

CONVERSATIONAL STRATEGIES OF SPOKEN INTERACTION

КОНСЕРСАЦІЙНІ СТРАТЕГІЇ ПРОЦЕСУ УСНОЇ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ

Polishchuk G.V.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-9547-4959

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor,

Professor at the Department of Translation, Applied and General Linguistics
Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State University

The importance of conversational strategies in educational applications is in focus of the present study. The purpose of this paper is to describe conversational strategies in the teaching of conversational skills. Drawing on this purpose, the analysis of recent studies which lay the theoretical background for this article has been made, the definitions of the notion 'conversational strategy' have been overviewed, and the major functions performed by the strategies in spoken interaction have been determined. It has been estimated that a detailed description of the functional load of conversational strategies in the EFL spoken interaction will enrich the knowledge and awareness of the effective mechanisms of successful communication. The following strategies have been analyzed: managing conversation as a whole; managing one's own talk; taking account of other people; listenership. Conversation as Interaction Communicative Activity has been defined as interaction with a primarily social function: the establishment and maintenance of interpersonal relationships. It presupposes interaction with short exchanges, through maintaining a conversation and sustaining relationships, to flexible use for social purposes on different topics. Conversational strategies have been defined as techniques that are used to manage conversations with other people, to be more fluent in English and become more accomplished as a speaker. The material clearly demonstrated that to manage the conversation appropriately and effectively learners of English need to learn how to do them in English, and they have to be taught from A1 to C2 levels, as by using them, perceptions of students' fluency is transformed, they enable them to be successful communicators greatly improving their global achievement, i.e., handling communication on a range of familiar and unfamiliar topics. The author believes that by teaching strategies students are given tools to be more confident in speaking English, to be more engaged and to be less resistant to speak out in the classroom helping them to overcome the passivity of not knowing what to say. As such, it will increasingly develop the trainees' competence in English to an extent for them to become good models of effective communication.

Key words: overall language proficiency, conversation, conversational strategies, speaking, listenership, verbal interaction, interaction communicative activity.

У статті автором узагальнено сучасні підходи до ролі конwersаційних (розмовних) стратегій у процесі усної взаємодії. Метою даної роботи є опис конwersаційних стратегій у процесі навчання іншомовній усній взаємодії, відповідно до якої здійснено критичний огляд сучасних підходів до розмовного дискурсу, що складає теоретичне підґрунтя роботи, визначено поняття «конwersаційні стратегії» та описано основні функції стратегій у процесі усної взаємодії. Установлено, що визначення функціонального навантаження конwersаційних стратегій під час усної взаємодії мовців сприятиме ефективній комунікації. У статті проаналізовано управління ситуацією діалогічного спілкування в цілому, управління власною розмовою, зосередження на адресаті, поєднання говоріння та слухання (listenership) як основні конwersаційні стратегії. Неформальний розмовний дискурс визначено як інтерактивну комунікативну діяльність, що передбачає взаємодію адресата та адресанта з виключно соціальною функцією: започаткування та підтримка міжособистісних відносин, отже, студенти мають володіти навичками інтеракції, починаючи з коротких обмінів репліками до підтримання неформальної розмови як соціальної взаємодії на різні теми. Доведено, що конwersаційні стратегії як техніки управління процесом іншомовної усної взаємодії, дозволяють забезпечувати плавний перебіг розмови та набувати навичок освіченого мовця. Матеріал дослідження демонструє, що задля адекватного та ефективного управління процесом іншомовної усної взаємодії необхідно, починаючи з початкового рівня до найвищого, вчити студентів їх використанню в діалогічній ситуації спілкування англійською мовою, адже це покращить не лише рівень вільного володіння мовою, а й дозволить досягти високого рівня ведення розмови на знайомі та незнайомі теми. Автор висловлює сподівання, що навчання конwersаційним стратегіям під час викладання англійської мови є тим знаряддям, що дозволить студентам упевнено спілкуватися англійською мовою, допомагаючи подолати певний брак словникового запасу у процесі усної взаємодії та підвищить комунікативну компетентність студентів.

Ключові слова: загальний рівень володіння мовою, неформальна розмова, конwersаційні (розмовні) стратегії, усна взаємодія, інтерактивна комунікативна діяльність.

Introduction. In the scope of communication studies, as well as in teaching of speaking in language pedagogy, there has been a tendency to focus on speaking in the teaching of conversational skills paying no significant attention to teaching of conversational strategies, so this paper highlights

some significant aspects of major conversational strategies of spoken interaction, taking into account combining speaking and listening while acquiring the knowledge of the strategies because generally, people worry about participating in social settings because they lack confidence in their conversation skills, for

fear of saying the wrong thing, not being able to think of anything to talk about, or whether they will find themselves feeling generally embarrassed about their conversational technique, taking into account the fact that the speaker is under a considerable pressure to keep on talking during the period allotted to him [1, p. 5]. Thus, the objectives of the article are to present an overview of what conversation strategies actually are and why they should be taught, thus revisiting how they could develop learners' awareness of language to maintain and develop conversations in educational applications, i.e., what conversational strategies are needed for initiating, maintaining, and ending conversations, aimed at developing the ability to manage and sustain informal talk in a second language.

It has been argued that conversation should occupy a central place in English Language Teaching (ELT) as it is the most common form of interaction between speakers and hence one which most learners want to develop [3]. Most teachers, however, will have met learners who have studied the language for a number of years and still feel unable to have a successful conversation. One reason for this may be that, as McCarthy and McCarten [4] underline, communicative language teaching has often valued speaking practice above practice which develops conversational ability. Learners are commonly asked to undertake activities which require students to speak, but often this is in order to practice specific language points or perhaps for the slightly vague notion of 'developing fluency'. Learners seem therefore to be given speaking activities in the hope that the ability to develop conversations will simply develop naturally. McCarthy and McCarten [4] argue instead that the ability to converse in English requires a specific skillset, and that strategies which learners need, such as developing their own turn or showing they are interested in what someone is saying, can and should be highlighted, taught and practiced with learners. At the same time, many models of conversations provided in English language textbooks are designed with the primary intention of presenting language points. As a result, such dialogues may serve to show particular language at work but do not always help learners develop common conversation strategies [5, p. 107–108].

Literature Review. Recently the topic of conversational strategies which has been often underrepresented in descriptions of interaction, attracted much attention among researches [Brown, Yule, 1983; Yang 2009; Roberts 2012; Jones and Oakey 2019; McCarthy 2002, 2003, 2013, 2017, 2018, 2019; McCarthy and McCarten 2018, McCarten

Sandford 2014; Celce-Murcia, Domyei, Thurrell 1995, etc.]; the extent to which conversations in literature a) contain examples of frequent features of spoken English, in this case common lexical chunks, and b) contain examples of the language used to realize typical conversation strategies as outlined by McCarthy and McCarten [4, p.13-14; 5]. Also there is still a tendency nowadays to separate speaking and listening, though some scientists, such as Celce-Murcia M., Olshtain E. [16], McCarthy M. [10; 12; 14], McCarthy M. and McCarten [4], have argued for listening and speaking to be treated as intertwined conversational skills, as the fifth skill of human interaction, listenership, where teaching of speaking is actually teaching people how to respond and react; teaching of speaking is actually teaching someone to be a good listener [10]. It has been claimed that in interaction, interlocutors are expected to allow the talk to flow without difficulty, and this smooth flow can be achieved with the use of little words (or response tokens) which do not appear to have any effect on the syntactic structure of the utterances but add important pragmatic value to them because when the talk does not flow, the moment is noticeable and accountable [9, p. 33], so as mentioned, the vocalization of understanding must have taken place [17, p. 204] that is of vital importance in teaching and learning conversational strategies.

Communication strategy training has been shown to be effective and beneficial for language learners, conversation strategies in particular, and could offer useful means of developing conversation skills, essential to building and developing EFL learners' communicative competence as they focus on specific conversational features, such as how to manage turns and invite others to give their views [18; 19]. It should be kept in mind that when it comes to teaching the spoken language with its examples of slips, errors, incompleteness, produced by the speaker, speaking in the here-and-now, under pressure of time, trying to tie in what she/he is saying now with what he/she has just said, it is not always obvious what sort of model is appropriate to offer to learners. But they have to be reminded that while listening to native speakers talking, most of the time listening to language produced simultaneously, they should realize that speakers of this foreign language talk like human beings, like they talk in their native language, as they also do not produce ideal strings of complete, perfectly formed sentences. As researchers underline, the language may be formally correct, but inappropriate and the reaction of many native speakers of English might reasonably be that it is quite hard to feel friendly towards someone

who addresses you as if you were an audience at a public meeting [2, p. 20–21]. Thus, it would seem effective in a syllabus for learners to concentrate on exposing them to a range of modes of speech and conversational strategies appropriate to different contexts of situations. According to McCarthy and McCarten [4], there are four categories of conversation strategies (managing the conversation, constructing your own turn, listenership, and taking account of others), and each category includes several sub-categories. Before analyzing the details of the above-mentioned strategies, it is necessary to highlight how the conversational ability is presented in the Common European Framework of Reference.

In the context of innovations to National Curricula for Foreign Language Learning defined by the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) the practical aim of the Curriculum for the English Language Development [21] is outlined as “to develop the trainees’ competence and fluency in English so that they can become good models of effective communication, by forming and consolidating their linguistic, communicative and socio-cultural knowledge and skills”. In CEFR, communicative competence is interpreted in terms of knowledge and it includes three basic components – language competence, sociolinguistic competence and pragmatic competence. The CEFR is based on an action-oriented approach and views users and learners of a language as members of society who may wish to accomplish tasks in a given set of circumstances, in a specific environment and within a particular field of action: Language use, embracing language learning, comprises the actions performed by persons who as individuals and as social agents develop a range of competences, both general and in particular communicative language competences. It presupposes that the repertoire of a competent communicator consists of the following integral parts: 1) the language resources used to create discourse; 2) the language skills used to process spoken discourse; 3) the discourse knowledge used to interpret how the meaningful, unified and purposive language as an act of communication is created; 4) the knowledge of the functions of utterances used to understand utterances as social acts; 5) the pragmatic knowledge used to interpret the speaker meaning and the contextual meaning; 6) the knowledge of social and cultural norms used to produce discourse appropriately with reference to formality, setting and other contextually defined choices; 7) the knowledge of cultural communicative preferences used to structure persuasive messages [16, p. 19–24]. The document (CEFR) has distinguished four main types

of activities: reception, production, interaction, and mediation, thus the traditional model of the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) has been replaced, as it has increasingly proved inadequate in capturing the complex reality of communication. It has been claimed that the proposed categories (reception, production, interaction, mediation) better reflect the way people actually use the language than the four skills do, thus, the speakers’ overall language proficiency is actualized in four communicative activities: reception, production, interaction, and mediation. In their turn, each of these activities have complex nature, manifest themselves in different discourse modes and possess specific revealing qualities. It has to be underlined here that in CEFR [20, p. 55], understanding the interlocuter as the aspect of listening comprehension is excluded from reception activities and included under interaction. So, oral interaction as a communicative activity has a few central discourse modes relevant for occupational and educational domains of communication: Overall oral interaction; Understanding an interlocuter; Conversation; Informal discussion; Formal discussion; Goal-oriented co-operation; Obtaining goods and services; Information exchange; Interviewing and being interviewed; Using telecommunications.

Conversation as Interaction Communicative Activity which is defined in the CEFR as interaction with a primarily social function: the establishment and maintenance of interpersonal relationships is our primary focus, it means that trainees should be able to interact with short exchanges, through maintaining a conversation and sustaining relationships, to flexible use for social purposes on different topics: from personal news, through familiar topics of personal interest, to most general topics. As for language functions it includes: from greetings, etc., through offers, invitations and permission, to degrees of emotion and allusive, joking usage. It has been underlined that the learners of English should be able to establish a relationship with interlocutors through sympathetic questioning and expressions of agreement plus, to be engaged in extended conversation on most general topics in a clearly participatory fashion, even in an audially/visually noisy environment [20, p. 83, 86]. To achieve all these requirements, to interact with exchanges on different topics, special attention has to be paid to conversation strategies, and, as scholars agree, without doubt, an important item to consider is the realization of the strategies for the purposes of building a pedagogic syllabus into four main areas: 1. Managing the conversation as a whole includes starting and ending conversations, changing topics, revisiting earlier topics, etc. with sub-strategies

as Referring back to an earlier comment with the typical language used to realize the strategy (*As I was saying*); starting a new topic or conversation (*So*) and Ending a conversation/Showing you have finished what you want to say (*Better go; So yeah + that's + briefsummary*); 2. Constructing/Managing one's own turn includes features such as taking time to think, hedging, and expressing attitude and stance. It also includes the linear assembling of spoken utterances in real time and strategies such as elaboration and reiteration. Most crucially, it involves linking one's turn to the previous speaker's turn to create continuity and confluence and, to that end, paying careful attention to how one opens one's turn. Among the sub-strategies the following had been indicated: Taking time to think of an answer with the typical language used to realize the strategy (*Well, Let me think*), Adding ideas (*I also...*) and Elaboration sub-strategy (*In other words, I mean...*); 3. (Good) listenership, as described by McCarthy [8; 9; 10], involves responding appropriately to show both understanding and engagement by means of responding to news or information: showing understanding, showing you are following: *Wonderful!*, expressions with *That's + adjective* (*That's great/crazy/good/etc.*) *I see, Right*; showing you are interested and reacting/responding (*Yeah, I can imagine, Yeah, I think so too, As I was saying*) 4. Taking account of others refers to the language choices speakers make depending on who their interlocutors are: friends and family or strangers, peers and equals or superiors, and this category addresses issues of formality, politeness and the projection of new and shared knowledge with the following sub strategies: Projecting shared understanding (*And things like that*); Telling new information (*What happened was*). It has to be underlined that choices have to be made in real time, requiring considerable skill and practice, keeping in mind quick alternation of roles that is central to conversation: how one behaves as a listener, what one does and says, is just as important as what happens when one is the speaker. As scientists claim, this will be a significant feature of practice [4, p. 13–14; 18].

Recent research has given interesting insights into many aspects of how people communicate, e.g. based on investigation from the Cambridge International Corpus of North American Spoken English, presenters Jeanne McCarten and Helen Sandford [13], authors of the Touchstone series, considered a range of topics presentation, including: what conversation strategies are and the kinds of strategies speakers use to manage conversations, for example, ways to show or check understanding, to start and end conversations, or to involve other speakers in a conversation etc.; why

these kinds of strategies have to be taught to students and how they can contribute to fluency in English and some important pointers when teaching these strategies in the classroom.

The treatment of the notion 'conversation' originally developed by sociologists in the early 1970s which concentrates on relations between successive turns and on the operation of hypothetical turn-taking system. It ensures (according to hypothesis) that at any moment a specific speaker will have the floor and that when their turn ends that of the next speaker will follow smoothly without an appreciable overlap, or intervening period of silence, or confusion as to who, in a conversation with several participants, that speaker will be [22, p. 81]. It is important, as conversation usually accounts for the major proportion of most people's daily language use [3, p. 4]; informal talk in which people exchange news, feelings and thoughts [23, p. 298], so if you have a conversation with someone, you talk with them usually in informal situation; talk between two or more people in which thoughts, feelings and ideas are expressed, questions are asked and answered, or news or information are exchanged [24, p. 267]; etc. The above definitions lead to the reinforcement of the cooperative, dialogic and contact, spoken nature of informal verbal interaction, thus, following the definition given by Thornbury, Slade [3] with a special reference to language-teaching methodology, it ranges from speaking and communication to dialogue and role play, characterized by hesitations, word repetitions, false starts, repairs, unfinished utterances and ungrammaticality, the use of discourse markers etc., interactional language that is primarily listener-oriented (as the social well-being of the participants is at stake in casual conversations, the aim being essentially phatic, i.e. to signal friendship and to strengthen the bonds within social groups, rather than being directed at the achievement of some practical goal, the talk is primarily directed at the establishing and servicing of social relationships. When two strangers are standing shivering at a bus-stop in an icy wind and one turns to the other and says '*My goodness, it's cold*', it is difficult to suppose that the primary intention of the speaker is to convey information. For this reason, conversation has been labelled interactional) [1, p. 3]. To manage it appropriately and effectively, conversational strategies have been defined as techniques that are used to manage our conversations with other people, to be more fluent in English and become more accomplished as a speaker, as they are crucial for successful communication.

Researches underline the importance of teaching the strategies to students who are learning English

for a number of reasons [13]: 1. Most of the students are not in immersive English language environment, they can't really use these strategies or pick them up naturally, it's not easy to do that, thus, an environment has to be created where these strategies are overtly taught and practiced; 2. Strategies are very important because they can possibly help students become more fluent in English and they can become more accomplished as a speaker. 3. Managing a conversation is a real skill, it's important that we can ask for favors politely, or that we can avoid answering difficult questions if we choose to; or that we can get to a point more quickly and to do so politely, teaching students speech acts of establishing, maintaining and ceasing the contact to avoid communicative failures or disruption of verbal contact. For repairing such gaps in conversation one can use a lot of conventional indirect speech acts, in other terms, etiquette phrases that mark certain stages in speech communication by establishing, maintaining and ceasing the contact, e.g.: *Hello, You are welcome; Thanks; Wish you good luck*, etc. In many cases it's not actually difficult to teach some of these conversational strategies, these are skills that have to be taught actively as often they manifest themselves through specific vocabulary or expressions to be given very easily and overtly to the students.

We now call your attention to managing conversation as a whole: it is important to make sure the speakers are taking turns or to refer back to things people said earlier in conversation; or to keep a conversation moving along, i.e., the speaker is making a comment and then asking a question in order to keep a conversation going, e.g., A: *Have you been to that new club?* B: *No, but I've heard things about it. How was it?*; managing one's own talk: to rephrase something that we said to make the meaning clearer; if we made a mistake and we want to correct what we said; not to sound too harsh, to soften things we say; repeating ideas to make your meaning clear, e.g., A: *I often have weird dreams. Really weird dreams. I mean, just off the wall.* B: *Yeah? To soften You are insensitive* – it's potentially quite harsh and too direct to say this in an argument, but it's potentially less confrontational to say: *You know, you're being just a little, you know, kind of insensitive, in a way*; taking account of others: to check what someone said and ask for reexplanation, to help someone to remember a word that is forgotten (e.g., suggesting a word or name using *Do you mean...?* as in the following example: A: *My sister has her hair, um, what do you call them?* B: *Oh, do you mean cornrows?* (here Speaker B is taking account of other people); asking questions in two ways to soften the question, to be

clear and not too direct thus making the message clear, unambiguous, explicit and understandable (e.g., *What do you do for lunch? Do you, like, bring your own packed lunch?* – one should avoid to be threatening, confrontational to other people).

Researchers claim that the strategies are usually realized in one of three ways: through vocabulary, a 'technique', grammar, e.g., when having a conversation, the task of the speaker needs to end it politely, or needs to learn how to soften what he/she says. It is usually done through vocabulary, it can be a single item, such as *Well*, that is usually used for answering a question without *Yes/No* answer, it makes the reply not so straightforward, it's more complex, not just *Yes/No* answer: *Where are you from? Well, I am from...* It's a great strategy to teach lower-level students. The second important point is underlined when speakers need more time to think: *What do you want for dinner? Well, it may be sushi or salad* – this strategy is taking time to think and it manifests itself through this piece of vocabulary, through the word *Well*; when the speaker is waiting for an answer, he/she may prompt with the word *Well*: A: *What do you want for dinner?* B: *Umm...* A: *Well, what do you want?* It has been estimated that *Well* is a top 50 most frequent words used in three different strategies (analyses of spoken English, based on the CANCODE corpus (Cambridge and Nottingham Corpus of Discourse in English); a five-million-word corpus of everyday spoken English which has sub-components of social conversation (one million words) and a smaller component of speaking in academic contexts (460,000 words); the British Academic Spoken English (BASE) corpus, a 1.6 million-word collection of lecture and seminar data [14, p. 2–3; 26, p. 689]).

As mentioned, a set of expressions used for a strategy ending a conversation politely, if realized through vocabulary, e.g., *I'd better go, I've got to get going, I am going to have to run, Can I call you back? I'll call you later, I've really got to go; That would be... + adjective* is used to comment on suggestions and possibilities, e.g., A: *You might want to go there and meet some of the professors?* – a suggestion is made, B: *That would be good!* (the strategy here is commenting on suggestions and possibilities and it is realized through *That would be + adjective*). The most frequent adjectives after *That would be*: *nice, good, great, fun, cool, interesting, fine, wonderful, hard, awesome, neat*.

Discussing techniques, the researches pointed out that strategies are realized through particular technique: you answer the question and ask a similar one, e.g., A: *How about your weekend?* plus answer

plus *Good, anyway, what did you do? How was your weekend?* So, the answer plus similar question is a technique where you show that you are interested in the news, it keeps the conversation going.

The importance of grammar of interaction or the grammar of spoken English has been highlighted which is undoubtedly a very promising field of investigation in discussing conversational strategies, as stated by researches who augmented their work by exploiting the power of large-scale data. It is claimed that when people are speaking in conversation with their friends, family, colleagues, they are not thinking in sentences, as J. Leech [26] underlines, the conversation reflects online, in real time, linear nature in brevity of utterances where words and phrases, rather than long clauses or heavily embedded structures predominate, stressing the need for a new descriptive apparatus for the language of speech. Although arguments for the view that spoken and written language utilize the same basic grammatical repertoire were presented by Leech, their implementations of it may be different [26, p. 675], as private, face-to-face communication takes place on the basis of shared context – physical, psychological, and social. This aspect of conversation is reflected in the high differential frequency of features that reduce the length and complexity of utterances, by making use of information retrievable from the linguistic or nonlinguistic context. According to J. Leech, such features include the following: personal pronouns (as contrasted with nouns, which are notably more frequent in the written registers); substitute and other “pro-forms” such as *so* (as a substitute for a clause), *do* as a pro-verb, *do it* and *do that* as pro-predicates, etc.; various types of ellipsis, such as front ellipsis (as in *Doesn't matter* or *You want a double?* where the subject and/or auxiliary is omitted), and ellipsis across independent syntactic units such as independent clauses, for example: nonclausal material: i.e., “stand-alone” elements that are not attached to any clause or sentence and that reflect a general simplificatory tendency in conversational grammar [26, p. 694–695]. The realization of strategies through grammar is presented in giving short answers in the same tense: it shows interest to what the other person has just said, it keeps the conversation going, it shows interest; tense and aspect system of English exploited to create relationships (e.g., the use of Past Continuous to facilitate politeness, indirectness, good relations, etc.). Giving short answers in the same tense requires some manipulations of grammar: through grammar, through questions that have a grammatical component: e.g., *Are you? Do you? You do? Did you/You did? Have you?* etc., for example:

A: *I've never been up in an air balloon, I'm afraid* B: *Are you? Me too, I hate flying* A: *Do you?*

Grammar plays a lesser role in the total communication process in speech than in writing, thus, it is quite logically stated by researches, new understandings of spoken grammar need to be integrated in a larger discourse framework, rather than treated as “another thing to be taught” and discourse-based tasks should fit grammar into its broader human context, i.e., discourse-based grammar tasks should focus first and foremost on the people involved in producing the language sample, their relationships, and the ideas that they are conveying rather than merely on a section of text as a setting for a grammatical structure [26, p. 715; 25, p. 281]. Several factors in grading strategies have to be taken into consideration, such as frequency (as *Well* is the most frequent word in the corpora, it's worth teaching); relevance, i.e., how useful or relevant is it to students' level? But very often in conversation all listeners need time to think when asked a question, so *Well* gives this time and may be used as a very handy little tool that interactants can use); complexity, i.e., how complex is the language that students' need? (e.g., *I was wandering if I could help you?* – the grammar here is difficult, it shouldn't be taught to young learners until they know basic grammar); teachability/learnability, i.e., how easy is the strategy to explain? To practice? To remember? (as is reported, *Well* is easy to students to remember that it gives them time to think and is a good way when starting an answer to the question); extent of student's production, i.e., how much are they expected to say? (we cannot expect them to hold a floor for longer); context and Topic, i.e., what types of conversations will students engage in? (Low Level students are engaged in simple casual conversations). The same is applied to the use of *I mean* to repeat ideas or say more about something as it is one of the top 15 expressions; *I mean* is very frequent, after *You know* and *I think*; it helps to put together what people want to say, it helps to keep the floor, to keep their turn in conversation: A: *How do you like the restaurants around here?//* B: *They are OK, I mean, they are not cheap, but they are good.* But at higher levels it is advisable to focus on one aspect of strategy, e.g., clarification, extend the repertoire of items: *I mean/I don't mean; What I mean is; What I am saying is; In other words, I am just saying/not saying* – to clarify meaning.

Conclusion. Awareness of conversational strategies have developed our understanding of the language used in everyday talk, particularly in conversation, and proved vital to successful communication as people

can't actually communicate without them. They are used all the time whatever language people are speaking, when they are involved in conversation with other people, thus, we are always employing strategies, all the time. Thus, learners of English need to learn how to do them in English, and they have to be taught from A1 to C2 levels, as by using them, perceptions of students' fluency is transformed, they enable them to be successful communicators greatly improving their global achievement, i.e., handling communication on a range of familiar and unfamiliar topics. By teaching strategies students are given tools to be more confident in speaking English, to be more engaged and to be less resistant to speak out in the classroom. It can also support students for the conversations they wish to have outside the classroom helping them to

overcome the passivity of not knowing what to say, to decrease anxiety, and to increase willingness to participate in conversations, thus providing useful means of developing conversation skills, essential to building communicative competence. As such, they have to be organized into four category areas, 4 main syllabus areas, the corner stones: managing conversation as a whole; managing one's own talk; taking account of other people; listenership. Thus, this paper is an attempt to map out an increasingly important field of study concerning implications for teaching and learning of conversational strategies and how they may be relevant to Ukrainian context, so much is expected from the researchers in future as for implementing them into practical classroom activities.

REFERENCES:

1. G. Brown, G. Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1988. 286 p.
2. Gillian Brown, George Yule. *Teaching the Spoken Language. An Approach based on the analysis of conversational English*. Cambridge Language Teaching Library, Cambridge University Press, 1983. 162 p.
3. Thornbury, Scott and Slade, Diana. *Conversation: from Description to Pedagogy*. Cambridge Language Teaching Library. Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom, 2006. 256 p.
4. McCarthy, M. J., McCarten, J. Now you're talking! Practising Conversation in Second Language Learning, dans C. Jones (ed.) *Practice in Second Language Learning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. P. 7–16.
5. Christian Jones and David Oakey. Literary dialogues as models of conversation in English Language Teaching. *Journal of Second Language Teaching and Research*. Volume 7. 2019. P. 107–135. file:///C:/Users/PC/Downloads/583-1385-1-SM.pdf
6. Xiaomei Yang. Conversation Strategies in Institutional Dialogue. *Asian Social Science*. Vol.5. No. 7. 2009. P. 108–112. www.ccsenet.org/journal.html
7. Alison Roberts. *The Conversation Strategies Manual. A Complete Course to Develop Conversation Skills*. Speechmark, 2012. 192 p.
8. McCarthy M. Good listenership made plain: British and American non-minimal response tokens in everyday conversation. Using corpora to explore linguistic variation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002. P. 49–71.
9. McCarthy M. Talking back: "Small" Interactional Response Tokens in Everyday Conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 2003. Vol. 36/1. P. 33–63.
10. McCarthy M. Putting speaking and listening together. Webinar from Cambridge University Press: English Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. <https://youtu.be/P69Ho6CogAs>
11. McCarthy M. Spoken Grammar 20 years on: where are we now? VI International Conference "Innovation in Philology and Communication Studies", 25–17 October, 2017. <https://youtu.be/lm89QHufQX4?si=1jOXSRZjmftQSTL>
12. McCarthy M. Reflections on Spoken Corpora, 2018. <https://youtu.be/LUCTJ4hgdYs?si=R5ClyLiqiM8kKin>
13. McCarten J., Sandford H. Conversation Strategies 101. Cambridge University Press ELT Webinar. October 14, 2014. <https://youtu.be/2BUmK3liknY>
14. McCarthy M. and McCarten J. Interaction management in academic speaking. Document 5. Online since 30 December 2019. Connection on 07 April 2020. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/linx/3611>; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/linx.3611>
15. Marianne Celce-Murcia, Zoltan Dornyei, Sarah Thurrell. Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 6, (2), 1995. P. 5–35.
16. Celce-Murcia M., Olshtain E. *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching. A guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 269 p.
17. Rod Gardner. Between Speaking and Listening: The Vocalisation of Understandings. *Applied Linguistics* 19/2, 1998. p. 204–224. DOI:10.1093/applin/19.2.204
18. Christian Jones. Conversation strategies and communicative competence: theory, research and classroom applications. Workshop, University of Liverpool, 2021. <https://salcnews.wordpress.com/2021/07/14/workshops-by-christian-jones-university-of-liverpool/>
19. Christian Jones. *Conversation Strategies and Communicative Competence*. Candlin & Mynard Epublishing, 2021. 174 p.

20. Council of Europe. Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume with New Descriptors, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, 2018. 235 p. www.coe.int/lang-cefr
21. Council of Europe. Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, 2020. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>
22. Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics. Second Edition. Oxford University Press, 2007. 443 p.
23. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. British National Corpus, 1995. 1696 p.
24. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Cambridge University Press, 2003. 1550 p.
25. R. Hughes, M. McCarthy. From Sentence to Discourse: Discourse Grammar and English Language Teaching*. TESOL Quarterly, 1998. Vol. 32, Issue 2. P. 263–287. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587584>
26. Leech G. Grammars of Spoken English: New Outcomes of Corpus-Oriented Research. Language Learning, A Journal of Research in Language Studies. 2000. Vol. 50/4. P. 675–724. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00143>