

LITERATURVERZEICHNIS

1. Goethe-Institut: Märchen, literarische Texte im Unterricht, herausgegeben v. Karlhans Frank, Referat 42, München, 1985.
2. Horne, Herman Harrel: Storytelling, Questioning and Studying, New York, 1997.
3. Jonson, David, W. and Roger, T.: Learning Together and Alone, Cooperative, Competitive and Individualistic Learning, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, Sec. Edition, 1987.
4. Morgan, John/Rinvolucrì, Mario: Geschichten im Englischunterricht, Erfinden, Hören und Erzählen, Deutsch von R.E. Wicke, Hueber, München, 2005.
5. Wicke, Rainer E.: Komm Lass Dir Was Erzählen, Versuch einer Methodologie zum Geschichtenerzählen für Deutsch als Fremdsprache, Publications Alberta Aducation, Language Services Branch, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, 2000.

ВІДОМОСТІ ПРО АВТОРА

**Антоніна Білоус** – старший викладач кафедри перекладу КДПУ ім. Михайла Остроградського.  
 Наукові інтереси: методика викладання іноземних мов.

**THE COMMUNICATIVE-ANALYTIC APPROACH TO TEACHING ENGLISH  
 DISCOURSE INTONATION IN EFL MILIEU**

**Вікторія БОКОВА (Миколаїв, Україна)**

*У статті наведено переваги дискурсивного над емотивним підходом до навчання англійської інтонації. Автори пропонують пристосувати теорію дискурсивної інтонації до специфічних умов вивчення періодної мови як іноземної. В умовах вивчення, а не засвоєння іноземної мови подібно до рідної мови, автор вважає доцільним застосовувати комунікативно-аналітичний підхід у навчанні англійської дискурсивної інтонації.*

*The author analyzes the advantages of the discourse approach over the attitudinal one in teaching English intonation and suggests adapting this theory to EFL milieu. With learning, but not acquisition as the main strategy in EFL environment, communicative-analytic approach instead of communicative one is considered to be more efficient in teaching discourse intonation in EFL milieu.*

In the last twenty years “there have been major paradigm shifts in both general and applied linguistics toward acknowledging intonation as an indispensable component of language and communication” [7: 111]. Although intonation is proved to be relevant for efficient communication, it is taught almost exclusively to students of linguistic or philological majors and within the traditional British framework, with some syntax-based explanations of meaning [3], and very detailed recommendations on how to produce different elements of intonational phrases/syntagms/tone groups supported by careful comparison to Russian or Ukrainian languages [3; 2; 1].

The most influential theory on teaching English intonation in Ukraine remains the attitudinal theory by O’Connor and Arnold. It examines a large number of contours in an isolated fashion and ascribed attitudinal meanings to them. Teaching intonation is confined to developing skills in using intonation to express speakers’ attitudes. It is a real challenge for both teachers and students to apply this theory in practice, since it is impossible to memorize numerous intonation patterns/contours depending on sentence types, syntactic structures, and speakers’ attitudes. Non-native EFL teachers are reluctant to undertake teaching Phonetics and particularly intonation, since they should have a perfect ear to be able to distinguish and produce contrastively all those elements of intonation patterns.

As a result, there are anecdotal data showing the problems that intonational miscues can cause between native- and non-native speakers [9; 21]. Clennel summarizes these as follows: 1. The propositional content (essential information) of the message may not be fully grasped. 2. The illocutionary force (pragmatic meaning) of utterances may be misunderstood. 3. Interspeaker cooperation and conversational management may be poorly controlled [9: 118].

In the light of the above-defined problems in teaching English intonation, the author sets the following goals: to highlight the advantages of the discourse approach over the attitudinal one in teaching English intonation; to specify the needs of EFL learners as opposed to those of ESL learners; to define the main features of discourse theory application in EFL milieu; to specify the framework, learning strategies, and techniques appropriate to the Communicative-Analytic approach to teaching discourse intonation in EFL milieu.

Underhill was among the first to question the efficiency of the attitudinal approach to teaching English intonation. He proposed characteristics for an ideal system for teaching intonation: such system should be learnable, it “accounts for what native speakers do and don’t do”, and it has

“a limited set of rules that enables learners to develop valid generalizations on which to base their own interpretation and production” [20: 3].

David Brazil [4] was the first to take into consideration these recommendations. Intonation started to be studied in discourse also by Pierrehumbert's and Hirschberg's [16], but Brazil's discourse approach samples an ideal system for teaching intonation [7: 112]. While O'Connor and Arnold [15] examined a large number of contours in an isolated fashion and ascribed attitudinal meanings to them, Brazil developed a smaller and a more universal set of intonation meanings integrated into context. He considers intonation as a system of elements (prominence, key, tones) having their own independent communicative meanings. Thus, prominence has the meaning of selectivity (presenting new information). Tones are grouped into proclaiming new information (Falling tones) and referring to given information (Rising tones). Moreover, he claims that tones and keys have social meanings. Thus, the Fall has the meaning of a greater degree of speakers' dominance, the Fall-Rise – the least degree, and the Rise has a medium position on this scale. Key (pitch range) has two social meanings “inviting to concur” (low key) or “inviting to adjudicate” (high key) [4].

Based on Brazil's theory, intonation has two main functions: drawing (focusing) the listener's attention to the most relevant information of a message and regulating conversational behavior. The function of focusing allows studying intonation as a relevant element of an utterance information structure. The function of regulating conversational behavior consists in turn-taking managing and establishing or confirming the status of conversation participants.

Brazil's system of meanings allows us to infer a small set of rules for using intonation features for expressing wide range of functions (greetings, apologies, farewells, etc.) in various sentence types and syntactic structures. His theory was confined to studying “the most relevant intonation features (linguistic intonation)” [6: XII]. Wennerstrom, Chun, etc. contributed to the theory of discourse phonology by studying communicative meanings of prosodic means.

Although Brazil's theory has been widely used in teaching intonation in many world countries for the past 20 years [7: 112], it did not find wide application in our country. We will study whether it can be applicable to EFL milieu in the fashion it exists in ESL milieu. For this purpose we will consider the needs of EFL learners, arising from the specific conditions of learning foreign languages.

Brown uses the acronym ESL (English as a Second Language) “to refer to instruction of English to speakers of other languages in any country under circumstance, and to refer to English as a second language of commerce and education, a language that students often hear outside the walls of their classroom” [6: 3]. EFL (English as a Foreign Language) is an acronym used to refer to “English taught in countries ... where English is not a major language of commerce and education” [6: 3].

Based on the definitions of both acronyms, Tarnopolsky identifies two main features of EFL learning: 1) scarcity of input in English (comprehensible or any other) consisting in serious limitations in variety, richness, and volume of the input available to an EFL student in comparison with an ESL student” [18: 27]; 2) “absence of learner's immersion into the target language cultural community” [18: 29].

To explain the first feature, we will refer to Krashen and Terrell's Natural Approach in learning second languages. Krashen and Terrell distinguish between language acquisition and learning [12]. Language acquisition is an unconscious process, whereas language learning is a constant process of consciousness raising about minutest details of language use. They assert that in order to acquire a language, it is crucial to be exposed to a comprehensible input that should be one level higher than the actual level of a learner's language proficiency.

Based on Tarnopolsky's distinction, the first advantage of ESL over EFL learning is in being exposed to a big amount of varied and linguistically informative input of a target language. The second advantage consists in having the opportunity to be intensively exposed to a target language. In ESL milieu, a target language dominates in most spheres of communication. In EFL milieu, the exposure to a target language is mainly confined to English lessons. As a result, “EFL learners have very limited opportunities to develop their interlanguage gradually bringing it nearer to the target language following the classic second language (SLA) paradigm through making and

testing their own hypotheses as to the target language structure on the basis of rich and comprehensible input” [18: 27]. Therefore, learning remains the main strategy in EFL conditions.

Tarnopolsky suggests compensating this “unavoidable deficiency” in comprehensible input of a target language by introducing such a learning strategy as “explicit focusing on language forms” [18: 27]. According to Ellis, focusing on language forms or form-focused instruction (FFI) includes “any planned or incidental instructional activity that is intended to induce language learners to pay attention to linguistic form ... (phonological, lexical, grammatical and pragmalinguistic)” [10: 2]. FFI is opposed to meaning-focused instruction (MFI) “requiring learner to attend to the content of what they want to communicate” [10: 13], but not to the linguistic form.

According to Ellis, the difference between the planned and incidental attention to the form consists in the level of intensity of language forms learning. He asserts that “in the case of planned focus-on-form, the instruction will be intensive, in the sense that learners will have the opportunity to attend to a single, preselected form many times. In the case of incidental focus-on-form, the instruction will be extensive because a range of linguistic forms (grammatical, lexical, phonological, pragmatic) are likely to arise like candidates for attention” [10: 16]. We can infer that in order to make the learning process more intensive, students must attend to language forms in methodically structured and sequenced activities.

The studies about FFI became the basis for developing the Communicative-Analytic approach in EFL teaching by Tarnopolsky. Unlike Communicative Language Teaching, the Communicative-Analytic approach consists in combination of communication and cognition. According to this approach, “focus on language form (analysis) will serve the purpose of EFL learning for communication if communication dominates analysis ...” [19: 28].

Applying Communicative-Analytic approach to teaching English discourse intonation in EFL conditions implies revising the existing framework by Celce-Murcia [7] who applied Brazil’s theory for teaching intonation communicatively. We will particularly find out the learning strategies and activities that would enhance learners’ focus on different realizations of intonation phenomena.

Celce-Murcia outlined the following stages of phonetic features learning:

- 1) “Description and analysis (e.g., oral and written illustrations of when and how the feature occurs in order to raise learner consciousness).
- 2) Listening discrimination (focused listening practice with feedback).
- 3) Controlled practice and feedback (e.g., oral reading of minimal pair sentences, short dialogues, etc., with special attention paid to the highlighted feature).
- 4) Guided practice and feedback (e.g., structured communication exercises that enable the learner to monitor for the specified feature, such as information gap activities, cued dialogues).
- 5) Communicative practice or free production and feedback (e.g., less structured activities that require the learner to attend to both form and content of utterances)” [7: 36].

As we can see, Celce-Murcia claims that the intonation forms should have oral and written form of illustration. It means they should be attended auditively (in oral texts) and visually (in written texts with graphic representations). Gaudin also claims to combine the auditive and visual approaches in teaching French intonation. The author argues that imitation combined with graphic representation of intonation is especially helpful for the learners with little or no ear or without a special aptitude to imitate foreign speech [11: 496]. In our opinion, it not only develops learners’ ear, but also makes students feel more self-confident. It reduces the level of learners’ anxiety in Phonetics class, which is in accordance with one of the principles of Communicative Language Teaching [6: 62].

In order to find out the most appropriate way of graphic representation of intonation within the Cognitive-Analytic approach to teaching discourse intonation, we will consider the existing systems of signs. There are two main systems of signs: “reflecting changes in melody alone and marking the degree of syllable stress in addition to melody variation” [5: 183]. Based on this distinction, we can infer that the second group of systems comprises marking more elements of intonation, and thereby is more appropriate to the explicit forms-focused instruction aimed at noticing minutest details about language forms realization. The second group includes such systems as tonetic symbols and using stand tonograms (staves). Tonic symbols by the British linguist R. Kington are used to mark intonation directly in the text. The method of stand tonograms “consists of

two parallel horizontal lines aimed at writing intonation signs between them. ...Two parallel lines of a stand signify the upper and lower levels of the voice range in speech” [5: 183].

Although Celce-Murcia recommends using graphic representations of intonation, she uses the first group system which is proved to be less efficient in EFL conditions. On the stage of description and analysis she uses the Fries’ system “which is based on a line drawn throughout a written phrase: the line points at a relative pitch of the voice in every part of the utterance” [5: 183]. On the stage of listening discrimination, Celce-Murcia uses the second group system of intonation graphic representations – tonetic symbols. On the stage of controlled practice, she recommends using only tonetic symbols and only for advanced students [5:198]. It means that such tasks as ‘imitate dialogues and mark the intonation features in them’ are justifiable for the students of philological departments whose level is supposed to be if not advanced then at least the highest among EFL learners. Within the communicative-analytic framework to teach discourse intonation, we will have to add such a task as marking intonation features using stand tonograms, which is aimed at enhancing students’ noticing details about intonation forms realization.

Following Celce-Murcia’s framework, most western course books in teaching discourse intonation include the tasks on marking intonation features using tonetic transcription only on the description and analysis stage. They completely exclude using stand tonograms. The course books of Ukrainian and Russian authors are based on the attitudinal approach to teaching English intonation, but they recommend using both methods of graphic representation of intonation for completing the task of imitate and marking on the stage of controlled practice. As a result, those EFL teachers who wish to teach intonation within communicative discourse approach, have to use western ESL-oriented course books and adapt them to EFL conditions by including the tasks on marking and making tonograms. This requires from them high auditory, discriminatory, and productive skills. EFL teachers should be able not only to identify and distinguish all the phonetic phenomena, but also demonstrate intonation patterns contrastively in order to convince students any time there is controversy in marking a phonetic phenomenon. In this situation, both EFL teachers and students will benefit from the keys (transcripts of the texts with marked intonation features), since their ear will develop through juxtaposing what they hear with what is marked in the keys.

The other aspect that needs to be attended is whether we need to include such a technique as dialogues memorization for acting out. Celce-Murcia [7] does not require including memorization activities. It can be accounted for the fact that memorization as part of habit development is considered to be an essential element of audio-lingual method of teaching second/foreign languages and is not appropriate to Communicative Language Teaching. Although memorization is incompatible with language acquisition, it is justified by the theory of learning.

According to Richards et al., memorization, inference, and habit learning are the “central processes of language learning” [17: 157]. Michalski in his theory of artificial intelligence describes “learning “in equation”: Learning = Inference + Memory” [13: 10]. He asserts that “learning can be viewed as a process creating knowledge/skill and memorizing it for future use” [14: 19]. Based on this definition, memorization should become an incompatible element of learning in EFL condition. Therefore, including the tasks of dialogues memorization for using their intonation patterns in new communicative situations (making up similar conversations) are recommended in teaching discourse intonation in EFL milieu.

Based on Michalski’s theory, the other important element of learning is inference. Michalski considers learning as an inductive inference system and defines it as “a process of acquiring knowledge by drawing inductive inferences from teacher or environment-provided facts” [13: 9]. Based on this definition, a new material should be presented inductively. Thus, students listen to some sample of preselected material in which some intonation phenomenon is richly used and formulate the rules of its use.

We can conclude that to increase the effectiveness of learning English intonation, we need to replace the attitudinal approach with the discourse approach providing a smaller set of rules for using English intonation in different communicative situations. To enhance the effectiveness of this approach in EFL classrooms, discourse theory should be modified. Having studied the difference between ESL and EFL milieu in language learning, we established that Tarnopolsky’s Communicative-Analytic method with its explicit forms-focused instruction would be more appropriate to teaching EFL.

Taking into account the class hour limitation for teaching intonation in EFL condition, the instruction should be intensive, and hence, the focus on intonation forms should be planned. It means that some intonation phenomenon should be widely presented in preselected learning material. We concluded that the tasks of marking the phonetic phenomena using both tonetic transcription and stand tonograms are appropriate to Communicative-Analytic approach. They both enhance students' noticing minutest details about intonation forms use and thereby facilitate explicit forms-focused instruction.

To apply the Communicative-Analytic method to teaching discourse intonation, we had to revise Celce-Murcia's framework of teaching English intonation communicatively. We arrived at the conclusion that her framework can be applicable to teaching discourse intonation in EFL classrooms if such learning strategies as memorization and inference are included. We particularly need to include the tasks on imitation not only in reading, but also in memorizing for acting out. Also, we proved that explicit inductive method of the theory presentation is in accordance with the Communicative-Analytic method.

Taking into account the above-mentioned modifications, we can outline the stages of teaching discourse intonation in EFL conditions. The lessons on teaching intonation should include listening and rule inducing as part of the theory introduction stage; listening, identifying, and marking intonation phenomena, using tonetic transcription and stand tonograms as part of the material introduction and listening discrimination stage; imitation and marking phonetic features using tonetic transcription and stand tonograms and dialogues memorization as part of the controlled stage; similar conversations or cued dialogues and performing or acting out as part of the guided practice; role playing as part of the free production stage.

#### REFERENCES

1. Бровченко Т.А., Бант И.Н. Фонетика английского языка. – К.: Радянська школа, 1964. – 272 с.
2. Соколова М.А. Теоретическая фонетика английского языка: Учебник для студентов высших учебных заведений. – М.: Владос, 2006. – 286 с.
3. Трахтеров А.Л. Практический курс фонетики английского языка. Учебник для институтов и факультетов иностранных языков. – М: Высшая школа, 1976. – 312 с.
4. Brazil D. Pronunciation for Advanced Learners of English. Student's Book. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994. – 159 p.
5. Brovchenko T.O., Korolova T.M. English Phonetics: Contrastive Analysis of English and Ukrainian Pronunciation). Mykolayiv: MSHU named after P. Mohyly, 2006. – 299 p.
6. Brown D.H. Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Regents, 2001. – 480 p.
7. Celce-Murcia M., Brinton D., Goodwin J. Teaching Pronunciation. A Reference for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Cambridge University Press, 1996. – 435 p.
8. Chun, D. Discourse Intonation in L2. From Theory and Research to Practice. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam, 2002. – 285 p.
9. Clennel, C. Raising the Pedagogic Status of Discourse Intonation Teaching//ELT Journal. – 1997. – Vol.51, №2. – P. 39-47.
10. Ellis R. Investigating Form-Focused Instruction. In Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Learning. Ed. by A. Cumming, 2001. –P.1-46.
11. Gaudin L. A Graphic Method for Presenting French Intonation//The French Review. – 1940. - Vol. 13, № 6. -P. 496-500.
12. Krashen, S. D., Terrell T. D. The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom. New York: Pergamon Press, 1983. – 234 p.
13. Michalski R. S. [Learning and Cognition](#)//Invited talk at 2nd International World Conference on the Foundations of Artificial Intelligence. Paris, 1995 (July 3-7).
14. Michalski, R. S. [Learning Strategies and Automated Knowledge Acquisition: An Overview](#). In Computational Models of Learning: Symbolic Computation. Ed by L. Bolc and G. L. Bradshaw. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1987. - P. 1-19
15. O'Connor J., Arnold G. The Intonation of Colloquial English. London: Longman, 1961. – P. 296.
16. Pierrehumbert, J., Hirschberg, J. The Meaning of Intonational Contours in the Interpretation of Discourse//Intentions in Communication. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990. – P. 271-312.
17. Richards J.C, Rodgers T. Method: Approach, Design and Procedures//TESOL Quaterly. - 1982. – Vol. 16, №2. – P. 18-33.
18. Tarnopolsky O. EFL Teaching and EFL Teachers in the Global Expansion of English, retrieved on December 22, 2008 from <http://www.wpel.net/v16/v16n2Tarnopolsky.pdf>
19. Tarnopolsky O. Communicative-Analytic Approach to Intensive Teaching/Learning of English in the Ukraine//Proceedings of the 16<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Linguistics. Oxford: Pergamon, 1997. - P. 25-39.
20. Underhill, A. Sound Foundations. Oxford: Heinemann, 1994. –376 p.
21. Wennerstrom, A. Intonational Meaning in English Discourse: A Study of Non-Native Speakers//Applied Linguistics. – 1994. – Vol. 15, №4. – P. 399-420.

#### ВІДОМОСТІ ПРО АВТОРА

**Вікторія Бокова** – старший викладач кафедри англійської філології МДГУ ім. П. Могили (Комплекс 'Києво-Могилянська Академія')

*Наукові інтереси:* дискурсивна фонологія, конwersаційний аналіз