

3. *Perković, A.* Film as an English Teaching Tool at Tertiary Education Level / A. Perković, I. Rigo // *Informatologia*. — 2010. — Vol. 43, no. 4. — P. 325—327.
4. *López, S. C.* Film Clips to Improve Listening Skills in Teaching English as a Foreign Language / S. C. López, I. C. Romero, M. M. Zapata, R. G. Villao // *Journal of Namibian Studies*. — 2023. — Vol. 33, no. 2. — P. 4742—4756.
5. *Sari, A.* Teaching English Through English Movie: Advantages and Disadvantages / A. Sari, B. Sugandi // *The Journal of English Literacy Education*. — 2015. — Vol. 2, no. 2. — P. 10—15.
6. *Çakir, I.* The use of video as an audio-visual material in foreign language teaching classroom / I. Çakir // *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology (TOJET)*. — 2006. — Vol. 5, no. 4. — P. 67—72.
7. *Ying, W.* The Application of English Movies in Higher Vocational English Teaching / W. Ying, H. F. Zhang // *Sino-US English Teaching*. — 2012. — Vol. 9, no. 3. — P. 1010—1014.

UDC 37.012.8

**A. A. Savko**

*Institution of Education “Baranavichy State University”, Baranavichy,  
the Republic of Belarus, savko74@mail.ru*

## **PRAISE AS VIEWED IN EDUCATIONAL THEORIES AND ITS EFFECT IN TEACHER—STUDENT DIDACTIC INTERACTION**

This article provides a theoretical rationale for praise as a means of positive assessment of students' performance and achievement. Praise is examined through the prism of educational theories such as behaviorism and social constructivism; the distinction between process praise and personal praise is also clarified in favor of the effectiveness of process praise; the concept of communicative initiative is introduced and its relationship to praise is examined.

**Key words:** pedagogical discourse; process praise; person praise; communicative initiative.

А. А. Савко

Учреждение образования «Барановичский государственный университет»,  
Барановичи, Республика Беларусь, savko74@mail.ru

## ПОХВАЛА В ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИХ ТЕОРИЯХ И ЕЕ ВЛИЯНИЕ НА ДИДАКТИЧЕСКОЕ ВЗАИМОДЕЙСТВИЕ ПРЕПОДАВАТЕЛЯ И СТУДЕНТОВ

Данная статья представляет собой теоретическое обоснование похвалы как средства положительной оценки деятельности и успеваемости студентов. Похвала рассматривается сквозь призму образовательных теорий, таких как бихевиоризм и социальный конструктивизм; также поясняется различие между похвалой процессу и личностной похвалой в пользу эффективности похвалы процессу; вводится понятие коммуникативной инициативы и рассматривается ее связь с похвалой.

**Ключевые слова:** педагогический дискурс; похвала процессу; личностная похвала; коммуникативная инициатива.

**Introduction.** An indispensable feature of institutional pedagogical discourse is to address praise only to the people under evaluation, that is students. Otherwise, the main goal of this discourse is unattainable. This feature makes praise in pedagogical discourse different from praise in any kind of informal communication, where positive feedback is aimed not only at the addressee, but can be done about a third person, who may be absent at the very moment of communication. “The socialization of the students through praise will occur only if the verbalized positive evaluation has a positive impact on them, stimulating their emotional lift, creating or fixing in their mental world a positive image of themselves, can help shape their worldview, their gradual adoption of values and behavior” [1].

**Main part.** There exist a lot of educational theories suggested world-wide, but we would like to distinguish two of them applicable to our research in general and to study of praise at an EFL class in particular. The first one is called *Behaviorism*; it is “a theory of learning based on the idea that all behaviors are acquired through conditioning, and conditioning occurs through interaction with the environment” [2]. Behaviorists believe that “our actions are shaped by

environmental stimuli and our behavior can be studied in a systematic and observable manner regardless of internal mental states” [2]. A behaviorist educator would use positive and negative reinforcement as a means to motivate their students. An extreme behaviorist believes all motivation for the students to learn is extrinsic. The educators are handing out “treats” to reward good test scores, they smile and praise their students on a task well done, they don’t give any homework to those who submit all their assignments on time, they emphasize grades rather than significance of learning. In such behaviorist environment, students adapt to the reinforcement, they learn to base their efforts, academic performances and behavior off the resulting positive or negative reinforcement. The behaviorists believe that students’ behavior and academic performance will develop as a result of their responses to certain stimuli. Behaviorists define learning as nothing more than the acquisition of new behavior based on environmental conditions [2].

We could agree to some extent with the behaviorist theory of learning. Positive and negative reinforcement proves effective in the classroom, but the motivation educators are giving to their students doesn’t have to be only extrinsic. There exists intrinsic one. The majority of students do want to learn, and if their wish to learn is always controlled by means of reinforcement, their intrinsic motivation can become extrinsic; if they are learning for knowledge they will get more information rather than they are learning for praise or a good grade. Even though it’s criticised we think that the behaviorist theory of learning is something every educator should bear in mind, it’s important to know how to manage or control one’s behaviour. It’s always important to know if a treat (in the form of praise) motivates your students or something else.

Another important learning theory that educators use to help their students to learn and the one which can be of use in our research is *Constructivism*, social constructivism to be exact, the proponents of which support the idea that “learning does not just happen by the traditional methods of teachers standing in front of the class and lecturing. It has been observed that a person learns more when he constructs the knowledge on his own rather than if he listens to the teacher or some other person” [3]. Constructivism theory can be a very

profitable venture in education as textbook learning can be substituted by practical application and usage of other resources; students are encouraged to utilize their thinking, reasoning and analytical skills. The teaching process becomes more practice-centered. For example, students could learn more from conducting research and experiment rather than listening to the teacher [3].

Social constructivism gives a high priority to language in the process of intellectual development, hence dialogue becomes the means by which ideas are shared and developed, not necessarily the dialogue with a more knowledgeable person, dialogues with groupmates can be of equal value, prior knowledge is a plus that forms the basis of any contribution to a dialogue. The role of a more knowledgeable person in formal learning situations is usually taken by a teacher. The teacher can initiate dialogues, engage students in conversations, he supports the development of understanding. What we really need at the classes of English Oral and Written Speech Practice is the ability to communicate, to interact getting some useful information. Assessment procedure also changes, as the teachers do not have to grade the students traditionally, non-traditional assessment (praise for example) can be used, or students themselves analyze their experiences, and so assessment is also involved as a learning process.

But still one of the biggest challenges for teachers is to foster a positive learning environment in which students become motivated and engaged in classroom activities. Praise as a means of enhancing students' resilience and learning outcomes has always been regarded effective in giving "positive evaluation for a person's performances, attributes or products, when the evaluator thinks that person-earned praise meets the validity of the standards" [4, p. 58].

Somewhere in the 1960s, researchers examined the effects of teachers' praise as a form of positive reinforcement to improve students' classroom behavior. Later other researchers investigated the effects of teacher praise on students' appropriate and inappropriate behavior as well as students' academic performance for individual students and for classes of students. More recently, some researchers have proved behavior-specific praise to improve student behavior. Researchers have presented several narrative reviews of the research based on teacher praise, examining the effects of performance

feedback to improve teachers' use of praise [5]. However, the quality and extent of the body of research on the effects of teacher praise has yet to be examined.

There is research on the use of praise in the classroom (though not numerous) but the majority of the researchers agree upon the effectiveness of praise especially when teachers positively acknowledge their students' work. It correlates to the definition of praise according to Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary which defines it as "admiration or approval about the achievements or characteristics of a person or thing" [6]. Nevertheless, it's possible to find research where praise is called a "threat because of the user's intent to motivate or change the recipients" [4, p. 60]. M. B. Rowe is against of using praise to improve accomplishment, as it "cuts down on cooperation and exchange of ideas among the students ... it cuts into the students' task persistence" [4]. The article was written almost 49 years ago, so we believe that nowadays educators view praise positively, hence quite a number of articles and theses on the matter. But the majority agree upon differences in kinds of praise and finding effective types of praise for educators to succeed.

C. Dwyer and others, for example, distinguish between *process praise* and *person praise*, finding the former more effective than the latter. According to them "process praise occurs when students' efforts, specific work strategies, and positive outcomes are praised, such kind of praise directly affects students' beliefs about why they succeed or fail. If students are praised for completing an assignment, they are now able to understand that their success came from working hard and putting in effort. Process praise is believed to increase persistence, self-evaluation, intrinsic motivation because of a sudden desire to achieve more accomplishments. On the other hand, person praise occurs when a person is praised simply for their intelligence, if somebody is praised just for being smart, as soon as they fail, they no longer feel smart, besides they don't see the direction or rather the teacher doesn't give one. Being a priory "labelled" as smart, students don't seek new challenges, don't set higher goals, don't apply more effort if the material is difficult and don't see their failures as opportunities to learn more" [7]. Process praise and person praise correspond to effort praise and ability praise in L. T. T. Do's research;

besides these two kinds, the educator distinguishes between general (directed either at no one in particular or if directed at an individual, it is generic in its use) and specific (which is directed at an individual and is very specific in what is being praised), and verbal and non-verbal.

In our research we will hold an experiment based on our hypothesis that the students' regular exposure to verbal praise by the teacher increases students' speaking time and communicative initiative, contributing indirectly to the students' vocabulary enrichment. Hence we need to identify communicative initiative, which we, following O. S. Issers, define as "the leading role of a communication partner at a certain stage of a dialogue...or the ability of the interlocutor to be one step ahead, to anticipate the course of the conversation, to lead and steer the conversation in the right direction" [8]. Communicative initiative as a linguistic phenomenon was and is studied in the framework of ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, theory of language, theory of communication, theory of discourse. Being an obligatory attribute of dialogue, it was studied by N. D. Arutyunova, A. N. Baranov, A. Wierzbicka, G. G. Pocheptsov, O. S. Issers.

Communicative initiative is always connected with the initial action, the first step, with the introduction of a new sentence. The main characteristics of the concept of initiative are initiation, independence, activity, encouragement of a new thing [9, p. 5]. O. S. Issers' contribution to the theoretical understanding of the concept of communicative initiative was great, as the linguist revealed the "dominant" role of the initiating communication partner [8]. M. L. Makarov described the communicative initiative in the context of "the exchange of communicative moves", distinguishing "three types of taking the replete step: the initiator interrupts the speaker, the initiative is transferred by mutual agreement or is taken after a pause" [10]. E. I. Sheigal calls the communicative initiative "a marker of manifestation of power, a kind of "coercion" to the point of view" [11, p. 7].

**Conclusion.** Previously, describing pedagogical as a type of institutional discourse, we pointed out the unequal roles of its participants: of a teacher and a student. However, we do not find any studies examining communicative initiative in pedagogical discourse, namely in English classes in national schools/universities, where

students rather than teachers are the initiators, because it is initially assumed that it is the teacher who should initiate the dialogue. Thus we dedicate our research to an important aspect of students' speaking fluency — communicative initiative.

## References

1. *Karatanova, O. A.* Linguistically Relevant Violations of Pedagogical Discourse : diss. ... Ph. D. in Philology : 10.02.19 / Karatanova O. A. — Volgograd, 2003. — 181 p.
2. Behaviorism // Pdfslide.us. — URL: <https://pdfslide.us/documents/behaviorism-learning-theory.html?page=3/Behaviorism> (date of access: 25.03.2023).
3. Cognition // verywellmind. — URL: <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-cognition-2794982/Cognition> (date of access: 25.03.2023).
4. *Do, L. T. T.* Praise as Classroom Communicative Reinforcing Device: Perceptions of Vietnamese University Students / L. T. T. Do, A. T. L. Vu // Higher Education in Russia. — 2020. — No. 12. — P. 57—71.
5. *Sundeen, D. M.* The Effects of Within-School Consultation on General Education Teachers' Use of Behavior-Specific Praise with Students with Emotional Disabilities / D. M. Sundeen. — URL: <https://digscholarship.unco.edu/dissertations/543> (date of access: 27.12.2022).
6. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. — 4<sup>th</sup> ed. — Cambridge University Press, 2013. — URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/praise> (date of access: 04.09.2022).
7. *Dwyer, C.* Using Praise to Enhance Student Resilience and Learning Outcomes / C. Dwyer, C. Dweck, H. Carlson-Jaquez. — URL: <https://www.apa.org/education/k12/using-praise.aspx> (date of access: 04.09.2022).
8. *Issers, O. S.* Communicative strategies and tactics of Russian speech / O. S. Issers. — M. : Unitorial URSS, 2002. — 284 p.
9. *Chernichkina, O. V.* Communicative initiative in interpersonal communication : autoref. diss. ... Ph. Candidate of Philological Sciences : 10.02.19 / Chernichkina O. V. ; Volgograd State Social Pedagogical University. — Volgograd, 2013. — 23 p.
10. *Makarov, M. L.* Fundamentals of discourse theory / M. L. Makarov. — M. : Gnosis, 2003. — 280 p.
11. *Sheigal, E. I.* Semiotics of Political Discourse / E. I. Sheigal ; Russian Academy of Science, Institute of Linguistics, Volgograd State Pedagogical University. — M. ; Volgograd : Peremena, 2000. — 376 p.