

**Volodymyr Tatarin,  
Postgraduate Student,  
Berdyansk State Pedagogical University**

## **PARTNER LANGUAGE IN MASTERING ENGLISH COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS**

In contemporary education, there is a growing need for interaction that ensures trust, transparency, and psychological safety. These conditions reduce anxiety, normalise the right to make mistakes, and support emotional-volitional regulation during foreign-language learning. Partner language functions not only as a speech style but as a pedagogical mindset that minimises hierarchy and builds subject–subject relations between teacher and student, which is directly related to enabling sustained practice of communication in English [2].

Partnership pedagogy is represented by two closely related directions: a subject-oriented line and a democratisation line. Its communicative foundations draw on humanistic psychology, nonviolent communication (M. Rosenberg) [3], and teacher effectiveness training (T. Gordon) [1]. Empirical studies highlight links between teacher empathy and students' motivation and achievement (S. Meyers et al.), gains in preservice teachers' empathic tendencies after communication courses (V. Çelik, G. Alpan), and the anxiety-reducing effects of pedagogical strategies in EFL (S. Aldubaikhi).

**Aim:** to substantiate the role of partner language in developing English communicative skills. **Methods:** theoretical analysis of psychological-pedagogical and methodological sources, synthesis of findings, and reflection on teaching experience.

Partner language is an integrated communicative system comprising four operational components that directly scaffold communicative skills:

1. *Equality of address and cooperative formulations* (reducing status distance; promoting turn-taking and negotiation of meaning).

**Stems:** «Let's build this answer together...», «What would you add to your partner's point?», «Shall we try a different phrasing and compare effects?»

2. *Empathic support and emotional validation* (protecting willingness to speak; sustaining risk-taking required for output).

Stems: «It makes sense that this feels difficult; let's unpack it step by step». «Your idea is clear; we can refine the tense».

3. *Dialogicity and active listening* (co-constructing meaning; modelling discourse moves essential for interactional competence).

Stems (teacher modelling → student uptake):

Paraphrase: «So you're saying that..., right?»

Clarify: «Do you mean X or Y?»

Probe/extend: «Could you illustrate that with an example?»

Hedge/politeness: «I might look at it differently because... Would that work?»

4. *Process-oriented, non-person-labelling feedback* (shifting attention from self to performance; enabling precise repair).

Stems: «The message is strong; let's check verb-subject agreement in line two». «This request is polite; to sound more natural, try 'Would you mind...?'»

Micro-procedure: stop–validate–clarify–agree → stop an automatic corrective impulse; validate the effort; clarify the linguistic target («we're focusing on past reference»); agree on a concrete next action (e.g., «try it once with used to and once with the Past Simple; choose which fits your meaning»).

In practice, partner language is embedded in visible, low-stakes routines that make participation safe while keeping it academically productive: brief think-time before speaking; pair-preview of ideas prior to plenary; choice-based prompts that grant agency («Explain your view or ask a follow-up – your choice»); learner-led repair invitations («Would you like to self-correct or hear a model?»); and a consistent feedback triad that attends first to content, then to one form target, and finally to communicative effect («Your example convinces the audience because...»). These routines align accuracy, fluency, and pragmatic appropriateness: learners talk more (willingness to communicate), talk better (clear targets and repair), and talk together (shared discourse moves), which cumulatively strengthen English communicative skills in classroom interaction.

Partner language is a key means of building subject–subject interaction that simultaneously lowers emotional tension, strengthens volitional regulation, develops empathy, and improves outcomes in English-language learning. Its systematic mastery should be viewed as a mandatory component of the professional preparation for English-language communication.

## References

1. Gordon T., Burch N. Teacher Effectiveness Training. NY : Three Rivers Press, 2003. 344 p.
2. Healey M., Flint A., Harrington K. Students as Partners: Reflection on a Conceptual Model. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*. 2016. Vol. 4, № 2. P. 8–20.
3. Rosenberg M. B. Nonviolent Communication: A Language of Life. [3rd ed.]. Encinitas, CA : PuddleDancer Press, 2015. 264 p.