023.

Ключевые слова (keywords): classroom language; phonetic competence; politeness strategies; phonopragmatics; national identity; речь учителя; фонетическая компетенция; стратегии вежливости; фонопрагматика; национальная идентичность.