

Yasynetska Olena Anatoliyivna,
Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor,
Horlivka Institute for Foreign Languages
of the State Higher Education Institution “Donbas State Pedagogical University”
Bakhmut, Ukraine
E-mail: olena_yasynetska2015@ukr.net

THE ESSENCE OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN CONTENT-BASED INSTRUCTION THROUGH A READING ASSIGNMENT

Introduction. In the 1980s, Content-Based Instruction (CBI) emerged as “an approach to second language teaching in which teaching is organized around the content or information that students will acquire, rather than around a linguistic or other type of syllabus” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 204). In many academic contexts, CBI exhibits priority in the development of reading and then promotes content information for language learning through listening, speaking, and writing. CBI presupposes that in content-based classrooms the teacher ensures opportunities for students to exercise speech patterns and pragmatic expressiveness in the framework of specific content and language activities that facilitate attention, interest, motivation, and creativity in exploring discourse content. Consequently, sociocultural content and systematic contextuality provide interested and thoughtful learning. In this view, CBI seems to be a useful and helpful approach to language teaching and learning.

The main principles of CBI can be outlined as follows: (1) activities to foster language acquisition should be integrated, whenever possible, with those designed to teach information or content, (2) an emphasis should be placed on visual and experiential learning—especially through videos selected and edited by the instructor; student can produce materials such as posters and projects, group skits and dramatic presentations, (3) as in regular EFL courses, all four skills—reading, listening, writing, and speaking—should be integrated, (4) teachers should have more than just a casual interest in the topic being studied and should have access to materials, especially videos and books aimed at or adaptable to the listening and reading levels of the students.

Being text-based and discourse-based, content-facilitated language learning becomes a purposeful means of developing and integrating the skills necessary for proficient communication. Therefore, in the present study, it is essential to consider how discourse analysis in content-based instruction can be an example of learning communicative strategies through a reading assignment.

Literature review, research framework, and problem statement. It is assumed that if students are interested in a subject matter, they become interested in their own learning, both under the teacher’s guidance and independently. From the CBI perspective, Stryker & Leaver (1997) consider that the content-based approach creates a favorable situation for learning a language because it presupposes integration of language and content, and language is used as a means

of studying a subject matter. Metaphorically speaking, the goal of ESL (or EFL) education is defined as providing learners' independence in an opportunity for them to "spread their wings, leave the nest, and soar off on their own towards the horizon" (p. 3). The researchers believe that content-based procedures promote language learning because they provide comprehensible input, which leads to acquiring the target language.

In the principles of functioning and promoting language acquisition, CBI is related to such approaches as (1) Communicative Language Teaching, (2) cross-disciplinary (Language-across-the-Curriculum) usage of the target language, (3) Immersion Education (when all the subjects are taught in L2, which presupposes that L2 will become acquired as L1), (4) Immigrant On-Arrival Programs (when language is being learned as a means of immediate communication in survival situations), (5) Programs for Students with Limited English Proficiency, and (6) Language for Specific Purposes (e.g., for career education and business) (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In this view, Stryker & Leaver (1997) define a CBI curriculum as such that (1) is based on a subject-matter core—learning about specific topics, (2) uses authentic language and texts—print texts, videotapes, audio recordings, and visual aids, and (3) is appropriate to the needs of specific groups of students—the content and learning activities correspond to the linguistic, cognitive, and affective needs of the students and are appropriate to their professional needs and personal interests.

CBI has its models of foreign language contexts for various sets of motivations and opportunities to study a subject matter in detail. Stryker & Leaver (1997) characterize CBI in three basic models: (1) "sheltered content", which adjusts the program to the learner's level of knowledge, specifies the precise goals and techniques of learning and, accordingly, makes the content more accessible to L2 learners, (2) "adjunct courses", where a connection is made between the study of a foreign language and the study of a particular subject matter in any other course(s) to enhance students' self-confidence with a feeling of using the new language to accomplish real tasks, and (3) "theme-based approaches", when the entire course is designed around in-depth study of topics. Besides, instead of being add-ons to a course based on the study of grammar, the study of grammar in these courses becomes linked to, defined by, and dependent upon the topics. Short (1999) explains that even when sheltered instruction presupposes that teachers concentrate on vocabulary development and grammar (speech patterns) of topics, they try to develop in their students such language techniques as reading comprehension strategies, process writing, and an oral interaction that helps students to use language for functional purposes, such as negotiating meaning or making hypotheses and evaluations.

In addition to the three models of CBI, Richards & Rodgers (2001) mention two more contemporary models of CBI—a team-teach approach and a skills-based approach. The first one consists in comprehension of the required material and writing for specific purposes, e.g., answering examination questions, or composing memos, accident reports, progress reports, and meeting reports (p. 217). This proves a connection of CBI with Competency-Based Language Teaching, too.

In terms of planning objectives, Met (1994) suggests the following: (1) content-obligatory objectives involve language that is needed in order to master the content, (2) content-compatible objectives involve topics that can be discussed with a range of proficiency levels, (3) materials should be both age appropriate and linguistically appropriate. The language can be basic or more difficult, depending on the knowledge of the learners, (4) lessons should be hands-on and experiential so that the students could learn by doing, (5) lessons should also be collaborative so that the students could have frequent opportunities to use the language, (6) to keep the interest of the students, lessons should also be cognitively engaging and cognitively demanding, and (7) because a content-based classroom is a language classroom, the use of the four skills should be taken into consideration.

As to the appropriateness of material and teaching, Chamot (in Cantoni-Harvey, 1987) advocates the following effective strategies for CBI teachers: (1) rewrite / rearrange difficult material in a form of a comprehensible input, (2) prepare advance organizers and outlines, (3) teach skimming, scanning, and predicting outcomes, (4) provide practice in note-taking, (5) use guided writing activities, (6) discuss effective models of communication, and (7) encourage students to speak the target language. In terms of techniques, the researcher proposes: (1) using language that slightly exceeds the students' levels of proficiency, (2) recording class discussions and other appropriate texts of cassettes [as audiofiles] and making them available to students, (3) using demonstrations and visual aids, (4) allowing the learners to show their comprehension nonverbally, (5) responding to the meaning of the students' utterances rather than their errors, (6) providing opportunities for small group interactions and brainstorming sessions, (7) asking the learners to share information with their peers by giving simple oral presentations, and (8) designing learning centers for individual listening practice, vocabulary expansion, and other content-related activities.

In terms of specifications, Kirschner & Wexler (2002) place more emphasis on developing students' reading skills and consider that CBI should have, among other principles, the following ones: (1) "the content itself should derive from the *specific* academic discipline that students are *concurrently* majoring in", (2) academic progress should be assessed through regular vocabulary tests and reading comprehension tests, (3) "content instructors" should see the content in "an inquiring student", i.e. in the knowledge level and learning needs of a student, (4) "the language skills of speaking, listening, and writing may come into play in order to reinforce reading, but the primary emphasis should remain reading" (for a further focus on academic research), and (5) content-based courses should be based on authentic material because mainstream academic courses presuppose research of authentic material.

When it comes to authentic input, CBI teachers and researchers recognize feature-films and other video materials as very useful authentic information that insures enthusiastic learning and development of (1) analytical ability and aesthetic awareness, (2) knowledge of the authentic information, (3) language skills, (4) broader academic skills, (5) interest in the subject matter and enhanced

enjoyment of studying, (6) broader understanding about the world and one's own place in it (Chapple & Curtis, 2000, p. 429).

Computer-assisted language learning and the Internet may also be explored and employed in the framework of CBI. In this case, technology provides the facilities that Von der Emde, Schneider, & Kötter, M. (2001) have outlined as (1) authentic communication and content, (2) autonomous learning and peer teaching in student-centered classroom, individualized learning, (3) experimentation and play, and (5) students as researchers within the intellectual dimension (which integrates reading, writing, and research).

Describing CBI, Grabe & Stoller (1997) estimate that content provides both focused and incidental, additional, learning. Accordingly, if some content is interesting and useful to explore, content-based assignments are never meaningless. Moreover, CBI is often supported by co-operative learning, metacognitive / learning strategy instruction, and discourse comprehension analysis. Eventually, CBI even resorts to a whole language approach when it places an equal emphasis on the four components of language—reading, listening, speaking, and writing.

This important whole-language principle is highlighted by Brinton, Snow, & Wesche (1989) as a valuable advantage of the integrative nature of CBI. Besides, in the study by these authors, a rationale for content-based language teaching-&-learning is manifested in the following: (1) the focus on the language forms and functions (as in “sheltered learning” for specific purposes) provides a systematic input of the lexico-grammatical information contextualized in topics, (2) “even though learner language needs and interest may not always coincide, the use of informational content which is perceived as relevant by the learner is assumed by many to increase motivation in the language course, and thus to promote more effective learning”, (3) teachers take into consideration the learners' existing knowledge of the subject matter and of the academic environment as well as the learners' knowledge of the target language, (4) the language use is contextualized and not restricted to a sentence-level usage, and finally (5) comprehensible input is provided within a content.

Dantas-Whitney (2002) discusses that in constructive learning students activate their previous knowledge and develop their new understanding and, consequently, new knowledge. In this view, content-based classes seem to be indeed effective if students are interested in a topic and are motivated to learn its content. The researcher notices that in CBI written journals have become very useful and conducive to the development of the learner's writing (and reading as well). Accordingly, further research has shown that audiotaped journals are considerably effective for the development of speaking skills. Although Dantas-Whitney doubts whether spoken journals contribute to oral language acquisition, it is obvious that this type of practice contributes to formation of self-awareness, self-direction and proficiency in oral communication.

It is important to notice that learners are successful if they are “both functionally and academically literate”, which implies that they are able to use the target language “to access, understand, articulate, and critically analyze conceptual

relationships within, between, and among a wide variety of content areas” (Kasper, 2000, p. 3). CBI provides an opportunity to arrange a comprehensible input and comprehensive development of both language and rhetoric skills. While learning content, students are exposed to a considerable amount of language that is perceived through reading and listening and reproduced in the learners’ speaking and writing. Thus, exploring a subject matter in the target language facilitates acquisition of language skills, whereas language knowledge becomes acquired through practice of the skills.

Reading provides an access to academic information. At the level of learning what strategies of reading should be developed, content based reading assignments can be the following: (1) pre-reading: work with topic-related vocabulary and defining topic-related concepts, (2) highlighting and taking notes while reading, and (3) after-reading: summaries, answers to open-ended comprehension questions, and expository essays. The teacher’s guidance provides students with practice and feedback for further development of the target language proficiency (Kasper, 1995, p. 225). Thus, it is believed (Kasper, 1997) that at academic institutions CBI should be “academically sheltered” so that ESL students could be prepared to “mainstream academic disciplines”.

As to reading assignments within CBI, Kasper (1995) emphasizes the fact that many ESL students on entering American colleges and universities become enrolled in developmental reading programs. Research has revealed that those students that have been engaged in content-based academic reading-comprehension groups succeed more in the development of their academic competence and performance than those who read fiction-content texts.

However, it remains important to clarify how particular fiction texts can contribute to acquiring effective interpersonal communication skills.

Research outline. The present study considers the parameters and principles of interpersonal communication based on a mutual misidentification. By means of discourse analysis, the study explores the techniques and conditions of mutually finding out the identity of two interlocutors in the story “*A Haircut*” by I. S. Nakata. Through the text for students’ reading, the research specifies the following aspects of English communication to be understood: the pragmatics, role distribution, directness, and strategies in clarifying a subjective assumption.

The study explores and proves sociolinguistic assumptions such as: (1) the minimal units of communication are not linguistic expressions, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements or asking questions (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 2), (2) in situations in which the speaker evaluates the major social factors on the basis of the context and past experience, the risk of real or pretended misunderstanding is higher, in addition to the danger of sounding too forceful (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 4), (3) the information structure consists of forwarding subjective opinion, contrastive perspectives, contextual grounding, relative definiteness, and respective topicality suggested by interlocutors (Scollon & Scollon, 1983, p. 159), (4) the way a person speaks will always reflect underlying assumptions about the relations of distance and power between himself/herself and a listener (Scollon & Scollon, 1983, p. 170), (5) a person interested in the validity of

his/her assumptions is inclined to talking more than his/her interlocutor (Scollon & Scollon, 1983, p. 170), (6) the irony is that it is the speaker who has assumed the closeness and solidarity of the two interlocutors that ends in a dominating position (Scollon & Scollon, 1983, p. 171), (7) a withdrawal of an assumption of common grounds may appear like a development of hostility and further frustrate the progress toward agreement (Scollon & Scollon, 1983, p. 171), and (8) miscommunication between people of different groups comes from their inappropriate use of conventional patterns of communication (Scollon & Scollon, 1983, p. 171).

The conclusions and inferences of the research will serve as methodological data for teaching and learning interpersonal rhetoric through texts of conversational discourse.

Research material. According to the genre specification, the short story “*A Haircut*” by I. S. Nakata is a first person narrative with a dialogical speech. The described event takes place at daytime at a barber’s, North Clark Street, in the USA in the second half of the 20th century. This is a realistic, common, casual, and informal setting for a conversation between two strangers one of whom is extremely persistent in clarifying the ethnic identity of the other man. The episode presents two participants: one is the protagonist who is the narrator of the story, a Japanese American born in Hawaii and living in the United States of America, and the other is his interlocutor, who was born in the state of Georgia, lives in the United States, has been to many parts of the USA, and speaks with an Alabama state accent. Judging by their personal experience, both of them are supposed to be about 40 years of age.

The narrator initiates the reader into a contemporary common setting in which people can mistake one another’s origin and identity. At the barber’s, a stranger, ‘identified’ by his accent as ‘Alabama’ starts a conversation by guessing that the story narrator is an Indian. The conversation is led by Alabama and continues in his numerous guesses of the narrator’s origin. Alabama is very persistent in finding out to what Indian tribe ‘Chief’ belongs by his origin. He is positive in the consideration that if a person speaks proficient English, he must be from the USA, and if that person does not look as if his ancestors were from Europe, then he must be Indian, because Alabama is proud of his knowledge of Indian tribes and wants to prove his knowledgeable guess true. He is unlikely to give up, and therefore the narrator does not hurry to persuade him out of his guessing. The protagonist, referred to (by Alabama) as ‘Chief’, wants to be left alone by the strangers who mistake his origin. However, he becomes reflective on the stream of Alabama’s guesses and intends to clarify the truth to Alabama by the method of ‘trial and error’ suggestions on the part of the latter. Obviously, he considers that the best way to ‘persuade’ a persistent stranger out of his false opinion is to make the latter recognize by himself that his self-assured and annoying suppositions were wrong. Meanwhile, both reveal their knowledge of Indian tribes. However, the narrator becomes self-conscious to win over the guessing of his interlocutor by finally saying that he is what he is. Alabama seems disappointed, claims that living in the USA one should be proud of being American (obviously, at least American Indian), and it comes out that he is not from Alabama but from Georgia and is proud of it. The narrator apologizes.

The present study is aimed at illustrating how discourse analysis of a text for reading in content-based instruction can help students understand and acquire appropriate communicative strategies. The analysis is focused on specifying the communicative acts and strategies employed by the characters of the story in their interpersonal conflict.

Data analysis. The story under consideration represents two types of assumptions on the part of the characters. First, Alabama assumes that judging by the appearance and, further, language ability, Chief comes from an Indian tribe. Second, Chief assumes that according to the accent his interlocutor comes from the state of Alabama. Although in the end both assumptions prove wrong, the misidentifications do not have any appropriate resolution in the process of the conflict. While Alabama is unaware of how he is being perceived in terms of his origin, Chief remains observant of Alabama's communicative attempts of dealing with his false belief. The misjudgment is supported by misleading information—when in a persistent guessing to what tribe Chief must belong Alabama twice mentions his experience with Indian tribes, Chief also twice reveals his specific knowledge of Indians. These two sets of comments from each interlocutor constitute informational backgrounding. It is quantitatively equal for both sides—50% of informational backgrounding from each interlocutor.

However, while both interlocutors testify to their experienced knowledge of the subject matter, the impact of their remarks is different. Thus, while Alabama's remarks remain background statements, Chief's remarks urge Alabama to believe that his interlocutor comes from an Indian tribe. Hence, in each case, Chief's backgrounding remarks constitute a foregrounding of Alabama's further misjudgment.

The pragmatics of Alabama's speech consists in a strong determination to find out whether his assumptions about Chief are correct. The performance within the conversation is distributed between the characters in turn. Chief is already used to being mistaken for belonging to nationalities other than his own. Therefore, he remains observant of the current situation and allows for Alabama's ideas in negotiating the truth. In this view, the intrigued Alabama is more inclined to talking. He resumes the conversation after each pause of silence. Consequently, the number of his turns in the conversation is bigger than that of Chief's—Chief's speech consists of 20 (45.45%) turns while Alabama's speech acts amounts to 24 (54.55%) turns out of 44, respectively.

The distribution of speech acts of the two interlocutors is uneven. Alabama assumes familiarity of the intercourse as he wants to show his solidarity with a person that might constitute part of his experienced knowledge of Indian tribes. The contrast of the interlocutors' speech acts consists in the fact that out of the 21 questions within the conversation Chief asks only 1 (4.76%) while Alabama forwards 20 (95.24%) interrogative utterances.

Within the framework of questions and comments, Chief has to express his doubt concerning Alabama's origin only once (20%), finally. Meanwhile, forceful in his guessing of Chief's nationality, Alabama expresses 4 (80%) doubts that his assumption is wrong.

According to the distribution of the interrogative nature of the conversation, Chief’s speech logically contains more responses. Negative responses are more indicative of whether a conversation will go on and whether the turn taking will initiate another assumption—another topical step. Accordingly, it has been revealed that in the characters’ speech within the story Alabama pronounces 2 (20%) negative responses while Chief has to utter 8 (80%) negations.

In comparison, the flow of speech from the two interlocutors can be considered from three perspectives: (1) the distribution of each type of a structural conversational pattern between the interlocutors, (2) the ratio of questions, doubts, and negative responses within the total number of steps of turn taking, and (3) the individual speech act strategies employed by each interlocutor within the framework of their conversation. These perspectives are reflected in the following tables.

Firstly, the ratio of the speech acts between the interlocutors reveals that Alabama asks more questions while Chief has to respond and deny the sustainability of Alabama’s assumptions:

Table 1

The distribution of conversational patterns between the interlocutors

Character	Backgrounding	Turn Taking	Questions	Doubts	Negative Responses
Chief	50.00%	45.45%	4.76%	20%	80%
Alabama	50.00%	54.55%	95.24%	80%	20%

Secondly, in the framework of two sets of backgrounding and 44 steps of turn taking, the ratio of the questions, doubts, and negative responses of the two interlocutors is the following:

Table 2

The ratio of conversational patterns within the steps of turn taking

Character	Backgrounding	Turn Taking	Questions	Doubts	Negative Responses
Chief	50.00%	45.45%	2.27%	2.27%	18%
Alabama	50.00%	54.55%	45.45%	9.09%	5%

Thirdly, according to the steps of turn taking by each interlocutor—20 by Chief and 24 by Alabama, respectively, it is obvious that Alabama sounded (1) more forceful in his turns, (2) most interrogative in the questions he employed to find answers to his assumptions, (3) hesitant to admit that his assumptions were wrong, and (4) reluctant to lead Chief into a ‘guessing game’ now concerning his origin, and therefore Alabama eliminates another perspective of interrogation by suggesting definiteness—he is from Georgia, not Alabama. Thus, the interrogative and negative utterances of each interlocutor within the conversation are displayed in the following table of their individual linguistic strategies:

Table 3

The individual speech act strategies employed by each interlocutor

Character	Backgrounding	Turn Taking	Questions	Doubts	Negative Responses
Chief	50.00%	45.45%	5.00%	5.00%	40%
Alabama	50.00%	54.55%	83.30%	16.66%	8%

The units of communication include both linguistic and extralinguistic components of one’s performance. In addition to linguistic expressiveness of speech, the story under consideration presents strategies of non-verbal interaction of the interlocutors, such as: nod, glance, silence, head shake, facial expression, voice/breath, and the position of hand and other examples of posture (e.g., *I turned away*). The ratio of the extralinguistic strategies has been revealed from those remarks of the narrator that are indicative of the non-verbal behavior. The total number of non-verbal steps of both interlocutors amounts to 35. The most frequent act was the movements of hands or a change of the general position of the interlocutors. This finding can have the following explanations: when no other strategy of resolving the misidentification had proved effective, the interlocutors seemed to be undetermined what step to employ next so that the problem could be solved. The hesitation of how to proceed created the change of their postures that finally resulted in Alabama’s standing up as it was his turn in the line to have his haircut. It is interesting to note that an affirmative head nod and a negative head shake were employed in the conversation the same amount of frequency. Glancing and taking a silence pause were equally resorted to. However, the interlocutors tended to change their facial expressions (e.g., from Alabama’s hopefulness to disappointment) and their voices (e.g., lowering one’s voice, saying with a sigh, etc.). In the framework of the latter two extralinguistic parameters, it seems appropriate to consider smiling as facial expression while laughter can be classified as both facial and voice change. Consequently, the distribution of the non-verbal strategies is the following:

Table 4

The ratio of non-verbal strategies in the conversation (quantity/percentage)

Nod		Glance		Silence		Head shake		Face		Voice/ breath		Hands/ posture		Total	
qty	%	qty	%	qty	%	qty	%	qty	%	qty	%	qty	%	qty	%
3	8.6	3	8.6	3	8.6	3	8.6	6	17.1	7	20	10	28.5	35	100

The above classified non-verbal steps can be further characterized as extralingual strategies employed by each interlocutor. It is interesting to note that although Chief is the narrator of the story, he observes the non-verbal steps used both by his interlocutor and himself, respectively. Judging by the previously described linguistic distribution of the interlocutors’ turns and strategies and the nature of the conversation in general, it is natural that Alabama resorted to more

non-verbal expressions as well—21 out of 35. Further, the non-verbal acts are distributed in the following way (C=Chief, A=Alabama):

Table 5

The non-verbal acts (extralingual behavior) of each interlocutor

Nod		Glance		Silence		Head shake		Face		Voice/ breath		Hands/ posture		Total	
C	A	C	A	C	A	C	A	C	A	C	A	C	A	C	A
0	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	5	4	3	3	7	14	21

Chief has to negate or chooses to ignore Alabama’s assumptions. Therefore, he (1) shakes his head rather than nods in agreement, (2) resorts more to glancing or taking a pause of silence, and (3) takes deep breath of disproof. Meanwhile, Alabama (1) nods to foreground his interest in proving his assumptions, (2) looks happy at a possible solution or frowns when he is lost in his guessing, (3) changes the position of his hands, head, or general posture.

Thus, the above data display that the units of communication cannot be reduced only to linguistic expressions. Rather, they consist in performing speech acts of, for example, giving a backgrounding or foregrounding perspective, asking questions, expressing doubts, and either affirming or negating assumptions. These speech acts contain both verbal and non-verbal strategies and steps of expression. Accordingly, the verbal and non-verbal steps of the interlocutors in the story have proved to be consistent and respectively relevant. Thus, linguistically and non-verbally, Chief expresses the negation of Alabama’s assumptions while Alabama shows his being preoccupied with eliciting proofs for his judgments.

Conclusions and inferences. The conclusions of the research on the reading task are all consistent with the expressed assumptions: (1) communicative steps consist of verbal and non-verbal speech acts, (2) when the speaker intends to prove his/her judgment that results from past experience, he/she tends to be forceful and lost in misjudgment, (3) the information structure consists of forwarding subjective assumptions, contrastive perspectives, contextual grounding, relative definiteness, and respective topicality suggested by interlocutors, (4) speech performance reveals that close distance and lack of power relations are typical of solidarity relations established by at least one interlocutor, (5) a person interested in the validity of his/her assumptions is inclined to talking more than the other interlocutor, (6) the dominant position of deciding whether to continue or stop a conversation remains with the speaker who has tended to express solidarity with his/her interlocutor, (7) when an interested interlocutor sees that his/her assumptions and the final resolution were different, he/she tends to withdraw in hostility, and (8) miscommunication between people results from their inappropriate use of conversational formulae—e.g., incomplete answers to questions or misleadingly additional information, which generates and develops only wrong assumptions.

The above conclusions have produced the following inferences for teaching and learning communicative strategies: (1) the strategies of effective interpersonal

communication should be taught by examples of what speech techniques are effective or misleading, (2) learners should become able to foresee the assumptions that can be provoked by their respective speech acts, (3) interlocutors should be aware of the possible outcomes generated by different types of distance and power relations within a conversation, (4) miscommunication may have different outcomes, for example withdrawal in hostility, and (5) pragmatics and rhetoric of communication should be taught inseparably from language learning practices through discourse analysis in content-based instruction. In further research, it seems important to clarify how content-based instruction can facilitate the development of the learner's fifth language skill—translation.

References

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 1-34). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Brinton, D.M., Snow, M.A., & Wesche, M.B. (1989). *Content-Based Second Language Instruction*. New York, Newbury House Publishers.

Cantoni-Harvey, G. (1987). *Content-Area Language Instruction: Approaches and Strategies*. Menlo Park: Addison Wesley Publishing.

Chapple, L., & Curtis, A. (2000). Content-based instruction in Hong Kong: Student responses to film. *System*, 28, 419-433.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. (1997). Content-Based Instruction: Research Foundations. In: Snow, M., & Brinton, D. (Eds.) *The Content-Based Classroom*. White Plains, N.Y.: Addison Wesley Longman, 5-21.

Dantas-Whitney, M. (2002). Critical reflection in the second language classroom through audiotaped journals. *System*, 30, 543-555.

Kasper, L.F. (1995). Theory and practice in content-based ESL reading instruction. *English for Specific Purposes*, 14 (3), 223-230.

Kasper, L.F. (1997). The impact of content-based instructional programs on the academic progress of ESL students. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16 (4), 309-320.

Kasper, L.F. (2000). Content-Based College ESL Instruction: Theoretical Foundations and Pedagogical Applications. In L.F. Kasper (Ed.). *Content-Based College ESL Instruction*. Mahwah, New Jersey, London, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Kirschner, M., & Wexler, C. (2002). Caravaggio: A design for an interdisciplinary content-based EAP/ESP unit. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 163-183.

Met, M. (1994). Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community. In F. Genesee (Ed.). *Teaching Content through a Second Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S.B.K. (1983). Face in interethnic communication. In J.Richards & R.Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 156-188). New York: Longman.

Short, D.J. (1999). *The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol: A Tool for Teacher-Researcher Collaboration and Professional Development*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics Washington DC.

Stryker, S.B., & Leaver, B.L. (Eds.). (1997). *Content-Based Instruction in Foreign Language Education: Models and Methods*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Von der Emde, S., Schneider, J., & Kötter, M. (2001). Technically speaking: Transforming language learning through virtual learning environments (MOOs). *The Modern Language Journal*, 85 (2), 210-225.

Анотація

Ясинецька О. А. Сутність дискурсивного аналізу в контентному навчанні на основі читання

У статті контентне навчання аналізується як ефективний підхід до викладання і вивчення мови. Воно розглядається як цілеспрямований засіб розвитку та інтеграції навичок, необхідних для компетентного спілкування. Його основні принципи детально викладені, а також охарактеризовані у співвідношенні з іншими підходами до навчання мови. Особлива увага приділяється цілям, моделям, матеріалам і типам мовленнєвої діяльності, які сприяють засвоєнню тематичної інформації та розвитку мовних навичок. Наведене у статті дослідження ілюструє, як дискурс-аналіз тексту для читання у рамках контентного навчання може допомогти студентам зрозуміти і засвоїти слушні комунікативні стратегії. Висновки дослідження підтверджують доцільність навчання міжособистісної риторики за допомогою текстів розмовного дискурсу.

Ключові слова: контентне навчання, мовна навичка (мовленнєва діяльність), читання, дискурсивний аналіз, комунікативна стратегія.

Аннотация

Ясинецкая Е. А. Сущность дискурсивного анализа в контентном обучении на основе чтения

В статье контентное обучение анализируется как эффективный подход к преподаванию и изучению языка. Оно рассматривается как целенаправленное средство развития и интеграции навыков, необходимых для компетентного общения. Его основные принципы подробно изложены, а также охарактеризованы в соотношении с другими подходами к обучению языку. Особое внимание уделяется целям, моделям, материалам и типам речевой деятельности, которые способствуют усвоению контентной информации и развитию языковых навыков. Приведённое в статье исследование иллюстрирует, как дискурс-анализ текста для чтения в рамках контентного обучения может помочь студентам понять и усвоить действенные коммуникативные стратегии. Выводы исследования обосновывают целесообразность преподавание межличностной риторики посредством текстов разговорного дискурса.

Ключевые слова: контентное обучение, языковой навык (речевая деятельность), чтение, дискурсивный анализ, коммуникативная стратегия.

Summary

Yasynetska O. A. The essence of discourse analysis in content-based instruction through a reading assignment

In the article, content-based instruction is analyzed as a useful approach to language teaching and learning. It is described as a purposeful means of developing and integrating the skills necessary for proficient communication. Its main principles are outlined as well as specified in relation to other language-teaching approaches. Special attention is given to the objectives, models,

materials, and types of speech activity that facilitate acquiring content-based information and language skills. Furthermore, the present study illustrates how discourse analysis of a text for reading in content-based instruction can help students understand and acquire appropriate communicative strategies. The conclusions and inferences of the research rationalize teaching interpersonal rhetoric through texts of conversational discourse.

Keywords: content-based instruction, language skill, reading, discourse analysis, communicating strategy.